

THE  
**Monthly Repository.**

No. CCXXXIII.]

MAY, 1825.

[Vol. XX.

*Mr. Hunter in Reply to Dr. J. P. Smith, on the Right of Presbyterians in their Chapels.*

Bath,

May 6, 1825.

SIR,  
**T**HE subject of Dr. Pye Smith's communication (208—211) is of such importance to the present race of Presbyterian Dissenters, that I wish to be allowed to offer a few remarks upon it; in which I hope to be able to shew that there is a material fallacy in his main argument, and an important misapprehension of an historical fact in what is the sixth head of his letter.

In his exposition of the duties of trustees in general, he is doubtless in the main correct. It is for them to carry into execution the intention of their founder or testator. But it is evident that there are cases in which they may lawfully, and even meritoriously, depart from the strict letter of his instruction. A testator, for instance, may direct that a trust for the benefit of minors shall be managed in a particular way. Circumstances unforeseen arise which make it most inexpedient that the property shall be deposited according to the letter of his instructions. If the trustees are willing to submit to the increase of responsibility which a departure from their instructions may bring with it, there can be no moral wrong in their doing so: on the contrary, they are in fact performing their duty with more conscientious propriety, than they would do were they to comply with the letter of their testator's requirement; and are, though against the letter, more strictly fulfilling his will. I mention this instance, not that it bears closely upon the subject before us, which will be seen to be not a case of *specific injunctions* being at variance with *general intention and spirit*, but to shew that Dr. Smith has drawn too closely the obligations by which trustees are bound, looking upon the subject not as a lawyer but as a Christian moralist, when he denies to trustees in general all right of deciding what is

*expedient* in respect of their trusts, and of acting accordingly. In fact, every thing in this world that is prospective, is to be moulded and governed more or less by circumstances as they arise, all of which cannot be foreseen and provided for: and there is, therefore, in all such engagements a tacit understanding between the founder and the trustees, that while his great and general design is kept in view, they shall in the detail be at liberty to bend before new and unexpected positions of human affairs, and to ask themselves, What if our founder were living in these times is it probable he would now do? Dr. S. contends that nothing but physical impossibility, or an immorality in the requirements, can release a trustee from his obligation to conform in all respects to the directions of his founder. Would he then have the strict letter of the ancient statutes of several of our national colleges enforced, when the certain effect would be, that the colleges would be deserted of all students, and the munificent intentions of the founders be wholly frustrated? As long as mutability is the characteristic of sublunary affairs, and human beings limited in their prospective vision, no founder when he creates a trust which is to have perpetual endurance, can be supposed to look for the punctual performance of all his intentions through all successive centuries, but only that the persons to whom he commits the management of the trust will not wantonly and needlessly deviate.

But taking Dr. Smith's own exposition of the duties of trustees, it does not appear to me that the trustees of our Presbyterian chapels have departed from the line of their duty. On the contrary, that so far from meriting the harsh epithets which have, it seems, been applied to them, I cannot see how they could consistently have acted differently from what they have done respecting them.

In considering the subject, two questions appear to arise, in which the whole case is contained. First, what was the intention of the founders of the Presbyterian chapels in the erection of them? And, secondly, Are the present ministers and congregations assembling in them the legitimate successors of those persons for whose use they were erected.

The general tenor of Dr. Smith's communication would lead one to suppose that he regards the Presbyterian chapels as having been erected in assertion of certain points of Christian faith: that they were rallying places for Calvinists or Arminians or people of some other particular faith, which prevailed among the first race of Presbyterian Nonconformists: that there were in those times the Trinitarian chapel and the Unitarian, and that the members of the latter had crossed over and taken possession of the chapel founded and endowed by the Trinitarians. The analogical case with which he concludes his letter has plainly this bearing, and such must be the impression which most readers would take from the general tenor of his letter. But no one knows better than Dr. S., that these chapels were not founded with a view to the maintenance of Trinitarian sentiments against Unitarian, or in assertion of any point which can strictly be called a point of faith. Any one so well acquainted with the history of Nonconformity as he is, knows that the intention of their erection was to afford ministers who were unable to comply with the terms of the Act of Uniformity, opportunities for the convenient and regular exercise of their ministry; and persons who were attached to their ministry, or who were dissatisfied with the impositions of the Act, opportunities for the convenient attendance upon them. By the erecting of these chapels they secured the benefit of the regular performance of public worship, unfettered by the language of the public liturgy, and of the performance of other Christian ordinances in what to them appeared a more scriptural or more edifying manner. This, and not the maintenance of any particular system of Christian faith, was the *object* in the erection of the chapels, and the creation of the trusts requisite for the

legal security of them. Doctrine was but at best a collateral consideration. If doctrine had been the leading consideration, the chapels would not have been erected at all: for in respect of doctrine the fathers of Presbyterian Nonconformity agreed with the church, were willing to subscribe her doctrinal articles, and would not therefore on that account have established an interest against her.

That the intention of the founders of the Presbyterian chapels was that which I have now described, must be evident to every one who is acquainted with the religious history of this country at the period in question. The declaration of uses in the original compact between the founders and the trustees it is supposed is, nearly in all instances, couched in the most general terms. If there are any instances in which it is required of the trustees that they shall allow the building to be used by no congregation or minister who do not profess the doctrine of the Church of England or of the Assembly's Catechism, those instances would require a separate consideration. If there are any such at all, they are exceedingly rare: the declaration of use being generally like that of the original trust deed of the Wolverhampton chapel, about which so much has been said, that the chapels were to be used *for the worship of God by Protestant Dissenters*. It is added perhaps in most instances, *Of the Presbyterian denomination; sometimes, of the Presbyterian or Congregational denomination; and perhaps in some of our smaller towns, where the number of Nonconformists of every denomination was but sufficient to erect and maintain one place of worship, those of the Baptist denomination might be joined with the others.*

But the great mass of the chapels which have been so long known as the Presbyterian chapels were founded for the worship of God by Protestant Dissenters of the Presbyterian denomination only; and as such they have continued to be used. In the fluctuations of human affairs some of our societies have become extinct: but where we still see them, the chapels have been used in uninterrupted succession as places where the Presbyterian societies assembled for public

worship, the administration of the Lord's supper, catechizing, and, in many instances, the performance of the rites of baptism and sepulture. For these purposes are they now used by the Protestant Dissenters who assemble in them. Whatever constitutes identity in such an association with continual succession, is found in us. We see in our societies aged persons who were born and baptized in them long ago: and young persons growing up to be their future supports. We see lying in the graveyard which generally surrounds our meeting-houses, the forefathers of those who are now the members of our societies, and we can trace many of them in our baptismal registers to the time when first these societies were constituted, and in some instances to the very persons who were themselves the principal contributors to the erection of these chapels, and the actual members of their original trusts. Some families once Presbyterian may have returned to the bosom of the church. Others have come among us, but not to such an extent as to have changed the character of the body to which they have united themselves, but to have taken their character from it. To the present race of trustees the interest committed to the original trust has been conveyed by all the proper and legal forms. The ministers also, however unworthy they may be of the honour, are the legitimate successors of those who first occupied the pulpits in our Presbyterian chapels. The great majority of them were born in Presbyterian families, who had been members of that body since first Presbyterian Nonconformity had a name. Not a few are they who are of families that appear (like the Levites of old) to have been separated to the work of the ministry, having never in all their generations been without one or more of their members employed in the ministerial office. They have been educated in academies which were supported by the successive generations of Presbyterian Dissenters. Some of the first race of ministers were the persons who directed the education of those of the second: they again of the third: and, however we may come behind our predecessors in

faith or knowledge, we owe what we are to our Presbyterian instructors, and they their ability to teach, to the Presbyterian tutors before them. They have also been successively elected to the ministerial office in particular congregations, by the suffrages of those congregations according to the primitive use of the Nonconforming Presbyterian societies. Would Dr. S. have the trustees of their chapels turn round upon the ministers, and (if they have the power) dismiss them from their stations, and substitute others who have no connexion with the Presbyterian body? Where would be the justice and propriety of such a measure? Or shall they (if they have the power) dismiss the congregations from the chapels raised by their forefathers, and place in them a host of strangers who would thus be saved from the burthen of erecting places of worship for themselves?

But, say Dr. S. and his friends, you have departed from the faith of the fathers of Presbyterian Nonconformity, and have therefore vacated your right to the use of the chapels erected by them. And if the chapels had been founded in assertion of points of faith, and not to afford opportunities for religious worship and the orderly performance of religious ordinances to those who would not comply with the provisions of the Uniformity Act, then might Dr. S. be right in his inference, that, having left the faith, you have no right to the chapel. But the present race of Presbyterians, though differing in points of faith from their forefathers, yet retain the impress of the great discriminating character. They are still opposed to the Church as by law established: they still protest against the impositions of the Act of Uniformity: and they still find the same necessity which their ancestors found for places of religious assembly apart from the Church.

I agree with Dr. S., that our forefathers would have looked with concern upon the change which has taken place in the religious opinions of their posterity. But I am not so sure that they did not contemplate such a change, or at least something like it, at the time when the chapels were erected and the trusts formed. Few have an earlier date than the Act of



Toleration : and the majority of trusts in the Presbyterian Nonconformist body are, it is believed, not older than about the year 1700, and some of them later. Now the average of Orthodoxy at that period was not the same with the average in the generation before. At least the *importance* of maintaining orthodox sentiments in opposition to those which were verging towards the Unitarian view of the subject, was not so sensibly felt as it might have been in the time of Vincent Alsop and other eminent and earlier Presbyterians. I do not mean to say that they were not orthodox in the wide signification of the term : but they did not set their love of Orthodoxy against another principle which they had received, the duty of forbearing to fetter inquiry, and of bringing every doctrine to the test of its conformity to Holy Scripture, of which the decision was to be left to the private judgment of the individual. On this part of the subject, I would refer Dr. S. to the Catechism of his late friend Mr. Palmer, of Hackney, who will not be suspected of any very violent leaning towards Unitarianism. Under the head of "The Reasons of the Protestant Dissent from the Established Church," the first question is, "What are the grand principles on which the Protestant Dissenters ground their separation from the Church by law established?" To which he gives this answer: "The right of private judgment and liberty of conscience, in opposition to all human authority in matters of religion: the supremacy of Christ as the only head of his Church, and the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures as the rule of faith and practice." Now it appears to me that before the creation of these trusts, these principles had begun to produce their natural effect, a diversity of religious sentiment; for no one can suppose that when these principles are conscientiously maintained and acted on, there will be a continued uniformity of religious faith: but rather that, what has in point of fact taken place, was foreseen, that there would be a declension, be it greater or less, from what at the beginning was the average of faith among those who professed the principle. And to this, as it seems

to me, may be in part attributed, the absence of all restriction in respect of doctrine in which the Presbyterian trustees were left by their founders.

The year 1719 was not long after the date of the original trusts. Many of the original trustees and the founders of Presbyterian societies were then in being: and Dr. S. is not ignorant that the zeal for Orthodox opinions was at that time much reduced from what it may have been, and that in the estimation of the majority of the Presbyterian ministers in and about London, it sunk before what appeared to them the superior importance of maintaining freedom of inquiry and the right of private judgment.

But it appears to me absurd that a religious body shall admit a principle, and then be declared dissolved in consequence of the natural and necessary operation of that principle. If it was a principle admitted by them that neither themselves nor their posterity should be fettered in their religious inquiries, their posterity must have a right to adopt and to profess any scriptural truth to which their studies in the word of God may have led them.

The founders and original trustees and ministers of these chapels might not, perhaps, have foreseen the whole extent to which their principle would lead their successors. But we cannot suppose them to have been so ignorant as not to have foreseen that such changes would take place: and it seems to me that if they had wished, or meant to counteract them, we should have found clauses to that effect introduced into the trust deeds, which might with the utmost ease have been done by them.

The declension moreover has been gradual. One point of Orthodoxy was dropped after another. I would ask Dr. S., What quantum of unbelief disqualifies for the possession of their property, and whether he is not acquainted with instances in the very first race of trustees, congregations and ministers, in which there were departures from the Orthodoxy of such men as Alsop and the other founders of Presbyterianism? So that if a change of sentiment were to disqualify for the possession of these chapels, the very persons by whom



they were erected must, in some instances, themselves have left the chapels which their own hands had built.

The changes too have taken place through the whole body. Congregations, trustees and ministers have gone together. For the trustees to eject the congregation were to eject themselves and to leave the chapels among the waifs and strays of society, not to be used at all for the purposes for which they were erected, or to be taken possession of by persons who neither in themselves nor their ancestors had borne the burthen of their erection, and who in many points of considerable importance, entertain not a similarity of sentiment with those by whom they were founded.

Dr. S. further says, that we have no right to the name of Presbyterians, because we have nothing of the Presbyterian discipline among us. But at what period since the establishment of the trusts in question did any of the Presbyterian discipline exist in the body which, notwithstanding, was called Presbyterian? At no period since the foundation of these chapels have there been "Courts of Review," &c. : so that, according to the criterion which Dr. S. would establish, there never was any right to the name of Presbyterian among the Presbyterian Non-conformists, since they had any chapels amongst them. And perhaps the name, like the name Methodist, never was peculiarly appropriate. The truth is, that the name was acquired before they began to take their place as a religious denomination of Dissenters. It was given to them at a time when they were labouring to supersede the episcopal form of Church Government in England by the Presbyterians. A name once acquired usually adheres to a party; and this name was continued to them when they appeared in the character of Dissenters, though they were then little strenuous for the Presbyterian discipline, and in fact never attempted any general establishment of it amongst them. From the first foundation of these chapels they were what, in this respect, they now are, congregational or independent: i. e. so far as each congregation was regarded, competent to the direction of its own affairs, with no foreign interference, and acknowledging no spiritual superiority. This is now

the case. So that it seems, if there is any thing in a name, the modern Presbyterians, can with as much propriety and fairness as their forefathers, call themselves by the name.

Under the sixth head of his letter, Dr. S. insinuates, that many of the chapels now called Presbyterian would be found to have been built by Congregationalists. I believe that it is much more probable that many of the chapels now occupied by the persons who call themselves Independents, would be found on inquiry to have been erected by the Presbyterians: the Presbyterians having been at the time when these chapels were erected so vast a majority of the whole body of Dissenters, and through their wealth, so much more able to give that direction to their zeal. "Of one important instance" he says "he can speak with certainty. The Upper Chapel at Sheffield was built in 1700, for Mr. Jollie and his church, who were strictly Congregationalists." It is too much to say that Mr. Jollie and his church were *strict* Congregationalists, since it is not unknown, I presume, to Dr. S., that Mr. Jollie was ordained pastor of that church, not in the Congregational but the Presbyterian manner. This is expressly recorded by a Presbyterian minister of great eminence,\* who took a part in the ordination of Mr. Jollie, and who regarded the circumstance as a gratifying proof of a disposition to union between the Congregationalists and Presbyterians at that time (1681) residing at Sheffield. From the academy, over which Mr. Jollie presided, issued more ministers who took their places among the Presbyterians, than

---

\* Oliver Heywood, of Northowram, one who was ejected by the Act of Uniformity, and continued his diligent labours in the ministry till his death in 1702. An attempt has been made to deprive the Presbyterians of the credit of this venerable name. In a life of him published by the Rev. Dr. Fawcett, p. 79, is what purports to be a copy of a license granted to him in 1672, in which he is described as of the *Congregational* persuasion. Where the Dr. met with this license I know not: but the original license which he took in that year is certainly in possession of his descendants, and he is described in it as of the *Presbyterian* persuasion.

among the Congregationalists. Mr. Jollie, however, I may admit, is rather to be ranked as a Congregationalist than as a Presbyterian: but I deny that the chapel in which he officiated was erected for the especial use of that small part of his society which formed the Congregational Church. It was intended for the general use of the Nonconformists of Sheffield, the great majority of whom were Presbyterian, formed to Presbyterian Nonconformity by the labours of the other Nonconformist ministers who had resided at Sheffield between the Restoration and the Revolution. Then all were willing to place themselves under the ministry of so admired a preacher as was Mr. Jollie, and when it became necessary to erect a larger chapel, they willingly contributed to it. But it was for *themselves*, not for the little congregational body which was included within the whole society, that this sacrifice was made. And we accordingly find that they were two Presbyterians who contracted for the ground on which the chapel was built; viz. Mr. Field Sylvester, who was a near relation of Matthew Sylvester, who preached as coadjutor with two remarkable Presbyterian ministers, Baxter and Calamy; and Mr. Bayes, father to the minister of that name, who was then exercising his ministry among the Presbyterian Dissenters in London. The latter advanced the money requisite for completing the building, and has the repayment of £200 guaranteed to him in the original trust deed of 1704. Of several of the original trustees it may be shewn that they were Presbyterians. At least there is this kind of evidence, their families were always accustomed to account themselves as belonging to the Presbyterian in opposition to the Congregational body. The Congregational Church consisted in 1715 of seventy persons, but the whole society exceeded 1300 persons, of all ages: and when, after the death of Mr. Jollie, in that year, the Congregationalists attempted to claim the right of nominating his successor, the claim was completely overruled by the other part of the society, and a successor appointed by the general voice, who ranked with the Presbyterians. The overruling in this instance the claim of the Congregation-

alists while still the founders of the chapel were alive, and the first trust had endured only eleven years, is an evident proof that the chapel had not been erected exclusively for the Congregationalists.

JOSEPH HUNTER.

*London,*

*May 2, 1825.*

SIR,

**M**OST of your readers will, I think, be surprised that the project of the Lancashire Calvinists for depriving Unitarians of their places of worship should be considered by any Calvinist of sober and liberal mind, out of the sphere of the local controversy, worthy of serious discussion. That lawyers of sharp practice should urge on the scheme may be easily accounted for; but that disinterested persons and serious divines should give countenance to the design, is one of those practical anomalies that can be explained only by the too well-known influence of party spirit, an influence sometimes not perceived by those on whom it most strongly operates.

The acceptance of a trusteeship is an engagement to fulfil the trust according to the will of the founder, only so far as that is practicable and agreeable to the present state of society. The moral obligation depends upon the law of the land. There may be trusts for purposes once legal but now illegal. An act of parliament or a decree of a court, may make it a moral duty to apply a trust to different purposes from those originally contemplated by the institutor. This is the justification of the application of property left for Roman Catholic to Protestant uses.

A benefactor, a century ago, directed part of his estate to be employed in giving away the Assembly's Catechism. The Court of Chancery has determined that the trustees may give another catechism more suited to the theology of the times. No wrong is done to the founder by the trustees acting upon the Chancery decree; for this plain reason, that every deed of trust is formed under the knowledge that it will be expounded, and may in particulars be overruled, by a court of equity.

Suppose a benevolent person, before Dr. Jenner's time, had left a sum of money for the establishment of a

Small-Pox hospital: would it be wrong to apply the bequest to the charitable promotion of vaccine inoculation? The welfare of society demands the change, and it would be laid down in any court, that the testator, were he now living, would himself do that which is done by his trustees. The same may be determined as to opinions. There is at Warboys, in Huntingdonshire, an endowed annual lecture against witchcraft; but since there is no longer any belief in witchcraft, and it is no crime in the eye of the law, may not Mr. Nicholson or any other preacher honourably receive the endowment for a sermon shewing that the origin of the establishment was itself superstitious, and that the founder was under a delusion?

The fallacy of the whole argument, in favour of the literal and punctual execution of Dissenting trusts, lies in the notion that there is property in opinions, and that one generation can bind the faith of another. This is wholly impossible, and hence the futility of all endowments tending to mortgage the belief of posterity. A father may recommend his own notions to his children, but he cannot do more: a founder of a trust may express his wishes for this or that system of opinions being taught, but he cannot secure his wishes by any legal instrument ever yet devised. Nor ought any one to have the power to tie up the human mind, even by golden chains, or by threats or bribes to interfere with the progress of knowledge and the interests of truth. A trust for opinions is a solecism, and is *per se* invalid. Such a trust would be an establishment for opposing Protestantism, the essence of which is, that the Bible is the sole rule of faith, and that every individual shall judge of the Bible for himself.

In the case of endowments for Protestant Dissenting worship, the intention of the testator must be judged of by the fundamental principles of Protestant Dissent. These are, that each individual shall have liberty of conscience, and that the majority of every congregation shall have power to determine every thing that appertains to such congregation; be it faith, worship or discipline. If I build and endow an Unitarian chapel, I do it with the knowledge that the majority

of the worshipers in such a chapel, at all times, must have absolute power of believing and worshipping as they please, in spite of any thing in the trust deed by which I attempt to enslave their minds. This attempt of any man or body of men to legislate in matters of faith for a future generation is arrant Popery.

The Calvinists of the present day have as little right in their old endowments, as the Presbyterians in theirs; for though they have not departed so widely as the Presbyterians from the faith of their fathers, they have gone astray sufficiently to disinherit them, according to Dr. J. P. Smith's principle. In fact, they are no more Calvinists than the Presbyterians are Presbyterians; and a Westminster Assembly man would disown and condemn them as rank Arminians. Where then are their consciences?

Put the case of an academical institution founded upon the law of subscription to articles, and that in process of time the trustees abolish such subscription. Let Dr. Smith say whether, on his own shewing, this be not malversation in office? The founders believed that subscription was the only safeguard of orthodoxy, and would not have laid out their money on buildings or books or any other academical property, but on the faith of subscription being continued: in abolishing it, the trustees fly in the face of the original founders, and undo the very thing on which they placed all their hopes and wishes.

Put the case again, of property bequeathed for the use of such as believe and teach the Assembly's Catechism; and suppose those that manage, or in any way enjoy the benefit of, the endowment, have arrived at the conviction that 1 John v. 7, 8, which is set down in the Catechism as holy scripture, and as the main proof of the doctrine of the Trinity, is a gross forgery; can they on the principle I am controverting honestly hold their appointments? If the intention of the testators be decisive, they certainly cannot; for the Trinitarian Dissenters, a century ago, or even less, would have denounced him as little better than a "Socinian," who should have given up the three heavenly witnesses; and much more one who should have proposed their being ousted with dis-



grace from the Bible. Allow the departure from trust deeds in this instance, and where will you stop? The concession implies all that the Presbyterians ask for their own justification. The Calvinist trustee or tutor or beneficiary who comes under this case, may plead, that had the benefactors lived in our times they would have been of our mind in this particular; he has no other defence; but this is a defence equally of Presbyterians that hold Unitarianism, administering trusts founded by Presbyterians that were Trinitarians and Calvinists.

I will suggest only one more case; that of an endowment for the distribution of the Bible, by a person who knows no language but his mother tongue, and has no idea of any Bible but King James's English Translation: there is no doubt, we will suppose, of this being his view of the Bible, and he provides for its being given without note or comment, or any alteration, addition or subtraction. But, by and by, the government call upon the heads of the church to revise the translation, and to accommodate it to the present sense of propriety, and to the actual state of Biblical knowledge. They go to work, and take for the New Testament Griesbach's text, and the Improved Version is set forth by authority as the English Bible. Now, in what way will the trustees in this case act? Will they circulate the testator's Bible, with many acknowledged errors and interpolations, and thus, in fact, set themselves against Divine revelation; or will they take up the new and corrected Bible, reasoning that they best fulfil the mind of the institutor by disregarding the letter of his instructions? This would surely be a moral duty; though some grave theological schoolmen might assail them with the cry of "thieves," and denounce them as excluded, for this exercise of their best moral judgment, from the kingdom of heaven.

Let me make one observation more: the chapels held by Presbyterians in the present day are none of them scarcely cases of unmixed Trinitarian or Calvinistic endowment. The originators of the establishments might be of this description, but they only began the work which has been carried on by their children or successors ever since, and every new generation has

made good their title to the property in question by repairs, rebuilding, ornamenting and additional bequests. Now he must be a good casuist who can determine which race of worshippers, in a century and a half, is entitled to be considered, on account of property expended or bequeathed, as having authority over the faith and worship of those that shall come after. "Whose wife is she of the seven, for the seven had her to wife?"

If the Trinitarians of the present day mean to try the whole question in a court of law, let them make haste; their time is short; there is no hope for them but in the present Lord Chancellor, and he may have his doubts. A lawyer, worthy of the character of a statesman and of the age in which he lives, and superior to the pitiful prejudices of underlings at Oxford three quarters of a century ago, would repel applicants in such a cause with indignation and scorn, and send them home to "learn what that meaneth," "I hate robbery for burnt-offering."

There wanted not, Sir, this practical exhibition of Calvinism to shew your readers its true character; but Calvinists themselves may see in this emanation of their zeal, "what manner of spirit they are of;" and I would recommend the history of the project to be inserted in the next book that shall be written to prove that Calvinism is vital godliness, *because Calvinists are more meek, more spiritually-minded, more religiously-benevolent, more righteous and more holy than Unitarians*. The motto of such a book is at hand: *God! I thank thee, that I am not as other men are—* EXTORTIONERS.

A PRESBYTERIAN TRUSTEE.

SIR,

FROM the obliging answers of Dr. Pye Smith, I learn that, in his opinion, God will hereafter deal with mankind according to the principles of strict equity; that all who habitually attend to the obligations of virtue will be made happy; that none will be excluded; and that in apportioning to all men their future condition, due allowance will be made for the circumstances of their present lives, and for the deficiency of their moral cultivation resulting from them.

To these opinions I heartily subscribe, to this statement I devoutly respond Amen. I have confidence in them, because they are in agreement with the tenor of the New Testament, and because they are in entire unison with the best and most delightful feelings we entertain towards the great and bountiful Creator, whether derived from revelation or from the exercise of the understanding directed and illuminated by the light of revealed religion. They teach that God has promised to mankind a future and an everlasting life, and that he will adapt the future condition of every individual to that character which has been the result of this first stage of his existence. And, as I feel the highest moral certainty that every thing is from God and of God, and that God is Love, I have no hesitation in the conclusion, that, ultimately, all will be well with every creature he has destined for immortality.

In this conclusion, I fear the learned gentleman and I must part; having agreed in our premises, I wish we had travelled together to the conclusion: and being agreed in all that appears to me most important I shall leave the subject with one remark upon an argument used to support the hypothesis designated by the terms Justification and Sanctification. It has been said that, without the process described by these terms, a sinner could have no *ground* of confidence before God.

If by the word *ground* be meant, that a creature may prefer a claim against his Creator, independently of the will and mercy and goodness of that Creator, founded upon some supposed right which he has derived from moral habits, then neither with Sanctification and Justification nor without them has he any *ground* at all: but if by the term be meant that connexion between certain moral habits and a future state of immortal happiness which the supremely good Creator has, by revelation, declared shall exist, then Dr. Pye Smith, Mr. Andrew Fuller and myself are all entirely agreed. The Doctor has said, "The penitent and believing sinner is pardoned because Christ gave himself a sacrifice, not to purchase the Father's grace, but as a fruit and effect

of that grace;" so that mercy and grace are the *ground* of the expectation of happiness, or, which is the same thing, the ground of a sinner's confidence before God. (Mon. Repos. p. 78.) Mr. Fuller says, "That good works have the promise of salvation, is beyond dispute. Nothing that God approves shall go unrewarded. The least expression of faith and love, even the giving a cup of cold water to a disciple of Christ's, because he belongs to him, will insure everlasting life." See Fuller's Works, Vol. VII. p. 431. I should think no man would wish to employ a term of higher certainty or one that implies more of necessary connexion than the word *INSURE*.

I observe that the charge of pious theft and the hint that these pious thieves will be excluded from heaven for it, made by Dr. Smith, has attracted the notice of a correspondent, and that the Doctor has replied to him. Nevertheless, I will take the liberty to say, I think the change of property in this country from the Catholic to the Protestant Church, at the Reformation, is a case very much in point. Except indeed, and this is a most important exception, that in one case Dr. Smith's party were the gainers, and in the other they are likely to be the losers. The mere fact of the exchange of property being made by act of parliament, and by the act of such a parliament, though it might *justify*, it could not *sanctify* the appropriation of the funds of the Catholic Church, if such an appropriation were in itself unjust, and if so tremendous a punishment had been threatened against it. The law and the fact I take to be this, that as succeeding generations of men improve in knowledge, they will apply, and they ought to apply, those means which their forefathers had found serviceable, to carry on their own improvement; and that an endowment for a professorship whose object was to maintain the Ptolemaic system, will be and ought to be devoted in the present day to maintaining the system of Newton, notwithstanding the former system was stoutly supported by the founder.

THOMAS GIBSON.

SIR,

April 10, 1825.

**B**EFORE I transcribe the extracts I alluded to in my last, (p. 142,) I beg leave to prefix a brief sketch of the character of the author, by a gentleman not unknown to many of your readers, the late excellent William Rathbone, of Liverpool, who was well acquainted with Job Scott personally, and of whom he says, in his Narrative of Events in Ireland, among the Society called Quakers, p. 28, "As a man and a minister he was esteemed and beloved, both in his native country, where his religious labours had been frequent and extensive, and also by those persons who had the opportunities of being acquainted with him in Europe.

"In Ireland his visit was manifestly influential in producing an expansion of mind, especially among those with whom his acquaintance was intimate. He was a man of strong natural abilities, of singular piety, and of exemplary dedication of heart to whatever appeared to him in the light of duty. He considered religious truth as a pearl of inestimable value; hence he became accustomed to habits of frequent and serious reflexion; and these habits he was desirous of encouraging in others. It was his belief, and the subject of his frequent regret, that the professors of the gospel generally, those of his own Society not excepted, were too much in the practice of resting in forms and ceremonies—taking up their religion on trust—depending on the labours and experience of others—and too implicitly adopting their opinions.

"To counteract this tendency, and to excite a serious, diligent and *individual* search after truth, and a faithful attention to all its dictates, were the great objects of his ministry, conversation and epistolary correspondence. These, as well as the journal of his life, labours and religious experience, exhibited striking proofs of a mind desirous of penetrating beyond the surface, and accustomed to original and instructive views of truth.

"It has, however, been greatly regretted by several of his friends, that some controverted opinions, which are known to be at variance with those of his maturer age, are published, without any comment, in the early part of

his journal; and that several other passages, some of which were peculiarly striking and energetic, are wholly suppressed."

I have made the following extracts from Job Scott's tract, entitled, "Remarks upon the NATURE OF SALVATION BY CHRIST," &c., which commences at p. 39 of the pamphlet, published under the peculiar circumstances described in my last.

"He" (God, says Job Scott) "never repeals a jot or tittle of the moral law to any, further than it is fulfilled in them. It can never pass away till it is fulfilled: and it is never further fulfilled than the state of transgression is removed, on account of which it was added. 'God is unchangeable.' All the changeable dispensations result from, and are accommodated to, the different states of mankind. There never was but one way of salvation, nor of remission of sins. Could any thing else ever have answered this purpose but the birth, life and government of Christ in man, it would answer still, and as well now as ever. This was pointed to by the law and its ordinances, by John and his figurative and preparatory baptism, and, as far as the work of salvation was ever wrought in any age or dispensation, it was the work of God in Christ; yet never was carried on and completed without the creature's consent and co-operation."—Pp. 45, 46.—"Remission of past sins is equally, in all ages, the act of Divine grace. It is the mercy of God, in and through Christ the begotten, his unchangeable nature, an attribute or excellency inseparable from the Divine Essence. He cannot retain anger, or opposition to a state not in opposition to *him*. Anger, as a passion, he has none; he is always in himself the *same*, and always *one*. There is no *twain* in him."—Pp. 47, 48.—"He cannot" (such is the purity and goodness of his eternal, unchangeable nature) make a sham invitation to any, and pass it upon them as a real and sincere one! As his promise is yea and amen for ever, so is his *call*. All have heard it; but they have 'not all obeyed.' Rom. x. 16. The call is as *real* to him who *does not*, as to him who *does* obey. In order that we might be rational creatures, conscious of good and evil,



and proper objects of reward and punishment, free agency was absolutely necessary to man. Hence results our capacity to obey or disobey God's call, to yield to or resist the operations and workings of his power in us for salvation. And hence the Divine equity of rewarding every man according to his works, according to the deeds done in the body.

"He that commits sin works directly against God, against the Divine call, the manifestation and operation of God in himself. This is the evil of sin. It is hence the guilt and condemnation ariseth. It is rebellion against the light. The light shines in all; in 'Every man that cometh into the world.' John i. 9. It not only *is* but *must* be so, from the very nature, the goodness of God."—Pp. 48, 49.

"God and evil are in eternal contrariety, and as God cannot change, he cannot at one time be unreconciled, and at another time reconciled to the same state. Imputation of Christ's righteousness to sinners, so as to reconcile them to God in a state of actual sin or alienation from him, is as impossible as to reconcile light and darkness, or Christ and Belial. It is a phantom that has risen up in the fogs and mists of benighted minds. It is attempting to climb up to heaven some other way than by Christ, the *door*. And yet such is the power of darkness, that this is called magnifying the merits of a crucified Saviour, who never saves his people, but as he saves them from their sins! He is the eternal *word*, and as such is God. To *us* he is the *emanation*, or Son of God's love."—Pp. 50, 51.

After quoting the words of Christ, recorded in John xiv. 20, "At that day ye shall *know* that I am in my Father, and you in me, and *I in you*," Job Scott adds, "This is the great mystery of godliness. God manifest in the flesh, is not confined to the flesh of that one body," p. 54; and in the next page, after quoting John x. 30, "I and my Father are one," he says, "*Christ formed* in man, is in the oneness with the Father. The begotten of God in every soul is *one* with him in the everlasting covenant; as truly so, in measure, as there was a real oneness with God, in the man Christ Jesus. 'I have said ye are gods, and all of you are *children* of the

Most High.' Psalm lxxxii. 6. [*And if children then heirs,*] and their dying like men, in the next verse, is, as it happened to the blessed Jesus, as well as to all his co-heirs and brethren."

Of the declaration in Exodus, "Israel is my son, even my first-born," our author says, "This is true for ever; for Israel, the begotten and born of God, even when the seed of Abraham suffered in Egypt, was truly his only son, his first-born; and hence he speaks of all the seed in the singular number. 'Israel is my son, my first-born.' This could not have been true, had not this Israel been the seed of Abraham *spiritually*; and in the same sense Christ is so called; that is, not seeds as of many, but the one seed, which is Christ, in all the heirs and brethren. 'This day have I begotten thee,' is, through all time, the language of the Father. 'Unto us a child *is born*, unto us a son *is given*,' Isa. ix. 6, is as true at one time as another, in the present tense, without looking backward or forward."—Pp. 59, 60.

"There is an eternal distance and separation between Christ and all that is unholy. No *grain* of his righteousness was ever imputed to any soul, but in exact proportion to its actual sanctification, or submission to the Divine will. What can be more absurd than to suppose Christ's sufferings have altered Him, who is always unchangeably the same? Or, that He sees us any otherwise than as we are, in our actual state and condition? I can have no expectation of salvation by Christ, without the fellowship of his sufferings, and conformity to his death. But blessed for ever be the name of the Lord, I have known something of the power of Christ to salvation; I know certainly that there is no other name given under heaven whereby men can be saved. But who is this Saviour? 'I, even I am the Lord, and besides me there is no Saviour.' Isa. xliii. 11."—P. 68.

After observing that "some of the greatest sons of natural science, the very darlings of genius, and masters of reason, have been and now are Deists," our author adds, "And, I confess, I see nothing so absurd in Deism, at least nothing so repugnant to the good sense and common understanding of mankind, as I see in what some

of the great doctors of divinity, so termed, hold forth for the doctrines of the gospel."—P. 70. Again, "But if I know Christ no otherwise than they teach, describe and declare him, I think, I must be either a sceptic or a Deist. I can never see the connexion between the sufferings of a body of flesh, seventeen or eighteen hundred years ago, and the salvation of an immortal soul at this day; *without seeing those sufferings connected with the sufferings of the seed that is one in all.* The seed groaned on Calvary, the seed groans in all; 'Even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, the redemption of our body.' The whole creation (of mankind) groans more or less to be delivered into the liberty of the children of God. And this salvation by Christ, the suffering seed, the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world is in this way, the most glorious display of infinite wisdom! But I think the system by some promulgated for the gospel of salvation by Jesus, is as full fraught with absurdity, as almost any thing I have met with in Mahometanism, or the ancient mythology of the Heathen.

"The world by wisdom knew not God then, nor can the wisdom of the world a whit more know him now; but this wisdom has got hold of things given by inspiration and revelation from God to his children; and doubts not its full competency to the comprehension, methodizing and promulgation of the gospel! This wisdom reads," [but not in the genuine text of the Scriptures,] "'There are three that bear record in heaven:' and will have it, these are *three distinct persons in one God*; and rivers of human blood have been shed in consequence of the contentions that have been about this mystery! As they handle it, they advance natural flesh and blood to divinity; they deify a person of shape and dimensions, and look for his coming, as such, to judgment. They make, in short, *three Gods*; and yet say they are but one God! But the three that bear record in heaven, are known where God reveals them, and never elsewhere."—By this and the following observations of our author, it seems probable he was not acquainted with the history of this corrupt interpolation of the text. He adds, "No

mystery can be declared from God, and gain credence, but anon, the poor finite wisdom of the creature presumes to lay hold of it, and vainly proceeds to absolute determinations; and then often seeks to enforce their notions on mankind, sometimes by the point of the sword, sometimes by fire and faggot; and were I an *honest Deist*, I must endure their tortures, before I could subscribe to their dogmas.

"Let the creature be passive till life leads to action; let man be a fool, as he is, and wait on God for instruction, and he will at least avoid the labyrinth of learned absurdity; and may learn that the *infinite Jehovah*, the great *I am*, as the eternal, self-existent, omnipotent, and first cause of all things, ever reigns properly *God* and is *one*."—Pp. 71, 72.

"How far he (God) is or is not properly the *Father* of all created intelligences, all animated nature, I am not curious to inquire or anxious to decide; but as putting forth his power, or uttering his voice, or as power put forth, or a voice uttered, in order for production or creation, or in order for diffusion of bliss, he is the *holy word*; also as manifesting in intelligible language the Divine Will, to the ear of the soul, he is the *word of the Lord*; the word nigh in the heart and mouth; not only in the *heart*, for when the prophets speak, 'It is (as Christ said) not ye that speak, but the spirit of your Father that speaketh in you.' And as he speaketh in them, and by or through them, to others, he is also the word in the *mouth* as well as in the *heart*. As having a production, or as being begotten and brought forth in man in a state of dependence and want, and looking up to a superior, preserver, feeder, and helper in every sense, he becomes a *son*; and this was our Saviour's state in that body, and is the state of sonship in all. He was dependent, he was tried and tempted in all things as we are, hence his sympathy with all the seed; he is touched with a feeling of all our infirmities; is a merciful and faithful high priest; and being himself tempted knows how to succour them that are tempted. He could do nothing without his Father; 'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work,' said he. 'My Father is greater than I.'

‘ But of that day and that hour knoweth no man; no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.’ Mark xiii. 32.” Pp. 72, 73.

“ He (Christ) submitted to his parents, obeyed and learned gradually. ‘ Learned obedience by the things he suffered.’ He advanced by degrees, and grew in ‘ stature and in favour with God and man.’ And though he never sinned, yet ‘ he died unto sin once;’ that is, unto the motions, which, if obeyed, had brought forth sin; for he had a will as a man; as a man his nature was reluctant to the cross: ‘ If it be possible, let this cup pass from me,’ but he abode in subjection: ‘ Not my will, but thine be done.’ Just the path we all must tread to glory, the way we all must walk if ever we obtain salvation. He must reign in us till he puts all enemies under us; here he must sit at God’s right hand, the right hand of Omnipotence in every soul, till eternal power makes all his foes his footstool; till he puts down all other rule and authority in us but his own, till perfect obedience and subjection takes place, till our will is swallowed up in the Divine will; here as Mediator, having made perfect reconciliation, he renders up the kingdom to the Father, and God becomes all in all.” P. 74.

“ Though God is eternally *but one*, and there is no *twain* at all in him, not even love in him, in any wise different from wisdom, goodness, power, wrath, vengeance, or any thing that is in him; yet as it is very proper to speak of these several attributes or perfections, and of divers operations, according to what he operates upon, a fountain of living waters to the faithful, a consuming fire to the man of sin—so it is proper, and there is a substantial experimental ground for the distinction Father, Son, and Spirit; yea further for the distinction ‘ of God, and of the Father, and of Christ,’ as we find Paul expresses it.” Pp. 76, 77.

“ All the *divine life* in Christ, was the very *life of God in him*, and in that sense he and his Father were one; yet as in him something was taken into *union with God* which was *human*, therefore Christ testified, ‘ My Father is greater than I.’ This will eternally be the case; God *is* and ever will be greater than any thing else; and

though *humanity* is united with *divinity* in every new-born babe in Christ, yet none can ever aspire to equality with God, nor with Christ. For, though every babe that is begotten and born of God is the offspring of God, born of the same holy seed, and so ‘ Christ is not ashamed to call them brethren;’ yet as the birth of the divine life, in the union with the human, was most eminent in that prepared body; as the *body* itself was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and was uniformly in subjection to the divine life; as he was thus brought forth for a most excellent work and service, and for the glorious display of the way and work of salvation, so all the brethren and fellow-heirs with him, must for ever allow him the pre-eminence. Yet this hinders not their being born of the same holy seed as to the *divine life in them*, therefore it is one and the same wherever it becomes the life of the soul.” Pp. 84, 85.

The concluding paragraph of this work is as follows: “ God will be for ever disposed alike at all times to a soul in the same state. If he rejects at one time for actual sin or sinfulness, he will always reject for the same. It is perfectly idle to talk of being completely reconciled to God, by the righteousness of Christ, whilst remaining actually sinners in ourselves; or that we are holy in him, and unholy in ourselves. God always regards us just as we are in ourselves, and is to us accordingly, because he cannot change.

“ And therefore to the froward he will shew himself froward, because all that are froward are in direct opposition to him. Let that frowardness in us be removed, and a reconciliation must of course take place, for he is in eternal good-will to all good, and to all that are strictly under the influence of good. Here there can be twain no longer; for all jarring frowardness and opposition being removed, the oneness is established, wherein the true peace consists for ever. This is the work of CHRIST in man, and of GOD in CHRIST. It is also the work of man by CHRIST, and of CHRIST by GOD the FATHER.”

Copious as the foregoing extracts are, I would offer you one more from the author’s address to the reader.



"If," says he, "courteous reader—thy heart is won to Jesus in good earnest, and thou art engaged to follow him wherever he leads thee, through fire and water, through persecution, temptation, ridicule, and contempt; if thou art bent to bear him company before the high priests, lawyers, and Pilate, and to stand by him through all his perils, in his fast, agony, and death on the cross, hold on thy way, he will be with thee, and will not forsake thee. Remember, for thy encouragement, what he said to his disciples; 'Ye have continued with me in my temptations, and I appoint unto you a kingdom.' This will hold good to all his upright followers for ever. I heartily wish thee a good journey in thy race to the heavenly Canaan, the communion and comfort of the holy spirit, and a blissful abode in the mansions of eternity. I dedicate in much real good-will, the foregoing to thy use and service, and bid thee farewell, until we meet next in the realms of Emanuel, to unite with saints, angels, and seraphs in the songs of salvation, round the throne of Jehovah for ever."

THOMAS FOSTER.

Norwich,  
May 3, 1825.

SIR,  
IN the pages of the Repository I have sometimes spoken of the Established Clergy in no very favourable terms, and their conduct with regard to the important question of religious liberty, as connected with the emancipation of the Catholics, has certainly not raised them in my opinion. It is, therefore, with no ordinary degree of satisfaction that I send you the names of the following clergymen, of Norfolk, who have petitioned *in favour* of Catholic emancipation. While Mr. Sydney Smith, at a meeting of all the clergy in the East Riding of Yorkshire, had to regret "that he had not only to differ, but to stand *alone* among them," (see *Christian Reformer* for April, p. 109,) Norfolk can produce the following honourable list, and I hope it will be allowed to find a permanent record in the pages of the Repository. Let some who call themselves Dissenters look at it, and, if they can, blush!

EDWARD TAYLOR.

*R. stands for Rector, V. for Vicar, and C. for Curate.*

George Glover, Archdeacon of Sudbury.  
Charles Anson, Rector of Lyng.  
Edward S. Keppell, R. of Quidenham.  
Robert Bathurst, Commissary of Suffolk.  
Henry Wilson, R. of Kirby Cane.  
J. B. Collyer, V. of Wroxham.  
Henry Anson, R. of Skepton.  
Joseph L'Oste, R. of Postwick.  
Thomas Sword, Perp. C. of St. Mary, Bungay.  
James Stoughton, R. of Sparham.  
Thomas Sayers, C. of Oby.  
Francis Howes, Minor Canon of Norwich Cathedral.  
Lig. Treadway, V. of Gayton.  
John D. Borton, R. of Blofield.  
Edward Valpy, R. of Thwaite.  
Charles Hardy, C. of St. Swithin, Norwich.  
W. Gibbs, C. of Castleacre.  
John Colman, R. of Knapton.  
W. Collett, R. of Swanton Morley.  
W. Collett, Jun., V. of Surlingham.  
Cremer Cremer, C. of Town Barningham.  
John Fellowes, V. of Shotesham.  
Hor. Dashwood, R. of Caister.  
Dacre B. Lennard, R. of St. Michael at Plea, Norwich.  
Thomas Talbot, R. of Heigham, Norwich.  
J. Mathew, Reepham.  
Thomas Hetling, C. of Witchingham.  
Thomas Watson, R. of Thurlton.  
R. F. Elwin, R. of Wilby cum Hargham.  
E. J. W. Valpy, Norwich.  
Thomas Clowes, C. of Cromer.  
A. Turnour, V. of Garvestone.  
W. Gordon, Mundesley.  
T. G. Heigham, N. Walsham.  
Stephen Allen, Jun., R. of Wolterton.  
Philip Hudson, R. of Felbrigg.  
J. Ackroyd, C. of Warham.  
J. D. Crofts, C. of East Barsham.  
J. A. Tickell, V. of Wighton.  
Robert Hamond, R. of Beauchamwell.  
George Taylor, C. of Marlingford.  
William Newcome, R. of Munford.  
Gooch Fowell, C. of Weeting.  
Dixon Hoste, R. of Tittleshall.  
Edwin Sidney, C. of Acle.  
R. H. Cooper, C. of Cantley.  
W. Manning, R. of Diss.  
W. H. Langton, D. D., R. of Warham.

E. G. Blyth, R. of Burnham.  
 Stephen Allen, Minister of Lynn St.  
 Margaret.  
 James Carver, C. of Lynn St. Michael.  
 James Coulton, V. of N. Wootton.  
 Robert Leeder, C. of East Winch.  
 Robert Hankinson, V. of Walpole St.  
 Andrew.  
 William Parson, R. of Brandon.  
 George Stracey, R. of Rackheath.  
 Charles Codd, E. Dereham.  
 Caleb Elwin, Melton Constable.

SIR,  
**T**HESE are extraordinary times. One of his Majesty's ministers, one highly gifted, brings a charge of ignorance upon the subjects of religion against a large and powerful class of petitioners to the House of Commons. Another member of the House ventures in very measured terms to hint at a consideration of the Thirty-nine Articles, and his hints are received with shouts of laughter. The solemnity of the subject is in vain put before the honourable members, for if the report be correct, *derision alone was waking*.

But let the report speak for itself; it is worth your attention whether my remarks upon it be so or not. Mr. P. Courtenay said he had long been of opinion, and it was an opinion he had been some years in forming, and other years in determining to act upon (a laugh), that all sects and all establishments, not excepting the Church of England, required from their members too great a minuteness of conformity. (Hear, hear!) It was his humble opinion, which he offered to the House with great deference, but still with the confidence of sincere conviction, that the time was come when we ought to alter our articles. (Hear!) If honourable gentlemen would take the trouble to read over the Thirty-nine Articles. (Loud laughter, and cries of hear!)—He regretted the levity which the House had exhibited on this occasion, and as he was likely to be the means of having so serious a subject treated with ridicule, he should close his observations. (Cries of "go on," and hear!) When the House treated as ludicrous and chimerical the bare possibility of reading the Thirty-nine Articles of our religion, was not this a strong confirmation of

the proposition he had advanced? (Hear, hear!) He would almost venture to say, that a very great majority of those he was addressing never read the Articles of their religion. (A laugh, and cries of hear, hear, hear!) Of this he was quite certain, that the most religious parents, who were desirous of bringing up their sons in the most exemplary manner, were not in the habit of inculcating religion through the Articles of the Church. See *Morning Chronicle*.

I am inclined to think that the charge of ignorance upon subjects connected with revealed religion might be extended beyond the members of the House of Commons to scientific men in general. It is a question worthy of an answer, How is it that so many very respectable men turn from it with disgust or derision? "Knowledge," says Lord Bacon, "is power," and every man knows that the possession of power is supremely desirable. All the human race from the cradle to the grave are in pursuit of it, and although the roads are various through which they have sought or are still seeking for it, yet according to the degrees of their civilization they are rightly or wrongly driving on in the pursuit. How far this powerful stimulus is capable of carrying mankind, or how interminable its influence, let those declare who are best fitted to judge; but the fact is clear that one uniform and irresistible influence is driving forward the whole human species in search after the best means of securing their happiness.

From the history of Natural Science we learn how various have been the opinions of different men in different circumstances, and that exertion and collision have produced progression and uniformity. So that although the chase may be considered only begun, certain laws have been discovered by the sure operation of which, we shall be carried forward to the destruction of our prey. Those who have laboured most or who have been most successful have been rewarded by the common approbation; if discrepancies have been observed in their opinions, they have not been attributed to sinister motives, and the reward they have sought they have obtained, which Lord Bacon so emphatically describes by the word Power.

In such a delightful world as the one we inhabit, this, which may be called a part of its moral government, is conformable to our expectations; for the influence which propels men forward in their search after good is bound up in and is inseparable from their constitution. It binds them into societies and enables them to benefit by the advantages of society.

Yet in the range of science one department is inaccessible. The mind of man, so curiously formed, wants one faculty. He is able to collect, to arrange, and to use the information he derives from outward and visible objects, but his anxiety is not satisfied. He wishes to know if he be not connected with other beings and with other times, and he finds no means of progression, no fulcrum for the powers of his mind, no star to direct him how to shape his course. But the finger of Omniscience has pierced the cloud, the hand-writing upon the wall has traced in fair and legible characters the interesting and grand result to which he is to be conducted. What has been revealed? By whom has the discovery been made? And how have mankind received the heavenly communication?

The prophet of Nazareth appeared in the simplest form and rank of society; he grew up from infancy to youth, from youth to manhood; he performed all the common offices of humanity, and enjoyed or suffered all the various relations of human society; his intellectual capacity appeared to be bounded by the sources of his information; his message was delivered in the simplest language; to learning and science he made no pretension; infancy and childhood were admitted to his familiar instruction; he appealed to his countrymen as to rational and intelligent beings; he addressed his teachings to them as to men who could attain to knowledge only by the exercise of the understanding, and by argument and reason he sought to make them his disciples. We, on the contrary, have invested him with a mysterious character and rank; we have declared that he was pleased and pained in appearance only; that his knowledge was only bounded by the objects of knowledge; that types and figures and prophecies must all be familiar to the mind that

would understand him; we have ransacked the stores of metaphysical subtilty, and coined a set of phrases when we would communicate our gleanings from the heavenly storehouse; we have set apart a distinct order of men, endowed them with a separate office and character, invested them with a mysterious official rank, exempted them from many of the honours and all the burthens of society, and declared that they and they alone shall be the authorized expounders of the heavenly doctrine; that no man ought to enter or quit the world but under their direction or superintendence; we have denounced eternal misery upon all who shall venture to judge and examine, unless by such judgment and examination they come up to the orthodox standard, and as if everlasting damnation was not enough, we have endeavoured to abridge them of the delights of social life, and of as many of its honours and emoluments as we can command.

And what has been the result? Just such a result as such a course must lead to. Knowledge has not been power, nay knowledge has abridged its possessors of power. It has not been increased by the use we have made of the heavenly message, but in spite of it. The terms religion, parson, articles of faith, firm anticipation of the promises of the gospel, are considered as by-words of contempt, or marks of hypocrisy, and not by men who are themselves contemptible, but by men who by common consent are admitted to be benefactors of their kind. And if any of these highly-gifted men have gained a glimpse of the heavenly messenger their view has been distorted and their ardour deadened by early and fixed prejudice against the world's idol.

In these days of increased and increasing knowledge, what is to be done? Let us take example from other sciences which are largely connected with the well-being of society. Put religious knowledge before mankind in its simplest form, invite them to a free discussion of its precepts, its discoveries, and its merits, take away the monopoly of the clergy, leave its professors to make their way solely by the exercise of their talents and their industry, divest it of the jargon of the schools, permit every man to publish



a translation of the Scriptures whenever pleasure or profit shall induce him, judge his work with candour and himself with liberality, and leave every man to adopt, to publish, and to promote his own views of religion according to his judgment and his feelings; and then let us see if general ignorance will prevail, or we shall be met with laughter and scorn when the articles of faith are introduced to the notice of Parliament.

THOMAS GIBSON.

*Communication from Ram Doss, of Calcutta.*

[Our readers may remember our giving an account in a former volume [XIX. 236, 296—301] of a publication by Ram Doss against the Unitarians, intended to unite the Hindoos and Trinitarian Christians as common believers in the incarnation of the Deity, in opposition to all believers in the unity and spirituality of the Divine nature and person. We are now about to lay before them a letter, from the pen of the same singular writer, to Mr. French, the Barrister, who, in the defence of two of Carlile's shopmen, prosecuted for blasphemy at the Old Bailey, made a furious attack upon the Unitarians, which, because it was furious, they have thought below their notice. The letter is forwarded to us by Mr. Arnot, lately Editor of Mr. Buckingham's Calcutta Journal, who, like that gentleman, has been banished from India by an order of the Governor-General. Mr. Arnot says, that "the MS., which appears to be the production of some red-hot idolator," was sent to him when on the point of leaving Calcutta in November last, accompanied by a letter under the same signature, and is now sent to us, "as it is evidently a sort of manifesto against the Unitarians in Europe." The letter is accompanied by a printed pamphlet, an appendix to Ram Doss's controversy with the zealous Athanasian, Dr. Tytler. This contains nothing that would interest our readers. The Doctor seems to have left Calcutta, in consequence of having obtained a medical appointment at Bencoolen. The government may think that he is best out of the way. In the course of the newspaper controversy between him and Ram Doss,

he insinuates that this latter personage is a fictitious character, and charges his productions upon some known individual, we suppose Mr. Adam, the Unitarian missionary, who appears (for the pamphlet is obscure on this point) to have published a contradiction of the charge, and a denial of all knowledge of the writings under the name of this Brahmin. Mr. Arnot says, "the letter to Mr. French has every mark of being from the same pen as it professes; but who the author may be is not known at Calcutta, where the name is too common to point out the individual, unless he were characterized by something else." Having given this history of the MS., we now insert it as a curiosity. ED.]

To —, FRENCH, Esq.,  
Barrister in England.

SIR,  
ABOUT eighteen months ago I met with a severe disappointment from Dr. R. Tytler, of the Honourable East India Company's service, his noisy professions having led me to hope that he was a sincere defender of *the manifestation of God in the flesh*, against our common enemies, the Unitarian heretics. A short time, however, discovered the inconsistency of his professions; as he failed to co-operate with me in this good work, notwithstanding the numerous appeals I made to him by the *common basis* of our respective religions, to unite with me in contending against that "nest of serpents" who have, by their false reasonings, shaken the lofty temple of the holy faith in the plurality of persons under one Godhead, which we in common with Christians piously maintain. These horrid blasphemers of Divine incarnations have consequently been since gaining ground in various parts of the world, and are gradually robbing both Hindoos and Christians of the sacred shield of divine mystery, which is the strong hold of religious truth. The accompanying pamphlet gives a full and correct account of my unsuccessful negotiation with that gentleman, and will shew you how I was ultimately reduced to a state of despair, by his imprudently neglecting to form with me a holy alliance in support of our common cause.

But I have of late fortunately met

with the speech which you, as a true Christian, delivered on the trial of one of the deluded shopmen of the impious Carile; a speech which, although it bears so much similarity in point of style with the language of Dr. Tytler, yet far surpasses his writing in soundness of reasoning and sublimity of illustration. My despair of seeing a holy alliance formed among all orthodox Hindoos and Christians in defence of our sacred cause of Divine incarnations, has consequently been changed into a sanguine hope of success. And I now look forward with confidence to the prospect of that "nest of serpents," the Unitarians, being exposed to disgrace, (as they have already been by your eloquent address,) and deprived of the situations, either high or low, which they now unworthily hold, and if possible banished from their homes and country, and prevented from enjoying the light of that heaven which they have insulted by denying the manifestation of God in the flesh, which both Hindoos and Christians believe! You who are distinguished as much by your legal knowledge as by your piety, may prove the legality and expediency of the alliance I recommended, to the Lord High Chancellor of England, who, from his known piety and zeal, will doubtless have sufficient influence with the most pious and enlightened part of the Bishops to induce them to co-operate with us. I, in like manner, will exert myself to procure the co-operation of all the worshipers of the blessed Munoo, all the believers in the Divine Ram, and all the followers of the holy Saviour Dutatru, and many other sacred manifestations of God in the flesh, which, together with the worshipers of the incarnation of the blessed Jesus whom you adore, will form a host of believers in divine incarnations, before which the Unitarian heretics must flee like chaff before the wind.

You will not, I hope, neglect this grand opportunity of uniting in defence of the common basis of our faith from any notions similar to those of Dr. Tytler, who, from the very confined theological education he has had the misfortune to receive, felt a difficulty in believing in more than one Divine incarnation; but you who display such superior judgment, must at

once perceive that, as God condescended to assume the form of a man, and even of a dove in Judea, there is every probability that the Deity should also deign to appear in the human shape for similar reasons in India. Besides, both the Hindoo and Christian Scriptures prove that God has never chosen to manifest himself in the flesh in any other quarter of the world but in Asia; doubtless because its inhabitants have been always his most favourite and peculiar people. This is an argument which even the most daring Unitarian heretic cannot refute; how then can any man, who is blessed with a single grain of faith in Divine incarnations, doubt that the Deity has often manifested himself in Indian flesh? In the same manner as no good Hindoo can for a moment doubt, that God in another part of Asia may have assumed the form of an Israelite, under which he has since been worshiped by Christians.

Let not the great distance between us depress our minds; but let us each in his respective sphere zealously maintain the holy cause of Divine incarnations, and co-operate for the extirpation of the heretical notion of unity in the Deity. A reply, expressing your concurrence in this proposal, will be received with extreme gratification, by your

Most obedient and humble Servant, and Friend in Faith,

RAM DOSS.

*Calcutta, Nov. 17, 1824.*

SIR,  
PERMIT me to call the attention of your readers to a subject, which I consider important to the cause, not only of speculative, but of moral and practical truth. I mean the gradually increasing custom of sending Dissenting youths to an University where they can enjoy no honours till they have subscribed themselves "bonâ fide Members of the Established Church." That such a test is illiberal and arbitrary, will readily be granted; but may it therefore be taken? The illustrious Ralpho has said,

"He 'tis who *makes* the oath that breaks it,  
Not he that for convenience takes it."

But as this was (even in the days of

Butler) a caricature of Presbyterian equivocation, it is to be hoped that none of us are prepared to adopt it. With regard to the test in question, we have been told that it is "a mere matter of form," that "it deceives nobody," and that "those who take it are often professed unbelievers," &c. I doubt whether a man is justified in professing a falsehood where it is "a matter of form," but in this case it most clearly is *not*. Suppose an estate bequeathed for the sustenance of poor men, and limited by the will of the donor to such as have never been married. The trustees, it may be, grow careless; not being Malthusians they may neglect to make any inquiries; or by the terms of the will they may be bound to receive such as declare they have not been married. Here, then, is a case precisely in point. A man may live openly with his wife, he may boast of his children in the hall where the trustees are assembled, but if he receive the stipend upon his own declaration that he has never been married, *he lies*. Is this or is it not a mere matter of form? "But," says the quibbler, "I am a member of the Established Church—we are all members of the Church by law just as we are of the State." Here, then, is a test that can never exclude! And a man may be at once a Mahometan and a member of the Church of England! It is needless to argue that this was not the sense in which the test was meant to be taken. "Nay," says the sophist again, "if I speak the truth, I have nothing to do with other meanings which may be affixed to my words." "When you take a test," I reply, "you are to speak the language of the imposer, (what the words mean in any other is not to the purpose,) and if you have found in English an interpretation, which it is evident *he* never thought of, it will justify you no more than the modern Greek Nai, when you are denying a truth." "Do you believe so?" "Nay; that is, Yes, because I am talking Romaic." Such reasoners, however, are none of ours; heaven knows they would never *dissent*. If our Catholic brethren were like them we should have heard no complaints of their incapacity to sit in Parliament, or on the throne. One more evasion I

notice, and then I have done. "A member" of the Church of England has sometimes been considered as synonymous with a "communicant," and it may have been thus defined a century ago, when men were more bigoted (if not more scrupulous) than we find them at present. It was at that time taken for granted, that no man would communicate with a church to which he did not belong, and the participation of the Sacrament was itself a test of agreement. The act of communion did not constitute a man a member of the Church, but it proved or proclaimed that he was so. The case then stands thus: If the Sacrament *be* a test, a Dissenter cannot take it without committing an act of solemn and deliberate perjury (and that too under the semblance of worshiping his Maker): if it be *not* a test, he may take it if he please, but it can never constitute him a member of the Church. *The lie must rest somewhere*,—and a lie thus wilfully told, with the sanction of numbers, and the encouragement of parental authority, is no trivial slip—no occasional deviation—it is not an error to be repented of, and (as we trust) forgiven; but it is the first step into the by-path of sophistry—it is a pledge to defend an imperfect system of morals, and a precedent to recur to, whenever falsehood can favour our views. Surely a parent will own that University-triumphs are too dearly bought at this price! Some will, perhaps, say that their sons may not be tempted; that few men gain honours at College, and so forth; but do they not wish for these honours? And do they not intend the test to be taken when it is required? If such is their meaning, they are only shutting their eyes on the crime till it is too late to retract; and if this is not their feeling, if they merely desire to provide their sons with a liberal education, why send them to Oxford or Cambridge? The merits of our sister-universities I am not prepared to discuss (nor could the subject be fairly treated within the bounds of a letter), but I believe if the glittering baits were removed, their venerable and orthodox walls would not long continue thus thronged.

A. E. R.



Islington,  
May 4, 1825.

SIR,  
MAN, borne along by the rapid and insensible flight of time, approaches the confines of eternity. The curiosity natural to the human mind explores the nature of that country from whose "bourne no traveller has returned!" Reason has in vain explored the awful subject. Revelation alone "hath brought life and immortality to light." Divines of almost every persuasion have taken up the topic, and have concentrated all the energies of an exalted and illumined genius to the investigation of it. These books have been caught up and read with avidity. The pious have dwelt upon them with rapture. Of this description are the well-known treatises of *Howe's Blessedness of the Righteous*, *Baxter's Saints' Everlasting Rest*, and *Watts's Happiness of separate Spirits in Heaven*. To these works may be added that excellent *Dissertation of Dr. Richard Price on The Junction of the Good in another State of Being*. The object, indeed, of this latter volume is to prove that we shall know each other in a future state, and that from this mutual recognition of each other springs an inexhaustible source of our felicity. Dr. Gisborne, also, a respectable clergyman, has published a small tract to the same purpose, breathing a spirit of benevolence and animated piety. With these several publications the reader is probably acquainted; therefore I shall not any longer dwell on the subject. But latterly have appeared two small volumes, evidently written by members of the Established Church. The one is entitled *The Excursions of a Spirit*; the other, *The Vision of Hades*, with Notes Theological and Metaphysical; both very ingenious and worthy of attention. They are the ebullition of imagination, and as such gratifying to the curiosity.

*The Excursion of a Spirit* traces the evolutions of the soul through the planetary system, with diagrams pointing out the road by which the excursions were accomplished. This is, indeed, extremely fanciful; and as no extract would furnish a fair specimen of the work, the reader is referred to its pages for satisfaction.

*The Vision of Hades* is shorter, and more within the bounds of reason, if her suggestions can avail on so mysterious a subject. A few of its pages may be acceptable; it is dictated by an ardent piety.

"As we entered into this glorious realm (says the author of the *Vision of Hades*) my perception, now refined by an influence which I could not comprehend, clearly distinguished innumerable forms; some were retired and seemed absorbed in contemplation; some were assembled in groups apparently conversing, and others were chaunting seraphic hymns of praise, the sounds of which reached me through an atmosphere of the mildest air, breathing fragrant odours and wafting tones of floating melody that seemed to move at the will of the happy beings, the radiant islands on which they dwelt. We were now close to a group discoursing; around them were many attentively listening. My celestial guide desired me to stop, and this gave me an opportunity of examining their forms, which were of the human shape and robed in silvery air, their countenances beaming with angelic character and brightness, yet inferior to the dazzling beauty of my guide, or of the angel of the watch! My attention was so riveted to their forms and appearance that I heard but little of their discourse, but was delighted with the music of their voices. My celestial guide having first made some inquiry of one who was near, bade me follow him. I obeyed, and after passing numberless islands, and at each opening seeing still more of every radiant and varying colour sailing through the space, we arrived at one more retired. Here was reclined a lovely form which rose at our approach; there was something in its graceful air that seized my attention and restrained my utterance; it smiled with enchanting sweetness, and with words that thrilled me to the soul, thus addressed the denizen of heaven: 'If this is the mortal you wish me to conduct through the regions of the blessed, gladly will I undertake the task.' 'Inspire him (rejoined the celestial spirit) by your precepts to labour during his earthly pilgrimage to ensure your society for endless ages in a life to come!'—then winged its flight and soon disappeared."

A few pages after, the author proceeds in his narrative, affording some explanation.

"Who are those (I exclaimed) that rush so swiftly by, and what is the cause of those loud and rapturous shouts they

raise?' Our island was instantly propelled with such velocity that it soon overtook them. 'These are spirits,' said my companion, 'who have lately arrived in these happy abodes attended by ministering angels, and who, prompted by a love of knowledge and under their guidance, are sailing rapidly in every direction. Listen to the expressions of ecstatic joy from some of them, to the songs of adoration from others; all are so full of thankfulness for the gracious gift of immortality and the hope of blessings yet to come, that though their capacities are enlarged even beyond what you can now conceive, they are unable to find utterance for the fulness of their thoughts. Some, you perceive, are hearing from the ministering spirits (who maintain a short but often-repeated converse with them) the mysteries of their creation and redemption, but these I am not permitted to communicate to you, and even if I were, your soul is not sufficiently unburdened of mortality to comprehend them!' I observed their countenances beaming with delight at the mysteries which were explained to them, glowing with fervent gratitude towards the Author of their happiness, or marked with joyful wonder at every scene that opened to their view. Some of them entered into converse with my guide, and on learning that I was not yet an inhabitant of their sphere, exhorted me to follow the example of their Divine Master, that on leaving my earthly cell I might rejoin them. 'Our course lies this way,' said my guide, and we left this celestial jubilee to pursue our way."

The author then affords another illustration with fervour and beauty:

"As we sailed about the vast expanse many of the beings came to our island and discoursed with my divine companion. The angelic sweetness of their manner, the kind familiarity of their conversation, shewed the elevated nature of their souls. When alone with my heavenly monitor, I inquired if they were all known to each other, as I had observed that they entered without hesitation into converse with any they met. 'Here,' rejoined my guide, 'neither rank nor riches are known; here is no distinction of persons or nations. The cold suspicion of the mortals of your earth has no place in our thoughts, and all the irregular and degrading passions of humanity are changed for universal benevolence and love. Since we have no reason for not associating without reserve, our reason and feelings prompt us all to pursue the same course of holiness

and to employ ourselves continually in adoring and thanking the Author of our joy, in continuing to learn from ministering spirits his unfathomable wisdom and power, in admiring his innumerable works, in receiving intelligence from the angels of the hope they have that those we loved on earth will be again united to us, and at the narration of which we rejoice with them; in associating with the spirits of those whom while on earth we loved, and to whom we now feel a refined attachment such as no mortal can experience; for here, though we associate freely with all, we form 'sweet societies' of those who were the objects of our affection during our mortal sojourn, and pursue inquiries with them, and wander at pleasure either on islands or through these realms of everlasting day with a buoyancy of unspeakable delight. Such are our occupations, joined to the ceaseless pleasure of contemplating so many millions unable to exhaust the measure of their bliss, increasing in knowledge and rising in the scale of beings, which, as we do, our appearance wears a more lucid radiance; for observe, and you will discern that the spirits differ in their degrees of brightness!'

"Suddenly, a louder strain and a vast island, on which were many spirits, attracted my attention. We met them and found they were rejoicing with parents who only a short time before had been united for ever to their children! The spirits they had known on earth had assembled, and also numbers of angels who with them were celebrating the arrival with songs; the enraptured parents were hearing from the tongues of angels, the trials and victory of their children! My heavenly guide felt the fervid joy that spirits feel at such a sight, and joined in praises with the applauding band. Again, our island floated on, sometimes with rapidity, at other times joining islands which our inclination prompted us to visit. One was chiefly occupied by those rulers who had either framed laws or supported them for the benefit of mankind, and by heroes who had passed their earthly life in defending the religion and laws of their country from the aggressions of the wicked! On another, we found the spirits of two who while on earth had been allied in mortal bonds, now met again never to have those bonds rudely severed by the hand of death, relating to each other how the hope was realized that their earthly might be changed for a heavenly and inseparable love, and guiding the island to view the magnificence of the realms they then inhabited. Their converse was interrupted by a glorious spirit who came careering from on high,

and told them that a ministering angel had arrived with the gladdening information that their child laboured to meet them there! Spontaneous hymns of praise burst from them, and they left us to pursue their way with the celestial spirit to hear from the ministering angel the intelligence he brought. Endless were the scenes we witnessed of such enthusiastic happiness, and boundless appeared the space through which we went, studded with the mansions of the blessed!"

The *Vision of Hades* thus concludes:

"Suddenly a vivid gleam and melting tones of entrancing harmony enwrapped my soul. With a shout of exultation my guide exclaimed, 'They come, they come! strengthen thy feeble spirit; watch yon lambent glory, and hearken to the voices of the hierarchy of heaven!' In an instant the elements were imbued with a deeper glow; myriads of islands covered with spirits were urging their way to where the lambent glory shone and forming themselves before it. Unfolding glories and sparkling rays came, showered from supernal spirits, surrounding one so intensely bright that even the seraphim scarce could gaze upon it, and all with spontaneous songs of gladness shouted Hosannahs, while all of the blessed bent in adoration at its presence! 'Sustain thy sinking spirit,' said my guide, 'and look if but for a moment!' My astonished soul just perceived a kneeling form almost absorbed in the resplendent glories that environed the vision so intensely bright. The form arose, and a spirit flew to guide and to support it. While angelic songs of praise pealed on my raptured soul, the vision, so ineffable, withdrew. Then for a season all was silent, save the melting melody of the elements. Around this form, conducted by the angels, the highest of created beings arranged themselves in increasing circles; they were arrayed in empyreal radiance, and wore six wings shining like the beams of heaven, reflected from the dust of mingled gems; around them and yet farther advanced, were myriads of the hierarchy of heaven, all wearing wings glittering with sunlike brightness, who flew toward us chanting hymns of joy which resounded through infinite space, and were re-echoed by the world of spirits! 'They bring,' said my guide, 'conducted by a ministering angel, a repentant spirit of the earth to dwell among us, and the vision robed in such resplendent glory, to whom they knelt, was the Redeemer!'

"They were now near, when a bright spirit winged its way before the rest, at

whose presence the descant died away, and, in sounds that my mortal soul can scarcely remember, announced the name and race the being bore on earth, declared that it was accepted in mercy and given the invaluable gift of everlasting bliss! Instantly thousands of spirits rushed forward to greet him, and the sounds of transporting triumph grew louder. I heard my lovely guide exclaim, 'I am the sainted spirit of — remember the regions of the blessed!' and immediately vanished."

Then follow copious erudite Notes, on the *intermediate state of the dead*, which he has here portrayed—and on the *immateriality of the soul*, which he defends with candour and ingenuity. But after all these pleasing speculations, I am more impressed with the silent grandeur of the Scriptures on the subject. The passages are, indeed, very indefinite; but by becoming the awful topic of meditation, they swell on the imagination, and dilate the heart. They kindle a holy curiosity, and stir up the soul to an ardent preparation for heaven. "Eye hath not seen," (says the Apostle, 1 Cor. ii. 9,) "nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him."

Dr. Paley deems this circumstance no mean presumptive proof of the truth of Christianity. "Our Lord's discourses exhibit no particular description of the invisible world. The future happiness of the good, and the misery of the bad, which is all we want to be assured of, is directly and positively affirmed, and is represented by metaphors and comparisons, which were plainly intended as metaphors and comparisons, and as nothing more. As to the rest, a solemn reserve is maintained. The question concerning the woman who had been married to seven brothers, 'Whose shall she be in the resurrection?' was of a nature calculated to have drawn from Christ a more circumstantial account of the state of the human species in their future existence. He cut short, however, the inquiry, by an answer which at once rebuked intruding curiosity, and was agreeable to the best apprehensions we are able to form upon the subject, viz. that 'they who are accounted worthy of that resurrection shall be as the angels of God in hea-



ven!" I lay a stress upon this reserve, because it repels the suspicion of enthusiasm; for enthusiasm is wont to expatiate upon the condition of the departed above all other subjects, and with a wild particularity. It is, moreover, a topic which is always listened to with greediness. The teacher, therefore, whose principal purpose is to draw upon himself attention, is sure to be full of it. The *Koran of Mahomet* is half made up of it."

Having, in the *Memoirs of the Rev. William Richards*, furnished the reader at some length with my opinion of the employments of the heavenly world, I conclude with a fine apostrophe of Dr. Isaac Watts to the inhabitants of heaven:—"Hail, blessed spirits above, who have passed your state of trial well! You have run the laborious race under many burdens, and you have received the prize! You have fought with mighty enemies; you have overcome a thousand difficulties, and you enjoy the crown! No more shall you complain of the mixture of error with your knowledge—no more shall you groan under the perplexities of thought, the tumults of passions, the burden of indwelling iniquity—nor cry out because of oppressing enemies and sorrows! The hour of trial is finished. You have been sincere and faithful in your imperfect services, and you are arrived at the world of perfection."

J. EVANS.

Mr. Clarke on the Exclusive Use of the Name "Unitarian."

"The stating any doctrine in a confession of faith with a greater degree of precision than the Scriptures have done, is in effect to say, that the Scriptures have not stated it with precision enough: in other words, that the Scriptures are not sufficient."—Paley's *Defence of the Considerations*, &c.

"If any man trust to himself that he is Christ's let him of himself think this again, that as he is Christ's, even so are we Christ's.—2 Cor. x. 7."

SIR,

FOR reasons too mortifying even for modesty to do more than hint, I seldom or ever appear in your pages under my proper name. But a dissentient from the great majority of my brethren, perhaps their accuser, a sense of shame must be for once

defied. In charity to them, as well to myself, I shall be brief.

It chagrins me then to the quick, let me at once avow, to find Unitarianism so invariably associated not only by disingenuous, but liberal minds, with the denial of the divinity of Christ. Not for myself alone, but in the name, surely of not a few of my fellow-scriptural Christians, I fling back the charge, as, in its universality, a libel on the creed. By Unitarianism, I understand only a positive appellation for Anti-Trinitarianism. What, therefore, I deny, and only what I deny, as a Unitarian, is, that there is any God but *the God* and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. To the man who concurs with me, *ex animo*, upon this point, whatever other doctrine he may deem apostolic, I tender the right hand of fellowship, as my Unitarian brother, in that common Lord and Saviour. I certainly believe as little that St. John or St. Paul were Trinitarians, under the name of Trinitarians or any other, as that they were Athanasians or Mahometans: but, if I were asked what tenet more than another these Unitarians, in the only honest and intelligible sense of the word, would have repudiated as unchristian, I should not hesitate one moment to reply, "In its utter nakedness the simple humanity of Christ." That, as Christians, they still worshiped, and as uniformly worshiped the name Jehovah they had worshiped as Jews, I have no more doubt, than I have, that most of their professed imitators, throughout Christendom, worship a quite different being in his stead under a correspondent appellation: but that when now, for the first time, they to his glory confessed HIS Son, Lord, they meant no more by the title than their merely human master, the son of Joseph, their fellow-mortal, prophet of Galilee, I could no more persuade myself from their writings, than I could that they bowed the knee to that Lord in prayer as the Almighty, or invoked him solely by the half hour together, as the compeer of *his* Lord of heaven and earth. Mysterious as is undoubtedly *their* Christ to my apprehension, so mysterious that in designating him, I should never but employ their own mystic terms, I cannot but perceive that they attributed divinity to his person, and recognized in

his intercession an efficacy which they would have predicated of that of no other being in the universe. *Their* Son of God is confessedly to my mind, let me repeat, not a very distinct, or perhaps very intelligible object of conception: but that *their* Mediator, the man Christ Jesus, was not, in their notion of him, as different a personage to what he is in that of many of my Unitarian brethren, as the Logos, (whatever that word may mean,) incarnate in his person, would make him also to these my brethren's apprehension, if with that word they connected in any sense the idea of Deity, I could no more convince myself, without offering violence to my understanding, than I could, for one, believe that in *their* creed, heaven and earth were the Jewish and Gentile worlds, or that an anthem occasionally sung to the victim of the cross, *sicut Deo*, would have sounded strangely in *their* ears, though they had been opportunely reminded at the moment of aspiration, that he was no longer visible to mortal eye, and consequently could know no more of what they were thinking or saying or doing, than any other being who had not the attribute of omniscience. Whether now I am right or wrong in these fanciful or well-founded conjectures, am I therefore only to be excommunicated from the pale of Unitarianism, or scarcely hear it said, even in an argument *ad homines*, that squeamish verily must be the conscience which feared to sit in Parliament beside a Catholic, when it quietly looked in the face of a man who, quâ Unitarian, must deny the divinity of Christ? Let me not, however, be misunderstood. I impugn not a faith in the "mere" man: I deny for it only the exclusive usurpation of a name: I protest only against so dogmatically identifying that faith with the apostolical, or that only those who hold it, and believe that the apostles held it in all its arrogated and ostentatious purity, should be allowed to put in for them, and for themselves, a claim to the title of Unitarian Christians. That a less intolerant use of the name amongst ourselves would redeem it from more than half its obloquy with our opponents, and propitiate many to our persons and our cause, who, rather than adopt the associated tenet, would fancy them-

selves any thing rather than what they are, and join, or even lead the worship of Athanasianism itself, I shrewdly suspect, if I must not be said to know. That it would be any compromise of our sincerity, as a fraternity of individuals having no common bond of union but the Scriptures, is a question which it becomes me rather to submit than determine, but upon which I can entertain but one, and that a most decided opinion.

J. T. CLARKE.

SIR,

April 30, 1825.

**W**ILL any of your correspondents have the goodness to inform me whether the alterations introduced into Mrs. Barbauld's beautiful Hymn, "Jehovah Reigns," in the Essex-Street Chapel Collection of Hymns were made by the author herself or by any other person?—Whether these alterations are improvements is another question: I confess I think them much the reverse under either supposition. But under that last mentioned they appear so unwarrantable, that one can only wonder they should not have been publicly animadverted upon.

E. T.

Todmorden,

April 11, 1825.

SIR,

**I** MUST confess a little disappointment at the total absence of any remarks on the subject of ordination, which has been brought so prominently forward in a former Number, (pp. 81—83,) by Mr. Baker's defence of the ceremony at Bolton. It is not my intention at present to enter upon the merits of the question on scriptural grounds; and it would therefore be improper to make any assertions respecting it, in that point of view. I may, however, here observe, that it is difficult to conceive how any service clearly marked by miraculous circumstances, and proceeding in all its parts on supernatural sanctions, can become a precedent under ordinary circumstances and to individuals, not one of whom has a jot more authority than any of the rest.

Neither do I now complain of the service called ordination, on the ground of its being "an infringement of Christian liberty." Every society has a right to make regulations for its own government, and to adopt

whatsoever customs or ceremonies may seem fit to the members of that society. The simple fact of introducing such a service as that at Bolton, is not, necessarily, an infringement of liberty. It may be introduced at the desire of the people and with the concurrence of the minister: in that case, though the yoke may be grievous, it is self-imposed, and there can be no reason for complaint on either side.

Let us look at the objects proposed to be answered by the measure actually adopted. Mr. B. is of opinion, that it is not open to any "legitimate" objections; and that every abuse was effectually guarded against. He has placed its defence on the ground of expediency and usefulness; and he tells us that ordination is "designed 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." Mr. B. has very confidently appealed to his own case as unexceptionable. He cannot object to its being tried by his own declaration.

The ceremony at Bolton was designed to recognize him as a public teacher of religion. Highly expedient, truly, and extraordinarily useful! He had been chosen by the people; he had accepted their invitation, and his acceptance had been notified through the country, in the pages of the Monthly Repository; he had, for nearly the space of a year, exercised his ministry amongst the people who had chosen him; he had made his appearance as their minister at a general meeting of the Presbyterian and Unitarian ministers of Lancashire and Cheshire; and, after all this, it is "expedient and useful" to have a service for the purpose of recognizing him as a public teacher of religion!

It is also expedient to "recommend" the person thus recognized "to the favour of God." I am not sure whether I quite comprehend what is meant by this *recommendation*, but whatever it may mean, and whatever value it may have in itself, it is not had until it has been done very well without through nearly twelve months. Then it is expedient that the young minister should be recommended to the

favour of God. And how? By whom? By ministers, and ministers *alone*, collected from various quarters for the purpose; by the men who "do not," as Mr. Baker expresses it, "usurp any unjust pretensions, and whose authority is not improperly raised by this service." It would be desirable to have the expediency and usefulness of this mode of *recommending* more fully developed.

The other object of ordination specified, is, "to aid inexperience by tried wisdom and affectionate counsel." Mr. B. speaks of the "inability of youth," and "the wants of inexperience," the "many difficulties which only his more advanced brethren can remove," the "delicate situation in which he is placed as to the nature and extent of his duties," and the danger he is in of "promising" either too much or too little; and he then asks, "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?" Why, to be sure, if he did not know *before* what duties *really do* belong to the office of a minister, it would be very satisfactory to be informed of them; and we cannot but regret the injury sustained both by himself and his congregation during so long a period of misapprehension as that which elapsed from the commencement of his ministry to the day of his ordination. But is "the voice of encouragement and affection" satisfactory in the service of ordination only? Is it, on that *public* occasion, most likely to *succeed* in aiding "the inability of youth," and supplying "the wants of inexperience"? Is it *there* most powerful in correcting the errors of an immature judgment, and providing assistance in unforeseen difficulties? Is it *there* best calculated to find its way to a sober understanding, and produce a real impression upon the conduct? If Mr. B. actually laboured under so much inability and inexperience and ignorance, as he would have us to understand, the remedy adopted was utterly inadequate to remove them; and his situation cannot now be less difficult and delicate, than it was before that remedy was administered. Granting, however, that the minister and his congregation are all the better



for the advice given to him by "one who is himself a pattern," it by no means follows that the adoption of *ordination* is expedient and useful. Many things might be invented which would, in some respects, have a beneficial influence on the mind, which, nevertheless, might be highly inexpedient, and, on the whole, injurious. Because a certain kind of instruction is good in itself, it ought, therefore, to be adopted under any circumstances, and in connexion with any ceremonies, is to my mind far from being clear. The advice which Mr. B. considers to be so valuable, *was* given under circumstances which rendered the whole business inexpedient; circumstances which "*are* calculated to impress men's minds with superstitious notions, especially with regard to the validity and sacredness of the clerical office and character." The service bears the name which is associated in the minds of men with priestly pretensions; and much of its outward form is similar to that where clerical power is actually assumed. Besides, the very fact of ministers being the prime and *necessary* officers on the occasion, must in itself tend to exalt them in the eyes of the people. But let facts decide the real tendency of this ceremony. I appeal to the impression made upon Mr. B.'s own mind. He sets out, indeed, with a specification of the naked objects of the service; but the state of his feelings about it is plainly evidenced by the tone he afterwards assumes in speaking of the ministers who came, not only, it would appear, to "recognize," to "recommend" and to "aid," but also to "strengthen," to "solemnize," and to "consecrate," by their "presence and blessing." And, after all this, we are told, that no undue authority is attached to the "ministerial character." What! when it is declared to be expedient, that the choice of the people should be recognized by the ministers, though he has already been recognized by all the world: that he should be by them recommended to the favour of God: that the new connexion should be solemnized, strengthened and consecrated by them—by their presence and blessing—is there *no undue authority* attached to the ministerial character? Not "*in my opinion.*" Perhaps not;

but in the opinion of other people, any *authority* is undue. *We have no authority amongst us.* If ordination impresses the mind with the idea that we *have* any authority, it must point to the ministers as the persons in whom it resides, and is, on that account, admirably calculated to bring back that state of things, in which office dispenses with character, and the pulpit and the sacerdotal robes supply the place of argument and persuasion.

R. A. M.

Manchester,  
May 15, 1825.

SIR,  
**T**HE ordination of priests is a ceremony that may look well enough in the Catholic, English, Scotch Presbyterian, and all other Churches, which claim and exercise authority over their brethren; but among those denominations which, in compliance with our Saviour's command, "But it shall not be so among you," do not exercise authority over them, it is the shadow without the substance, the name without the thing. In such societies, the choice of a minister is the free, independent act of the members—the people. Their own opinion is the only guide of their choice. No certificate is required of the qualifications of a candidate—his proficiency in sacred and profane literature—no inquisition into the soundness of his faith, no authorizing of him to administer the sacraments, and to be in all respects a Christian pastor; there is no pretence of conferring any kind of gifts; no greater aptitude or suitableness for his office, that can be specified or defined, is, or can be, conferred by any ministers, in any ceremony or solemnity of *ordination*.

In societies of the above description, there can be no proper ordination. Nothing can be more plainly a misnomer than to retain the name, when what is universally understood by the word is given up. Yet, if the empty form is continued, it may, with time and perseverance, resuscitate some of the prejudices and pretensions whose requiem we had sung. O that they were ever dead, and never forgotten!

Should we ever be carried again by the retrograde motion now begun, to

the point of priestly pretensions and domination; should ministers have any power, or even any considerable influence, in the choice and appointment of ministers (no chimerical hypothesis!), our brethren would be able to learn, by living example, the hostility of this ceremony to Christian liberty. But I hope better things of rational Christians. They, surely, will not spontaneously submit their necks to the yoke of bondage.

But Mr BAKER assures us, that no encroachment is made upon liberty by the new system of ordination which he advocates. We will give him credit that none is intended. But who will assure us that in its progress it will not unfurl the ensign of ghostly power and authority? All will-worship—every voluntary observance of superstition, is one of those things which, in its very nature, grows during its progress, *crescit eundo*. We are not ignorant of the puny beginnings of some of those towering superstitions which have long been extensively regarded with idolatrous veneration.

Perhaps some one will say, that by the kind of ordination now adopted, the clerical character will be suitably distinguished from the lay. Possibly it may be so. But it is at the expense of more trouble than the distinction is fairly worth.

As the ground of scriptural authority for the practice in question has been very generally abandoned, and as the passages quoted in the margin by Mr. B. can scarcely be said to have any reference to the subject, we are henceforth, I presume, at liberty to regard it as a ceremony, solemnity, or observance, which is unauthorized and unprecedented in the Scriptures. In them, indeed, the word to *ordain*, means simply to *appoint* or *choose*. From whence it is clear, that no ministers in solemn assembly *did* or *could ordain* Mr. B. as minister of the Bolton congregation. Why then should we still retain the word *ordination*, in that spurious ecclesiastical meaning, established by ages of ignorance and spiritual corruption; and by that means increase the difficulty, in this, as well as in numerous instances, of breaking the connexion in the minds of men, between certain misused expressions, and the wrong

and superstitious meanings attached to them? And is not this a matter of some little importance?

This argument of want of scriptural authority Mr. Baker thus answers:

“There is no precept in the gospel for the observance of the sabbath; and yet it is so consistent with the tenor 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.”

As Mr. Baker has not attempted to shew, by adducing even a single instance, the actual consistency of ordination services with the teachings and practice of Christ, his *grounds* become untenable of course. *The teachings, the practice* of Christ in reference to *ordination*—why are we not referred to them?

Mr. B. adds: “Neither the present manner of conducting them, (*i. e.* ordination services,) nor the present style of preaching, is strictly agreeable to the original model.”

I will dispense, at present, with Mr. B.'s producing an original model of the style of preaching; but the argument will not dispense with his producing an original model of ordination services. Where shall we find one?

The insufficiency of the argument is abundantly manifest on another account. Is the absence of positive precept for the observance of the first day of the week, in the New Testament, a valid ground for the observance of every silly practice which may captivate men's fancy?

Also, is it presumed, as the reasoning seems to imply, that the arguments for ordination services are equally cogent with those for the observance of the first day of the week? Sic magnis componere parva solebam.

I will grant that we ought not to argue against the use of a thing from its abuse. But the question now is, not concerning right use or wrong use; it is concerning the use exclusively. If the use cannot be proved and established, it is all abuse. Trace the use to the New Testament—shew us that it is “eminently scriptural in its origin,” before you charge us with attacking its abuses.

If, therefore, there be no legitimate

authority for the practice, the gratuitous solemnity of a modern ordination cannot be considered as a case parallel with that of a positive observance, to the time and occasion of the institution of which we can immediately refer, and quote the very words of the formula. But even in regard to that very institution, has it been found so very easy and practicable a task to eradicate from the minds of men, and even of rational Christians, the varied and debasing superstitions into which that simple rite has degenerated, as to banish all jealousy about the introduction of unauthorized rites and practices? I do not think so.

Mr. B. represents the positive advantages and utility of ordination services (when definitely stated) to consist in obtaining the prayers of the ministers for the Divine blessing upon the newly-formed union between the congregation and the minister, and the benefit of their advice and exhortations. In this manner, the minister is represented to be *recognized*, the union *consecrated*, and the mutual connexion *solemnized*.

I grant that the fervent and affectionate prayers of the church at Bolton, when Mr. B.'s real ordination took place, that is, when he was appointed minister, would have availed much, and that a very unexceptionable scriptural authority could have been alleged for such a mode of proceeding; but why it should have been thought that the prayers of distant ministers and the whole parade of an ordination service, would have proved of greater efficacy to draw down the blessing of the almighty and benevolent Father, on the connexion lately formed between the parties, I confess I am completely at a loss to know.

As to advice. If any particular advice respecting any particular difficulty be referred to, I do not think that such a thing was contemplated by any of the parties. If general advice respecting the duties of a Christian minister be regarded, there is enough of such advice already on record; an acquaintance with them is a necessary qualification for a candidate, and, judging from Mr. B.'s answer to the questions, (p. 25,) he did not by any means stand in need of such general advice and exhortation.

In concluding, it gives me great pleasure to acknowledge the good temper and urbanity of Mr. Baker's answer to my first communication on the present topic, and to assure both our nearer and more distant friends that I oppose the practice in question on principle, but with perfect goodwill towards those who differ from me; and, that I may not appear to avail myself of anonymous concealment for advancing any thing with improper freedom or severity, concerning the opinions or conduct of my much-respected brethren, I lay aside the disguise of *RURUS COLONUS*, and subscribe my real name.

WILLIAM JOHNS.

Sir,  
I HEAR a report of a new College or University in the metropolis, which shall be open to all; and, in common with all that desire the improvement of the species, I wish well to the design, though I fear the influence of the Church is too preponderant to allow of such an establishment, with the usual University powers and privileges. But it occurs to me that, without parliamentary or royal sanction, which it might be difficult at present to obtain, there might easily be founded, not only in the metropolis, but likewise in all large towns, liberal schools, where the children of the middle classes might receive, on moderate terms, a complete education. A Joint-Stock Company might be formed in each place for this purpose, and would, indeed, be necessary, as the expense of commodious buildings would be considerable, and there would be some little risk in the first formation of the Institutions.

My idea is, that the instruction in these schools should be various, and suited to all classes that can afford to pay for a good education, but that in every department the education should be complete.

The plan would probably embrace lectures on the several branches of natural philosophy and of literature; and it would be perfect if it provided for classes of pupils at a more advanced age, whose education may have been neglected, but who would be able and willing to spare an hour in the



evening from shops and counting-houses, for recovering lost learning, or entering upon new studies.

Hoping that some of your readers may be able to assist me with hints of advice, I am

THE FATHER OF A FAMILY.

---

*Peculiarities of Philo and Josephus as Defenders of Christianity.*

**I**T must now appear beyond all reasonable doubt that Philo and Josephus are Christian writers. But a thick veil yet hangs upon the question which must be drawn asunder, and I will then close the discussion for ever. Though historians and apologists of Christ and his cause, they not only do not use the terms *Christian* and *Christianity*, but they have passed over in studied silence the personal name, the miracles, the death, resurrection, ascension, and the second coming of their Divine Master, to raise the dead and judge the world. These grand truths make a prominent figure almost in every page of the New Testament; yet they scarcely once appear in the writings of Philo and Josephus. I will account for this peculiarity, and shew that these two wise men adopted, in their writings, a plan of defending the gospel, pre-eminently fitted to defeat its enemies on its first promulgation, and to restore it to its original purity in modern days.

Philo and Josephus, it is granted, do not defend the followers of Jesus under the name of *Christians*, nor their religion under that of *Christianity*. The reason is obvious. These at first were terms of reproach, invented by enemies. Christ did not sanction them; the apostles did not recommend them; they no where address their converts as Christians; nor did a Jew exist in the first century who adopted that title as a badge of his belief in Christ. Jesus, his apostles, and his first followers in Judea, and even in the provinces, were *Jews*. This was their real name; and under this name Philo and Josephus speak of and defend them. Moreover, Christianity is the soul of Judaism; it is the fulfilment of the promise made to Abraham; it is the substance of the shadows instituted by Moses; and as Christ himself affirms, it is the law and the prophets

fulfilled and perfected by him. Christianity then is Judaism; and no Jew who believed in Christ, ever considered it, or spoke of it, under any other name.

Philo and Josephus, who were themselves Jews, regarded it in the same light: and it is demonstrable that, under whatever terms they describe in their immortal writings the religion of the Jews, they mean that religion as it was taught and refined by Jesus Christ. No truth, after proper investigation, will appear more certain, more unequivocal than this; and none more conducive to the restoration and final establishment of genuine Christianity.

Philo no where mentions Jesus personally; but he frequently uses those terms which designate him in his official capacity, which mark his offices and character as a commissioner from God. He notices his divine mission to restore mankind to the lost image of their Maker; describes the spotless purity of his character, as one through whom are to be obtained the forgiveness of sin and the hope of future bliss. He does not indeed notice the violent and ignominious death which our Lord underwent; but he alludes to it, and, what is more singular, by virtue of that death, he sets aside the whole Levitical code, which the Jews had hitherto regarded as essential to the law of Moses, as forming no part of true religion. Even on the miracles and resurrection of Christ, themes to which he might be expected again and again to recur, and in which he might well glory, he has been profoundly silent. Josephus has preserved the same silence on this subject; and it is remarkable that even in those places where he had the divine works of Jesus before his eyes, and where he is studious to establish their truth by means of momentous and notorious facts, he declines to state them in direct terms. This omission may be deemed suspicious: it is a cloud which hangs upon and obscures their writings. It is, however, but a cloud, which, when dissipated, leaves the effulgence of truth the more surprising, serene, and delightful.

The features which thus characterize the works of Philo and Josephus owe their existence to circumstances of an

important nature peculiar to those times. These I will here state with all possible brevity. The reputed wise in Egypt and other Pagan countries believed, or affected to believe, Christ to be some God or a great demon, and referred his miracles and his resurrection to demoniacal agency. This was the obvious dictate of Heathenism, and the natural tendency of it to overturn Christianity was soon perceived by its enemies. The Almighty delegated his Son Jesus to announce to the world the glad tidings of eternal life. To prove the truth of his delegation, his heavenly Father gave him power to work miracles, and raised him from the grave as a proof and pledge of the resurrection of mankind. This proof, this pledge, to be valid, supposes his simple humanity: for the survival of death, on the part of a being who by nature is superior to death, furnishes no solid grounds of faith in the resurrection of beings who by nature are subject to death. Hence the divinity of Christ became an artful pretext in the hands of his enemies to set aside the doctrine of a future state, and to neutralize the purifying influence of his gospel. This was the object of the Pagan philosophers in acknowledging the divine nature of Christ; and it was still more directly the object of the Gnostics, who made his divinity the fundamental article of their system. And this is the precise state of things which gave the writings of Philo and Josephus their peculiar character. The adversary accounted for the miracles of Christ by referring them to a superior nature, or to the arts of magic, or to demoniacal agency. The vulgar superstition enabled the opponents of Christianity with some speciousness to prevent those means which, in the eye of enlightened reason, demonstrated the divine mission of Jesus, and consequently the truth of his gospel, into an instrument to destroy its end, namely, the deliverance of mankind from ignorance, vice, and misery. The proper course which a judicious advocate was called upon to pursue in circumstances like these, was to sink the means, and insist on the end, that is, to overlook the miracles on which the gospel was founded, and describe its happy effects on the lives of those who embraced it,

and thus to hold it forth to the world as a gift descended from the Father of lights alone—as incompatible with the character of demons or the arts of magic, and as worthy of acceptance by all the human race. The course which wisdom thus dictated, was actually pursued by Philo and Josephus. They recommended Christianity by representing its divine influence, and, meeting its enemies on their own ground, wrenched from their hands the artful weapons which they wielded to destroy it. And if in these days they do not appear to be fighting under the banners of Christ, in the same field with the apostles, and with that magnanimity which characterized the early believers, it is because they concealed themselves in an ambuscade, attacking the advancing foe with masked batteries, and making him feel the force, without hearing the noise, of their powerful artillery. The nature of the service thus done to Christianity, though it prevented them from being conspicuous in the ranks of its friends, supposes a complete conviction and undisguised avowal of its truth; and to suspect them of false shame or indecision, while they actually display consummate skill and intrepidity in many parts of their writings, would be as absurd as if we suspected the sun of not emitting his usual rays, because he is withdrawn from our view by the clouds that are just above us and bound our horizon. We, in modern days, have been misled by our very imperfect knowledge of the state of things at the first promulgation of the gospel, and still more by the prejudices of education. What is here advanced is not new: Philo and Josephus for ages were known to be historians and apologists of the Christian religion. The Greek and Latin fathers, as I shall shew, were fully aware of this important fact. On some occasions, which did not interfere with their corrupt views, they claim them as Christian writers: but in general they denied their claims to this character, fearing lest their writings should prove the means of blowing up their peculiar tenets as the offspring of Paganism, and wishing them to descend along the stream of time, only as not enemies to Christ and his cause.

J. JONES.

*Original Letters and Papers.* (From the Baxter MSS. in Dr. Williams's Library.)

*Account of Baxter's Acquaintance with Archbishop Usher, and Agreement with him in Opposition to Owen and others on Fundamentals.*

[A paper in Baxter's hand-writing, indorsed *To Dr. Bates.*—A full and interesting account of the framing of the terms of Toleration by a Committee of Oliver Cromwell's Parliament, and certain divines nominated by them, is given in Baxter's *Life and Times*, L. i. Pt. ii. pp. 179, &c. Baxter there says, he "knew how ticklish a business the enumeration of *fundamentals* was." He would have had the brethren offer the Parliament the Creed, Lord's Prayer and Decalogue *alone*, as Essentials or Fundamentals. They objected, "A Socinian or Papist will subscribe all this." He answered, "So much the better."]

AND here, because some consequences are considerable, I will mention somewhat of Mr. Baxter's acquaintance with B<sup>p</sup>. Usher, y<sup>e</sup> occasions of it and the effects. When Oliver Cromwell was settling himself in his government, a forme called The Instrum<sup>t</sup> of Governm<sup>t</sup> was drawne up by his friends as a new fundamentall law, according to which hee was to rule. Therein it was decreed y<sup>t</sup> liberty of religion should be given to all who *professed faith in God by Jesus Christ*, excepting *Popery and Prelacy* (as being ag<sup>t</sup> y<sup>e</sup> liberty of others: the uniting of wh<sup>h</sup> together made some say, if ever they prevaile againe, *Popery and Prelacy*, wch you thus unite ag<sup>t</sup> all y<sup>e</sup> rest, will joyne in exclusion of all y<sup>e</sup> rest). A Parliament being called to confirme this, they must know how farre profession [of *faith in God by Jesus Christ*] extended. It was voted, y<sup>t</sup> it required a profession of all the y<sup>e</sup> *fundamentalls of Christianity*. Hereupon it was voted by a committee, y<sup>t</sup> divines shold be called to draw up a catalogue of *fundamentalls*, y<sup>t</sup> they might know to whom this liberty did belong. Each man was to choose one divine. They chose Dr. Owen, Dr. Cheynell, Mr. Reyner, of Egham, Dr. Goodwin, Mr. Philip Nye, Mr. Sydrach Simpson, Mr. Jesse, Mr. Vines, Mr. Manton; and the Lord Broghill (afterwards Earle of Orery) chose A<sup>b</sup>p Usher. The A<sup>b</sup>p

would not come among them for several reasons, but advised the L<sup>d</sup> Broghill to choose Mr. Baxter in his stead; which being done, he is sent for from Kederminster to London, and lodged wth y<sup>e</sup> L<sup>d</sup> Broghill, B<sup>p</sup> Usher dwelling neare, in Martin's Lane, at y<sup>e</sup> Countesse of Peterborough's house. They had begun their catalogue of *fundamentalls* before Mr. Baxter came up, and voted y<sup>t</sup> they would not alter w<sup>t</sup> they had done. Mr. Vines would not come among them till he heard Mr. B. was come. Mr. Baxter thought y<sup>t</sup> y<sup>e</sup> *fundamentalls* of Christianity had bin so long stated in y<sup>e</sup> universall church, in y<sup>e</sup> generall reception of y<sup>e</sup> Scripture, and y<sup>e</sup> particulars of y<sup>e</sup> sacramentall covenant explained in y<sup>e</sup> Creed, y<sup>e</sup> Lord's Prayer, and y<sup>e</sup> Decalogue, y<sup>t</sup> that there needed no new catalogue of *fundamentalls*; but y<sup>t</sup> would not be heard. What further proceedings there were about y<sup>e</sup> business, and how it was broken and came to nothing, is not here to be mentioned. But, on this occasion, Mr. Baxter becoming acquainted with the B<sup>p</sup>, at last he treated with him about the necessary termes of concord between the Episcopal Divines and y<sup>e</sup> Presbyterians, and such other Nonconformists: for you must know y<sup>t</sup> in Worcestershire they had before attempted, and agreed upon an association, in which the Episcopall, Presbyterians, Independents, and the disengaged, consented to termes of love and concord in y<sup>e</sup> practising so much of discipline in their parishes, as all y<sup>e</sup> parties were agreed in, (wch was drawne up,) and forbearing each other in y<sup>e</sup> rest. Westmoreland, and Cumberland, and Essex, and Hampshire, and Wiltshire, and Dorsetshire, quickly imitated them, and made the like association; and it was going on, and likely to have bin commonly practised, till y<sup>e</sup> return of y<sup>e</sup> B<sup>p</sup>s after brake it. And about y<sup>t</sup> time Mr. Baxter had treated also wth B<sup>p</sup> Browning and Dr. Hammond by letters, and divers others, about y<sup>e</sup> terms of this desired concord. But B<sup>p</sup> Usher and he did most speedily agree. The B<sup>p</sup> owned the terms offered to y<sup>e</sup> King, and before then printed, called *The Reduction of Episcopacy to the Primitive Forme*, &c. Mr. Baxter made narrower proposalls, securing, 1<sup>o</sup>, y<sup>e</sup> constitution and administration of particular churches; 2<sup>o</sup>, y<sup>e</sup> communion of these by associa-



tions, synods and other correspondencie; 3<sup>o</sup>, the order and peace of all by a fixed Presidencie, or such a true Episcopacie as was agreeable to y<sup>e</sup> Scripture and primitive practice; 4<sup>o</sup>, the magistrate's governm<sup>t</sup> of all by y<sup>e</sup> sword; 5<sup>o</sup>, y<sup>e</sup> measures of tolleration of tollerable Dissenters, and keeping love and peace with all, were left to further consideration. The B<sup>p</sup> said, y<sup>t</sup> these terms were such as moderate men should and would accept, but there were others y<sup>t</sup> would not. And y<sup>t</sup> his proposed Reduction would not be accepted at the first, but after, they would have accepted it. Mr. B. asked his solution of y<sup>e</sup> doubt about y<sup>e</sup> validity of Presbyters' ordination. He shortly answered, y<sup>t</sup> B<sup>s</sup> and Presbyters are *ejusdem ordinis et ad ordinem pertinet ordinare*; and y<sup>t</sup> y<sup>e</sup> King had asked him where he found, in all antiquity, y<sup>t</sup> Presbyters ordayned Presbyters; and y<sup>t</sup> he answered, I can shew your Majesty more, even where they made B<sup>s</sup>, citing Hierom's words to Evagrius, of the Alexandrians (besides that Presbyters joyned w<sup>th</sup> B<sup>s</sup> in ordination). And, indeed, y<sup>e</sup> making of ministers is a kind of politicall generation, y<sup>e</sup> elder as ffathers making junior ministers as their sons; as physicians make physicians; and lawyers make lawyers; in imitation of nature's propagating of y<sup>e</sup> species: there needs not an angell to beget a man, nor a man to beget a horse, &c. But placing them in their severall churches requireth somew<sup>t</sup> more.

This short accord of y<sup>e</sup> B<sup>p</sup> and Mr. Baxter is mentioned as occasioning w<sup>t</sup> followeth. When the Parliam<sup>t</sup> was called by G<sup>l</sup> Monke, &c., in 1660, they began w<sup>th</sup> a fast, appointing Dr. Gauden, Mr. Calamy and Mr. Baxter to preach before them. They differed not in matter of loyalty; but Dr. Gauden preaching on [*give to Cæsar y<sup>e</sup> things y<sup>t</sup> are Cæsar's, and to God y<sup>e</sup> things y<sup>t</sup> are God's*], pressed y<sup>m</sup> to begin with giving y<sup>e</sup> King his due, and to settle religion after, lest y<sup>e</sup> pretences of religion should delay y<sup>e</sup> King's restoration. Mr. Baxter was accidentally stept out of the church when those words were spoken; and in his sermon told them, y<sup>t</sup> they should begin w<sup>th</sup> giving to God y<sup>e</sup> things y<sup>t</sup> are God's, and postponing religion had frustrated others' hopes, and would let slip the opportunity, and lose all by delay, and provoke

God by neglect, (to y<sup>t</sup> sense,) yet not delaying any duty to Cæsar, but putting it in its proper place, he being under God. Dr. Gauden thought this had bin preached in opposition to him, and printed a preface to his sermon to defend w<sup>t</sup> he had said. Mr. Baxter told y<sup>m</sup> how necessary it was to unite y<sup>e</sup> ministers, and end our church discords and divisions, and y<sup>t</sup> it was so practicable a thing if men were wise, moderate and willing, y<sup>t</sup> [*y<sup>e</sup> late A<sup>b</sup>p Usher and he had in an houre's time agreed on y<sup>e</sup> necessary termes*]. These words being printed in the sermon, occasioned many peaceable Episcopall Divines, to come to Mr. B. to know w<sup>t</sup> those termes were y<sup>t</sup> B<sup>p</sup> Usher and he agreed on, viz. Dr. Gauden, Dr. Gouldson, Dr. Allen, Dr. Bernard, &c. When he had intimated to y<sup>m</sup> y<sup>e</sup> same, they appoynted some meetings to consider of the particulars, and professed great desires of concord, and willingnes of such moderation and abatements as were necessary thereto. But some men of greater power stept in and frustrated all. Mr. Calamy thought y<sup>t</sup> y<sup>e</sup> best way to bringe it to successe was to engage y<sup>e</sup> King in it, and procure his consent and helpe. Mr. B. telling all this y<sup>t</sup> past between B<sup>p</sup> Usher and him to y<sup>e</sup> Lord Broghill and y<sup>e</sup> Earle of Manchester, they resolved to motion it to y<sup>e</sup> King, who readily embraced y<sup>e</sup> motion, and heard Dr. Reynolds, Mr. Calamy, Mr. Ash, and Mr. Baxter, first making y<sup>e</sup> proposall to him; and allowed y<sup>m</sup> to call to their ayde whom els they would, and offer their termes of concord to y<sup>e</sup> King by y<sup>e</sup> Lord Chancellor. Mr. Calamy, guiding much y<sup>e</sup> personall matters, invited all y<sup>e</sup> ministers of London, y<sup>t</sup> would, to meet y<sup>m</sup> at Sion Colledge to agree on y<sup>e</sup> termes of concord to be offered. As to Church Governm<sup>t</sup>, it was agreed by all y<sup>t</sup> mett, to offer nothing, but A<sup>b</sup>p Usher's owne Reduction as it was in print, lest any alteration of their owne should become matter of alteration, and be a pretense for y<sup>e</sup> clergie's refusall. And it was offered y<sup>e</sup> King accordingly, w<sup>th</sup> other proposalls about y<sup>e</sup> other differences. But y<sup>e</sup> B<sup>s</sup> and Lord Chancellor would not so much as allow it to be once taken into consideration and debate, but utterly laide it aside. Yet in the King's following declaration of Ecclesiasticall affaires, w<sup>ch</sup> settled y<sup>e</sup> English prelacie in their

former power, honour and wealth, some other abatements and indulgences being granted, y<sup>e</sup> London ministers met and gave y<sup>e</sup> King their joyfull thanks for it, w<sup>ch</sup> was published in print. But how y<sup>e</sup> said Declaration was laid aside, by y<sup>e</sup> contrary determinations of y<sup>e</sup> Convocation and Parliament, and how y<sup>e</sup> further debates at y<sup>e</sup> Savoy were brought to nought, it is not here to be mentioned, nor are we to conjecture w<sup>t</sup> moved y<sup>e</sup> y<sup>n</sup> Bps to preferre w<sup>t</sup> hath followed these 19 or 20 yeares, before y<sup>e</sup> healing motions then made, and before y<sup>e</sup> grants in y<sup>e</sup> King's Declaration. It was his reading of Bp Usher's Sermon before King James, at Wansted, on Ephes. iv. 3, and his high esteeme of y<sup>e</sup> piety, humility, peaceableness and learning of y<sup>t</sup> excellent man, y<sup>t</sup> moved Mr. Baxter to consult most with him, and think his termes so fitt for y<sup>e</sup> healing of y<sup>e</sup> severall parties, then seeming wearied w<sup>th</sup> divisions and the sad effects.

*Angelic Apparitions.*

(A Letter from John Sadler to R. B.)

REV. SIR,

A gentlewoman, of an ancient and honourable family, Mrs. Anna Dorothea von Madem, born in Courland, and married to the family of the Koshuels in Prussia, a woman of extraordinary piety, and of much reputation amongst the gentry and all others who knew her in those parts, (and well known to the D. of Brandenburg, from whose E. Highness she received several remarks of extraordinary favor, &c.)—this lady having layn sick and bedrid, for a long time, under such a distemper as none of the physicians in all those parts could cure—at length an angel appeared to her at her bed's feet, and asked her if no man could cure her; she answered, No. Then, replied the angel, I am sent by God to heal you; and ordered her to prepare some slight thing, and told her that should cure her, and vanished. She got it made, and in a few days perfectly recovered. This is well known to all the country in those parts. And, if I am not greatly mistaken, this relation is inserted in that book which this gentlewoman afterwards published, entitled "A Spiritual Wound-Balsam for the Jews, proving that Christ was the true Messias, from

the accomplishment of all the Prophets who foretold the Particulars which actually came to pass in his State of Humiliation," &c. This book is extant in High Dutch and Low Dutch; and translated into English, which I have read; and hath been the happy occasion of y<sup>e</sup> conversion of many Jews. It would fill a small book to relate the singular piety of this gentlewoman, whose name is mentioned with hon<sup>ble</sup> remembrance by many persons of quality, and others in several of y<sup>e</sup> dukedoms in those parts.

My wife's uncle, Captain Koshuel, was in this gentlewoman's house, being her brother, together with all her nearest relations, when she lay on her death-bed, at Kosaken, who were eye and ear witnesses of her rare end she made, w<sup>h</sup> was to the admiration of all who were then present. Having in a holy rapture spoken near two hours on our Saviour's last dying words on the cross, she desired a psalm to be sung, and when they came to these words, "I stretch forth my arms to embrace thee, my dearest Lord," &c., she raised herself up, and, opening both her arms to embrace her beloved, sang those words with a strong and clear voice, and immediately died in y<sup>e</sup> embraces of her dear Saviour, in whose bosom she had lived for many years. This Cap<sup>n</sup> Koshuel, a person of great integrity and reputation, told me, amongst several of these unto whom he hath related the same, y<sup>t</sup> he chanced to cast his eye into a room that joined to her house, w<sup>h</sup> she had built for her chapel, where she spent so much time in devotions, &c., and that at this time, being the night before she departed, he plainly saw, to his great surprise and astonishment, his sister's angel, all in white, kneeling at her table in that room, where she was wont to pray, and beheld y<sup>t</sup> it was the same aspect of his sister, who then lay on her death-bed, but with this difference only, y<sup>t</sup> her angel's countenance was of a bright and shining lustre, as was also her whole garment. And this relation I had from his own mouth, at Kosaken, and it is received without any doubt from a person of such an unsuspected reputation; this gentlewoman was sister to Capt. Koshuel and mother to my wife.

Given under my hand this 7<sup>th</sup> of Septber, 91,

Who am, Sr, yr most affte  
Servant, &c. &c.

JOHN SADLER.

To the Revernd Mr. Baxter,  
his most Hon<sup>d</sup> Ffrnd  
Presnt.

—  
“*Strange Pieces of Providence, at  
Brightling, Sussex.*”

(A Paper, so indorsed in Baxter's  
hand-writing.)

These are to certify, whom it may concern, yt in ye year of our Lord 1659, at Brightling, in Sussex, there were many strange pieces of providence. A fire strangely, suddenly kindled and burnt down a man's dwelling house, and he removing to another, the fire pursued him, and kindled in the thatch, and that, although the same was put out, it was said, that it rekindled again, till the man's goods were removed out of the house into a field, and that several things were thrown by an invisible hand, and scarce any quiet, but at ye time of prayer; wh providence occasioned a fast to be kept in ye Church of Brightling by four ministers.

Witnesse our hands hereunto, set this 29th day of June, 1683.

Joseph Bennet, the minr then of ye said Brightling.

I, Tho. Goldham, at yt time minister of Burwash, adjoining to ye parish of Brightling, aforesaid, and one of ye 4 ministers engaged in ye fast above-mentioned, do certify ye truth of ye narrative above-written. Witness my hand,

THOs. GOLDHAM.

(Signed also by John French, and 10 other persons, inhabitants, it is supposed, of Brightling.)

—  
*Mr. Biddle's "Great Congregations."*

In a letter from *Tho. Grove* to *R. B.*, dated Berry Court, the 13th of November, but without any year, the writer says, “I heard lately such terrible things from London, of *Biddle* and others venting their blasphemies publicly in great congregations of people that it makes my heart tremble to think what God will do with us.”

*Anecdotes respecting the Athanasian Creed.* (From the MSS. of the late Rev. Mr. Jones, author of the “Free and Candid Disquisitions,” in Dr. Williams's Library.)

1756. May 29. **T**HE R<sup>t</sup> Rev<sup>d</sup>. the L<sup>d</sup> Bp of Winchester told me, that whilst he was a parish minister he always read the Athanasian Creed as the Rubric required, and thought himself obliged to do so, in virtue of his engagements, at the same time assuring me that it is his judgement, that it would be much better for this church and nation, if we had no such creed; or that the reading of it in congregations were not enjoined by law.

1759. An ingenious and learned gentleman (Mr. Sh.) lately told me, yt he once asked the late Bp of Winchester (Dr. Willis), with whom he was well acquainted, what his Lp's opinion was of yt Creed, the solidity of its doctrine and ye justifiableness of imposing it as a confession of our common faith, &c. Sir, said his Lp, I will have no disputes with you upon this head. I will give you in one word my opinion of the matter: I am exactly of the same mind with Abp Tillotson, “I wish the X<sup>n</sup> Church were well rid of yt Creed.” There was no room for further inquiry.

The late Bp of Rochester (Dr. Wilcox) being upon a Whit-Sunday with his family at ye house of a clergyman in N—shire, who had for some time omitted reading the Athanasian Creed in his Church, his Lp's Chaplain, who was aware that this omission had given some offence, took a method of his own accord, and as is reasonably supposed not without consulting the Bishop, to remove the offence and abate the prejudice. He desired the clergyman's permission to read the morning service of that day in his stead. The favour of a sermon (said the clergyman) would be more acceptable. But I chuse (answered the chaplain) on this day to read prayers if you please, and may preach for you on another. He read them, and omitted the Ath<sup>n</sup> Creed, as ye incumbent himself had usually done, the Bishop being present. This conduct had its proper effect upon the people.



## REVIEW.

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

ART. I.—*An Inquiry into the Sense in which our Saviour Jesus Christ is declared by St. Paul to be the Son of God, in Two Sermons, preached before the University of Oxford. To which are added, Observations on some Passages in Mr. Belsham's "Translation and Exposition of the Epistles of Paul, the Apostle."* By John Hume Spry, M.A.,\* of Oriel College, Minister of Christ Church, Birmingham,† and one of the University select Preachers for the Year 1824. Oxford, at the University Press. Sold in London, by Messrs. Rivington, and by Hatchard. 1824. 8vo. pp. 162.

TO destroy Mr. Belsham's credit, as a scriptural critic and interpreter, is, obviously, the aim of the writer of this pamphlet: let it then be considered how far he has, in the present undertaking, made good his own.

He discourses from Acts ix. 20 [“ And straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God”]: yet, in quoting the former clause of the passage, he adopts a corrupt reading, and afterwards hazards a defective observation. The corrupt reading, is *Χριστον*, for *Ιησυν*: the defective observation, pp. 3, 4, [note g,] that, according to “ Mill,” some MSS. and some of the Fathers read “ Jesus” in this verse. What the genuine text is, may be seen in Griesbach's editions of the N. T. in loc.; and it will thence appear that not merely some MSS., and some of the Fathers, so read the clause, but that external testimony preponderates most decidedly in favour of *Ιησυν*. Our author has stated, indeed, the truth, yet not the *whole* truth: nor should he have contented himself with “ Mill,” when still better authorities were at hand. “ With Mill's edition,” says an extremely capable judge,‡

“ the age of manhood,” in biblical criticism, “ commences.” It would seem that Dr. Spry has overlooked those succeeding critical editions of the Christian Scriptures, to which a greater maturity of knowledge and investigation has given birth, and of which Mill's highly meritorious and learned volume was the precursor.\* This variety of reading, had been noticed, long before the appearance of the Principal of Edmund Hall in that department of Sacred Literature: Grotius† had not disregarded it; even Gregory, in his very inferior edition of the Greek Testament, which issued from the press of the University of Oxford, in 1703, had marked the same difference—and the text of the Vulgate had continued to exhibit the word *Jesum*.

To know that such is the genuine reading, cannot be unimportant: for the terms *Christ* and *the Son of God* are identical; both of them meaning the Messiah of the Jews, and both being well explained by the twenty-second verse of the chapter, and by several passages beside. Sometimes, these phrases are placed in apposition, or as exegetical of each other.‡ In

(Marsh,) Vol. II. P. I. Ch. xii. Sect. i.; and Marsh's Lectures, VII.

\* Küster's edition of the N. T. by Mill, is almost indispensable to the student.

† Annot. in Acta Apostol., in loc.

‡ So, Matt. xvi. 16, which the twentieth verse of the same chapter completely explains; Matt. xxvi. 63; Mark i. 1, compared with Mark xii. 35, xiv. 61; Matt. xxvii. 42; Rom. i. 3, 4, x. 9; and John vi. 69, in Griesbach's edition, together with John i. 49. To John xx. 31, John xvii. 3, is parallel. Other texts might be enumerated: but these are sufficient to shew that, if we interpret Scripture by itself, the title, *Son of God*, is no proof of our Lord's *Deity*. We take the liberty of further referring the theological student to Lightfoot's Works, II. 385, to J. D. Michaëlis' Introd. to New Test. I. 339, IV. (Marsh, 1801), 409, 410, on 1 John v. 1—6; and to Kuinoel's Comm., &c. (2d ed.), on Matt. xvi. 16, John vi. 69, who says of the terms in question, “ Sunt formulæ idem valentes.”

\* Now D. D.

† Now of the Church in Langham Place, &c.

‡ J. D. Michaëlis. Introd. to N. T.,

general, nevertheless, we do not meet with them together: it is observable that in Luke iv. 41, Griesbach expunges the words *ὁ Χριστός* from his text, and that he wholly omits Acts viii. 37; nor does he fail of bestowing some critical notices on most of the few remaining verses where both the phrases may be seen.

Dr. Spry (pp. 4, 5,) appeals to Allix, as justifying the statement which follows:

"It has been shewn, beyond the reach of reasonable objection, that this [the divine nature of the Messiah] was a truth already known to the more learned and unprejudiced Jews."

What *objection* exists to any such statement, and whether the objection be *reasonable*, our readers will judge, after we have laid before them a copious extract from a discourse, that we greatly prize, on "the Scriptural Meaning of the Title Son of God, as applied to our Lord:"\*

"A learned divine of a former age in the Church of England [Dr. Peter Allix], in a work which he entitles, 'The Judgment of the Ancient Jewish Church against the Unitarians,' has endeavoured to shew that the Jews in our Saviour's time expected their Messiah to be of a divine nature. His arguments are chiefly drawn from the expressions which occur in the Chaldee paraphrases of the Scriptures, in which the word of Jehovah appears to be spoken of as a divine person, distinct from Jehovah himself, and this divine word to be identified with the Messiah. But were the evidence ever so satisfactory, that the authors of these paraphrases entertained the expectation of a divine Messiah, it would be most unreasonable to admit this as a proof that the Jews in our Lord's time did so too, when the Scriptures, the faithful, living picture of the sentiments and passions of his contemporaries, not only contain no traces of such an expectation, but decidedly prove that it did not prevail. But the fact is, that in those of the Chaldee paraphrases, which may claim a nearly equal antiquity with the New Testament, the expression, the word of Jehovah, is never in a single instance used but as a synonyme for Jehovah

himself, especially considered as exercising command or exercising power, and that the notion of the word as a substance, having a distinct existence and proper personality, is not found in any of the Rabbinical writings till about the sixth century of the Christian æra, when the Jews, following the example of the Christians, exalted the Messiah to the rank of deity, in direct opposition to the expectations which prevailed in our Saviour's time, and long after it. Even while the great corruptions of the Christian doctrine on this point were proceeding, the Jews continued in their ancient opinions, and are reproached by the fathers with their blindness in not perceiving that the doctrine of the Trinity is taught in the Old Testament. Whether the mote were in the eye of the Jews, or the beam in that of their accusers, is a question foreign to our present investigation, but at least it is evident that the judgment of the *primitive Jewish Church* was in *favour* of the Unitarians."

The proper authority of rules of interpretation, depends not so much on their being "common," (p. 6,) as on their being just: in all events, it is clear that we should be governed by the sense of language, rather than by its sound.

"We know," says Dr. Spry, (ib.) "that the sons of men are partakers in the nature of their fathers; and, therefore, admitting that the apostle speaks of a fact which was communicated to him by a special revelation, when he tells us that 'Christ is the Son of God;' we may comprehend at once, that he intended us to infer, that, as such, he is a partaker in the nature of the Father; and may learn to confess that 'such as the Father is, such is the Son' also; 'that the Father is God, and the Son God.'\*"

Let us try the solidity of this argument.

We read, in 1 John iii. 1, that Christians, even "now, are the sons [children, *τέκνα*,] of God:" and in 2 Pet. i. 4, the same class of persons are declared to be "partakers of the Divine nature;" which form of expression, be it observed, is never applied, in the Scriptures, to Jesus Christ. Another text, not less perspicuous, occurs to our recollection: "Ye shall be my sons [*ἐς υἱούς*] and daughters;" 2 Cor. vi. 18; Jer. xxxi. 1. But will Dr. Spry maintain that

These names, then, "the Christ, the Son of God," are names of office, and do not designate a *nature*.

\* By John Kenrick, M. A., pp. 15, &c. [1st ed. 1818], and Mon. Repos. XIV. 573, &c.

\* "Athanasian Creed."

all Christians are, in nature and in rank, essentially divine; that "such as is the father, such are the sons"—agreeably to his own principle of what he calls the "plain, literal construction"? Of such a tenet he ought, in consistency, to be the advocate. For such an inference he has stronger ground than he can take in the case before us; where, from extremely precarious *data*, he advances to a vast and mighty conclusion.

This part of the subject must not be dismissed, until we have copied some further remarks of a writer, to whom we owe a large debt of esteem and gratitude.\*

"— the title Son of God, as applied to our Saviour, can be taken in no other than a figurative sense.

"I know how common a reproach it is against those who adopt our views of Scripture doctrine, that we never take the words of the Bible in their literal sense, but are perpetually recurring to metaphors and figures; and our opponents make it their boast that they keep close to the letter. I would, however, request such persons to consider that they cannot understand the title Son of God literally, without degrading the spirituality of the Divine nature. Unless they are prepared to maintain that the relation between our Lord and his Father is precisely that which subsists between an earthly parent and his child, they must take the words in some figurative sense. Whether they suppose Christ to be the Son of God in virtue of his *emission* or *emanation* from the Father, or the communication of the divine essence to him, or his creation in some more immediate and direct manner than all other beings, (for in such unprofitable questions has the labour of metaphysical theologians been employed,) still the term cannot be used in the sense in which it is applied to the connexion between one human being and another. Consequently it is used in a figurative sense.

"In the present instance, therefore, there is no foundation for the charge made by the professors of orthodoxy against their opponents, of turning the Bible into figures of speech, because they themselves must do the same, and because a figurative interpretation is necessary, to make different parts of Scripture consistent with each other. He who in many passages is called the only-begotten Son of God, is in another declared to be

the first-born among many brethren; both of which things cannot be literally true. But lest any one should think, that the use of figurative language, which, as the event has shewn, was liable to misconception, is an objection to the style of Scripture, let it be considered that the discourses of our Lord must come down to us as he addressed them to the Jews; that the language of a people so separated from the rest of the world, and stamped with such a character of peculiarity by their institutions, must be tinged with allusions to their rites and customs, their past history and future expectations; and that, to address either the hearts or the understandings of such a nation with effect, the public teacher must use that language in which they were in the habit of expressing themselves. The Jews, therefore, being accustomed to speak in figures, our Lord and his apostles must do the same."

Dr. Spry proceeds to consider some of those passages, in which Paul applies the title, "the Son of God," to Jesus Christ.—We shall accompany him in his exposition of Rom. i. 3, 4: and here it will be our first object to place before our readers what, with becoming deference, we deem a literal and correct rendering of the passage:

"Concerning his Son (who was of the seed of David, according to the flesh, who was defined to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by his resurrection from the dead) Jesus Christ our Lord, &c."

"It is not easy," in Dr. Spry's judgment, "to imagine a form of language which could more emphatically state the divine nature of Jesus Christ than this, when thus taken, according to the plain, literal and grammatical construction of the words." Now, it is exactly upon such a construction of the words—a construction plain, literal and grammatical—that we regard these verses as clearly teaching the humanity of the Messiah's nature, and the divinity of his office. Dr. Spry\* himself appears to concede that the title, *the Son of God*, will not alone be sufficient to prove the Deity of Him who receives it: accordingly, we have this comment on the apostle's words:

"As St. Paul here tells the Romans,

\* "The Scriptural Meaning," &c., ut supra, pp. 6—9.

\* See, too, his reasoning and statement in p. 23.



that Jesus Christ was 'of the house and lineage of David;' had he merely added that he was 'the Son of God,' without further explaining or enforcing the meaning of his words, there might have been something like a plausible pretence for considering this title as nothing more than a recognition of some extraordinary and especial portion of divine favour and assistance, by which he was supported and fitted for his prophetic and regal office."—P. 15.

The observation for which this part of Dr. Spry's reasoning calls, is, that "the Son of God" must be taken as *the title of a SPECIFIC prophetic and regal office*, rather than as a recognition of divine favour and help, accompanying the exercise of the office. He who will compare together those passages in Paul's writings and discourses, where the phrase occurs, will readily perceive its meaning. Nor should the order of the Apostle's ideas, in the text before us, be disregarded. In the parenthetical clause, Paul represents, first, his Master's nature and genealogy; then his peculiar *office*; and, lastly, a main evidence of his being invested with it; and this, in explanation of the language used in the body of the verses, "concerning his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord," &c.

If the reader attend to what we think a correct arrangement and division of the passage, he will be sensible that the following criticism is destitute of support:

"But when the apostle proceeds to inform us, that this extraordinary person was *the Son of God really and effectually*, *εν δυναμει*; a partaker of the *holy and spiritual* nature of the divinity, *κατα πνευμα αγιωσυνης*; and that he was thus clearly declared, in a manner beyond the reach of cavil or ambiguity, by that great surpassing miracle, his resurrection from the dead; it might seem scarcely possible for language to be framed less liable to exception, less open to misconstruction, less capable of being perverted from its true meaning by the ingenuity of heresy, or more clearly indicative of the fundamental truth which this great apostle seems to have been ever careful to state, as the basis upon which the whole fabric of his teaching, doctrinal and moral, was to be securely placed."—Pp. 16, 17.

Let us separate Paul's language from that of his commentator. "This great apostle," as we learn from him-

self,\* made *the Messiahship* of Jesus the basis of his teaching. It is the same grand truth which he now affirms; though Dr. Spry's criticisms on the phrases *εν δυναμει*, and *κατα πνευμα αγιωσυνης* would fix upon the passage a very different signification.

The words, *εν δυναμει*, are inadequately translated by the adverbs, *really and effectually*. We have the same expression in 1 Cor. iv. 20, where this apostle says, "the kingdom of God is not in word, but "in power;" meaning that the "dispensation of the gospel is introduced by the agency of miraculous endowments," ver. 19.† The complete form appears to be, *εν δυναμει πνευματος*,‡ or *εν δυναμει τω κυριω*.§ One proof of the Messiahship of Jesus—of his being the Son of God—is found in the mighty works that he wrought. Isa. lxi. 1; Matt. xi. 4—6.

Dr. Spry would render *κατα πνευμα αγιωσυνης*, by "the holy and spiritual nature of the divinity." Now, J. D. Michaëlis' remark on Paul's expression, "the spirit of holiness," is, || "Commentators have taken for granted that *πνευμα αγιωσυνης* signifies the eternal Godhead, without any authority or arguments drawn from the analogy of the Greek language." No decision of the kind can be more correct and unexceptionable. The phrase before us, is equivalent to *πνευμα αγιον*.¶ In the first verse of the epistle, Paul had described himself as a servant of Jesus, *the Christ*: and he establishes this claim in behalf of his honoured Master, by a reference to the Holy Spirit, or inspiration, which eminently rested on our Lord, and by the energies of which he was even raised from the dead.

Whether this be the sense which "the universal church" has put upon the passage, is a question comparatively insignificant, in the eyes of those with whom the exposition of the Scriptures by the Scriptures, must ever be an object of the first importance. Otherwise, it would not be difficult to produce the names of pious, learned, able and upright men, (p. 17,) in favour of even what Dr. Spry has been pleased to denominate "the

\* 1 Cor. iii. 11. † Locke, in loc.

‡ Rom. xv. 13. § Luke v. 17.

|| Introd. &c. [Marsh], II. p. 406.

¶ See J. G. Rosenmüller, in loc.

torturing ingenuity of heretical interpretation." It is not, however, by means of names or of epithets that the point at issue can be determined. "The select preacher, before the University of Oxford," had previously spoken of "ingenuity of heresy." From the pulpit whence he uttered these expressions, such criminations may be looked for, even after they have been generally banished from spots, where no *heretic* was consigned first to the secular arm, and then to the stake. Those days, happily, are past: and we submit to our readers, whether in this country, and at this advanced period of the world, it may not be as well to lay aside these vague yet obnoxious appellations. When Dr. Spry speaks of *heretical* interpretation, all which can, in reason, be understood is, that he adverts to an interpretation differing from his own. Of heretics, in the scriptural acceptance of that word, he, undoubtedly, is silent. He must be perfectly aware that in the judgment of the Church of Rome all Protestants, and therefore the members of the church to which he himself belongs, are *heretics*. If, then, he persist in so denominating us, we must remind him of Michaëlis' unquestionable maxim: "We may be assured, that whoever condemns another as a heretic, because he is of a different opinion, is wholly ignorant of the art of criticism."\*

Let us now attend Dr. Spry in his examination of Gal. iv. 4—7 ["When the fulness of time was come," &c.].

He discovers the pre-existence of Jesus Christ in the clause, "God sent forth his Son;" "sent him from himself, to take upon him our nature, to be made of a woman" [p. 20]. The original word is *εξαπεσευλε*; and there may be an advantage in considering some passages of the LXX., and of the New Testament, in which it occurs.

In Micah i. 14, the Greek translators of the Jewish Scriptures use the term in the sense of *something bestowed*: and a similar import it certainly has in Gal. iv. 6, "God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts" ["hath communicated it to you"].\* This verb frequently means to dismiss

with contempt and ignominy; as in Deut. xx. 19, 29; Luke i. 53. But in Acts xxii. 21, and in the text under our immediate consideration, its force is that of *αποσπello*; and it is equivalent with *send*.

Stress appears to be placed by Dr. Spry on the language, "made of a woman." Perhaps he will not deny that the original should be translated, "BORN of a woman:" scarcely can he be ignorant that the patriarch Job applies this phraseology to himself;† and he unquestionably will admit that neither was Job's nature divine nor his state pre-existent.

Upon the clause, "to redeem them that were under the law," the select preacher's comment is most extraordinary:

"If the Son of God had no existence prior to his nativity at Bethlehem; if he partook of no nature but that of man, it would follow that he was sent forth from God for a purpose which we have the authority of God himself for saying that he could not effect.

"No truths are more plainly set forth in Scripture than these; that man cannot be the redeemer of man; and that God has reserved this great office of mercy for his own especial performance. 'None,' says the Psalmist, 'can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him; that he should still live for ever, and see no corruption. But God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave: for he shall receive me.' "Psa. xlix. 7, 9, 15. And Hosea xiii. 9, 14.—Pp. 21, 22.

Doubtless, the natural doom of an individual man to death, by the operation of disease, or other similar causes, no fellow-man can set aside. No one can thus die in his brother's room, or so avert from him ultimately "the mortal hour." Substitution is here impossible. But this must be *exclusively* the case, of which the Psalmist speaks. As an universal, or even a general, as an unqualified and abstract, proposition, it is not true, and is not asserted, that "no man can redeem his brother." Such a proposition the Scriptures do not contain, and reason and facts do not warrant. Our readers, on consulting

\* Introd. &c., ut sup., II. p. 461.

† Schleusner, in verb. [No. 3.]

\* Job xiv. 1.

some texts \* to which we shall refer them, will hardly dispute the justness of our remarks. Whether to *redeem* be simply to *deliver*, or specifically to *ransom*, we know that both deliverance and deliverance by ransom are often effected by human beings for human beings. Let every passage adduced from the sacred volume, be first examined by the aid of its context, and then be compared with other passages in that volume. When the Psalmist says, "No man," &c., he makes no allusion whatever to redemption by Christ and the gospel: it is a perfectly distinct subject on which he writes. The words are misapplied, when cited in proof of the tenets, of which the select preacher is the advocate.

There is one sense, we most reverently and gratefully acknowledge, in which God alone can be the Redeemer of man. All means, all instruments, are his: what his creatures possess, the opportunities and the ability of effecting, is really effected by Him from whom that will and ability proceed. On this point Dr. Spry will scarcely differ from ourselves. This, however, is not the statement which he has made, nor this the doctrine which he here maintains. Were we strangers to the mighty power of preconceived opinion, we should feel astonished at his thus interpreting Scripture merely by its sound. In the same way, several favourite yet unfounded notions might be rested on the basis of single words, or single clauses, where a negative is either expressed or implied. So, because we read in Micah iii. 7, there is "no answer of God," we might be led, by this sort of criticism, to conclude universally from these detached terms, that Almighty God does *not* answer prayer. Numerous examples to the like effect might be brought forward: and the present is but one among a multitude of instances of the unsoundness of such a principle of exposition.

But Dr. Spry resumes his observations on Gal. iv. 4—7. In his opinion,

"The divinity of the Son of God is

† Job xxxiii. 24; Prov. xxi. 18; Matt. xx. 28; Levit. xxv. 48, 49; Num. xviii. 15; Nchem. v. 8; 2 Sam. xii. 7; Gen. xxxvii. 21.

further to be proved by the *effect* of his mission, as it is set forth in this important passage. He was sent forth to redeem them that were under the law, 'that we might receive the adoption of sons.' And one consequence of this adoption is, that thus becoming the sons of God, we are made partakers of the spirit of his Son \* \* \*. The mysterious being here spoken of as *the spirit of the Son of God*, is in other places called by the apostle, in language equally explicit, 'the Spirit of God,' 'the Spirit of the living God.' It is then clear, that the apostle, when he here called him *the Spirit of the Son*, intended to describe the Son himself as God."—Pp. 23, 24.

Such reasoning, if it be good for any thing, proves too much. We will try the principle and the force of it upon a simple case.

In 1 Cor. v. 4, Paul uses this language, "In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, (when ye are gathered together, and MY SPIRIT,) with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ." Here, by *my spirit*,\* the Apostle means the authority of his official *inspiration*. His *spirit* then was the spirit of God and Christ. But is the phrase a demonstration, is it even presumptive, of Paul's deity?

Obviously, the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of the Son of God, signifies a portion of the Spirit with which the Messiah was pre-eminently invested, and which, at his request, and by his agency, was imparted to his early followers. The source of this, as of every blessing, is uniformly declared, in the Scriptures, to be God, even the Father. It may be added, that Rom. viii. 14, decides the point: "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God" [*υιοι Θεου*]. Now being led by the Divine Spirit they possess it, yet are not, therefore, in rank *divine*.

It is a collateral, but not altogether an unimportant question, whether Paul wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews. Mr. Belsham thinks that he did not: and this judgment of the case Dr. Spry terms Mr Belsham's "dictum;" and "leaves it to weigh with those who look up to its author as their guide."

\* See the complete form in 1 Cor. vii. 40. Το πνευμα is *inspiration*; and the above clause should be read in a parenthesis.



Why does the select preacher style such a declaration, a *dictum*? This is not handsomely or correctly said. Scriptural critics, of the greatest name, have been divided in sentiment concerning the writer of the letter; though they are agreed in respect of its high antiquity. Nor has the subject any relation to Trinitarianism or Antitrinitarianism, as such. *Lardner* endeavoured to shew that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written by Paul; while *J. D. Michaelis* arrives at the contrary deduction.

In Heb. i. 1, &c., Dr. Spry beholds proofs of the deity of Jesus Christ. He, for example, informs us, (pp. 25, 26,) that "to the Hebrews such language as 'God in these last days hath spoken unto us by his Son; whom he hath appointed heir of all things; by whom also he made the worlds,' was highly significant." What evidence, however, can this gentleman produce in support of his assertion, "Him" [the Messiah] "they believed to be made heir of all things, by virtue of an especial covenant entered into between him and the Father from eternity"? If any phrases are "significant" of inferiority and dependence, they are such as we read in the clause, "whom he hath APPOINTED HEIR of all things." The prophetic Psalm \* to which Dr. Spry has referred, describes what is future, not what is past; the extension of the Messiah's kingdom, not his personal nature and dignity; a request and a grant, not a covenant: and when it is said, "The Father loveth the Son and hath given all things into his hand,"† *all things* must evidently be understood as meaning *all mankind*, both Jews and Heathens; the language being well illustrated by other passages.

"The worlds," now spoken of, are not the material worlds, but the *ages* or *dispensations*, [τὰς αἰώνας,] and emphatically, *the Christian dispensation*. The text has been admirably explained by the late amiable and judicious author of "Essays on the Language of Scripture."‡

It is the Nicene Creed which supplies Dr. Spry, as it had supplied

Bishop Bull, (pp. 27, 28,) with a key to the clauses, "the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person." So convinced, indeed, was the learned and worthy prelate of the identity of the doctrine of his favourite symbol and of the doctrine of the words now cited, that he pronounces a somewhat harsh censure on those who are unable to embrace his interpretation. He and the select preacher, after him, far from admitting that we see the matter with different eyes than theirs, or through another medium than their own, deny that we see it at all: they reproach us with having the "dim curtain" of "the blind mole."\* Who then are they that make "an insinuating appeal to the pride of human intellect," and, as serves their purpose, speak now of the mental obtuseness, and now of the ingenuity and talents of heretics; who are they that, on some occasions, ascribe to us "the lynx's beam," and, on others, charge us with ignorance and imbecility?

The image of a person must always be distinct from the original: nor can the image of the *invisible* God be himself God. Why, then, is this appellation bestowed on Jesus Christ? Because he received an immeasurable communication of Divine knowledge, wisdom and power; because his virtues eminently approached the moral perfections of the Deity; because he revealed the will of heaven, not to one nation alone, but to the whole race of man; because he was invested with signal authority and privileges; and, finally, inasmuch as he is the former and head of the new creation.

According to Dr. Spry, the Apostle has proclaimed Jesus Christ to be one in substance with the Father. Such is the select preacher's assertion: for proofs of the justness of it we search in vain.—P. 29.

This gentleman next puts the supposition that Christ was only a frail and mortal being, like ourselves; and upon his assumed and inaccurate *postulatum* he argues to the supposed perilousness of the Trinitarian faith, and to the improbability that Trinita-

\* Psalm ii.

† John v. 20; Matt. xi. 27.

‡ The Rev. John Simpson; No. VIII.

VOL. XX.

\* "Jam per απαντασμα, κ. τ. λ. \* \*

\* \* \* talpa cæcior est qui non videt." See the quotation in Dr. Spry's note, (q,) p. 28.

rians have actually mistaken the import of the language of the Scriptures.\* In such prescriptive reasoning there can be no strength, especially when we oppose to it the result of a pure and careful examination of the sacred volume. Some of the grossest errors may boast of considerable and even hoar antiquity: and the advocates of Transubstantiation itself, appeal to the words of our Lord, as recorded by his evangelists and apostles.

The select preacher does not discriminate between the principle of belief in *facts*, and that of belief in *opinions*; between historical assent, or the reception of *testimony*, and verbal interpretation. In the present case, the only point at issue between Unitarian Christians and their opponents, is *the sense of Scripture* which, we maintain, must be determined by Scripture itself, and not by creeds and catechisms. *We* admit no *hypothesis*, and certainly not the *Socinian*, the specific feature of which is so wild and visionary that we doubt, whether in this country it has a single advocate.—Pp. 32, 33.

By Dr. Spry, Unitarian Christians are represented as “a powerful and busy sect.” Its advocates he pronounces to be “neither deficient in zeal nor in controversial ability:” their “appeal to the pride of human intellect has at all times been powerful in mischief; and its deadly influence has perhaps never been greater than at present.”—P. 33.

There is no argument, as Dr. Spry should be aware, in sentences like these. A *fact*, we trust, it is, that Unitarian Christians have some zeal for what they consider as scriptural truth: for religious virtue they feel, we persuade ourselves, a yet warmer zeal. The *power* by which they are desirous of being characterized, is the power of virtue and of truth: without this, their controversial ability, be it what it may, will not long avail them; however, they are at least satisfied, that they have nothing to fear from either the theological knowledge or the reasoning talents of “one of the select preachers before the University of Oxford for the year 1824.” N.

(To be continued.)

ART. II.—*Sermons on the Study of the Bible, &c.* By Wm. Bruce, D. D., &c.

(Concluded from p. 227.)

SER. VIII. “On the Intercession of Christ,” is extremely unsatisfactory. Dr. Bruce does not explain what he means by the phrase, though he opens the discourse with the sweeping assertion, “The intercession of Christ is foretold by Isaiah, and occurs *every where in the Gospels and Epistles*” (p. 154). The office of intercessor ascribed to Christ may imply no more than that by virtue of his life and doctrine, his death, and resurrection, he has been our benefactor in relation to his and our heavenly Father. Our Lord represented to the unbelieving Jews, (John v. 45,) that Moses was their accuser before the Father, meaning plainly, that the predictions of Moses concerning himself condemned their unbelief; and in the same manner Christ is the advocate of his disciples by means of the gospel, which pronounces and ensures their acquittal from the sentence of death and the punishment of sin. The text of this Sermon, Rom. viii. 34, suggests this explanation.

“On Predestination, Election and Reprobation,” Ser. IX., Dr. Bruce is very clear and scriptural, and has our entire concurrence. He quotes, in order to oppose, the Assembly’s Catechism, and other works of Calvinistic divines. His rules for interpreting the Epistles are judicious and highly important, and, let us add, these alone have guided us in our remarks upon those topics on which we have the misfortune to differ from the worthy preacher.

Dr. Bruce argues boldly and ably, Ser. X., against the doctrine of “Original Sin.” He builds his argument on the solid foundation of the silence of our Lord. “With respect to Adam, or the consequences of his transgression, he says not a single word. We may, therefore, refuse to treat it as an essential article of faith—” (p. 191). He proceeds, however, to inquire into the doctrine of the epistles on this subject, and adopts the scheme of interpretation of Dr. John Taylor and other biblical critics of the same school. He examines some expressions of Calvin and other masters of

\* Pp. 30, 31.

the system, and is warned by their cold-blooded statements of the fate of the mass of mankind to exclaim—"it is impossible to treat of these monstrous positions without contradiction and blasphemy" (p. 206). We extract with pleasure from the preacher's remarks on the fifth chapter of the Epistle to Romans, his criticism on the phrases *to justify* and *to make sinners*:

"To justify, literally signifies, to make or render just: in common use, it means to defend or vindicate, and also to absolve from an accusation, or free from past sin by pardon. This last is its scriptural sense. It is always thus understood, when the state of Christians in this world is spoken of; because the sins of new converts are forgiven at baptism, on faith and repentance. This will enable you to understand the other phrase, *to make sinners*. As to *justify* signifies to make just, to place in the situation of just men by pardon; so this expression, to make sinners, is equivalent to condemn, to place men in the situation of sinners. As a guilty person may be treated like an innocent one, by being pardoned and received into favour; so an innocent man may be treated as a criminal, and condemned. The one situation is expressed in Scripture by *being justified*, or made righteous; the other by *being made a sinner*. Thus Christ is said, 'to be made sin,' or a sinner, 'for us; who knew no sin;' or, in the words of Isaiah, 'he was numbered with transgressors,' and put to death as 'a malefactor.' He is also said to be 'made a curse for us;' but as he never sinned, so neither was he ever cursed by God. The word is explained in the next clause: 'for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth upon a tree.'—The first phrase means only, that he was condemned, though innocent; and the second, that he was crucified. To *justify*, then, signifies to pardon; and *to make sinners*, signifies to condemn. In like manner, to make righteous, is to justify or pardon; and righteousness and justification are often synonymous. In Hebrew, the simple word means, to be a sinner; in another form of the verb, to make one a sinner; and it is so translated throughout the Old Testament; thus:—'whom the judges shall condemn,' literally, *make a sinner*. 'If I justify myself, my own mouth will condemn me;' or, *make me a sinner*. 'Wilt thou condemn him that is most just?' literally, *make him a sinner*. Thus too, in the passage before us; 'by the offence of one, many were made sinners;' that is, by the transgression of Adam, many

were condemned to be subject to death." —Pp. 194, 195.

The two Sermons, XI. and XII., "On Atonement," have our almost unqualified approbation. We know not where the argument against the popular doctrine and for the "free grace" of God is so well stated in such a small compass. With little alteration, they would form a most valuable tract (and we trust we shall not alarm any of our readers in the sister country by saying this) for our Unitarian Book Societies.

What will the Archbishop of Dublin (if, indeed, he condescends to take notice of Irish heresy) say to Dr. Bruce's opening position, "that the mode of Christ's death was an important part of his ministry, but from his own words we may conclude, that it might have been dispensed with by his Father, without defeating the end of his coming into the world?" (P. 212.)

After laying before his hearers the usual exposition given by liberal divines of the terms and phrases which are forced into the proof of the popular doctrine, our preacher proceeds to point out some important moral distinctions that are overlooked by the advocates of a literal atonement by blood:

"It is necessary to point out those (*these*) diversities of signification, to guard you against being misled by popular misinterpretations; for on some of the senses, in which these words are taken, have been chiefly erected the doctrines of imputed righteousness and vicarious punishment. As divines have plunged mankind into such an abyss of degradation and misery, by the imputation of Adam's guilt, it was but reasonable and equitable, that they should make them sharers in the merits of Christ: and as mercy is entirely banished from their scheme, and they deny to the Almighty the privilege of free grace, or a gratuitous forgiveness of sins, they were also obliged to lay the guilt of our sins upon our blessed Lord, that he might atone for them. But guilt and punishment, transgression and reward, are always personal. No man can partake in the guilt of another, except he be also a sharer in his crime; no man can be punished or rewarded for the merit or demerit of another. A father may suffer by the extravagance and depravity of his son, and a son by the misconduct of his father; but cannot be punished for it. Subjects may suffer by



the vices of kings, and we all may suffer by the transgression of Adam; but his *guilt* is never said in Scripture to be imputed to his posterity. Punishment and suffering imply very different ideas. Punishment is suffering, but suffering is not always punishment: for punishment supposes guilt. Christ may have *suffered* on our account, but could not be *punished*, because 'in him was no sin.'—Pp. 216, 217.

We agree, and unless we lay aside both our reason and our feelings cannot help agreeing, with Dr. Bruce in his elementary principle of true Christian theology:

"In the first place, we may be assured, that no true doctrine can impeach the Divine moral character; and that no principle, which casts an imputation on the Divine character, can be true; for there is nothing of which we can be more certain, than the purity, equity and benignity of our heavenly Father. This conviction results from the exercise of all those rational powers, and moral principles, with which he has endowed our nature; from the authentic declarations of his prophets, and from the fact of our redemption by his Son; which we all acknowledge to be a dispensation of free grace. This conviction we should ever hold fast; nor ever suffer it to be shaken by any speculations. It is the fountain of all our hopes, and the ground of our own moral character. Without this, there would be no faith, hope, nor charity; no purity, truth, nor brotherly love. Without this, we could not love God. This conviction we should especially keep in mind, while treating of what is called the atonement; for it has been the source of the grossest calumnies against the Most High."—Pp. 228, 229.

The preacher is very successful in pointing out the contradictions in the scheme of atonement as commonly received, on the vainly alleged authority of scripture. The following passage reminds us of some of the pithy arguments of the late Rev. Henry Taylor in his learned and, in many respects, invaluable work, "Ben Mordecai's Apology," a work to which Dr. Bruce refers, and which he probably consulted, and with evident propriety, on most of the subjects of his Lectures:

"In short, the whole scheme is full of injustice and inconsistency. If the guilt of our sins were literally laid on Christ, he could not be a Lamb, without spot and blameless:—if not, he could not be

justly punished for them. If the death of Christ be literally a payment of our debt, it cannot be literally a ransom from captivity; nor does God exercise free grace in forgiving us:—if it be a ransom, it cannot be a punishment; if a punishment, it is no ransom, nor sacrifice: if a sacrifice according to the Mosaic law, it is neither the payment of a debt, nor a ransom, nor a punishment, nor a substitution: if it be a sin offering, it is no peace offering; if a peace offering, it is not a sin offering; if it be a sacrifice, it is not a passover; if a passover, no sacrifice. Finally, if our sins be forgiven freely, there can be no literal payment, nor ransom, nor punishment, nor sacrifice, nor vicarious suffering; otherwise, what becomes of free grace? These are all figurative expressions, intended for explanation: but instead of explanation, we employ them for confusion; and instead of relying on the plain and positive assertions of Christ and his apostles, we convert similes into arguments, free grace into unjust exaction, and divine, gratuitous mercy, into cruel and tyrannical punishment."—Pp. 235, 236.

With a severity, which is not usual with him, the preacher reprobates the "detestable opinion" of certain "profligate" fanatics. "There are at this day, and in these countries," (he says, p. 244,) a multitude of wretched and ignorant enthusiasts, whose pernicious fanaticism engages them to delight in the prevalence of vice." He expresses himself even more bitterly. He may allude to some sect of Antinomians peculiar to Ireland, of whose tenets and conduct we have no knowledge; but if he has in view merely Ultra-Calvinists, such as we see them in England, we think the description is exaggerated and the censure uncharitable. We have known many who have carried their Calvinistic theory to an extreme that has alarmed us, who yet would have been the ornament and boast of any faith, not excepting the purest, on account of the excellence of their temper and the purity and usefulness of their lives.\*

\* One of these we remember in particular, who was fond of speaking disparagingly of good works, and never hesitated to avow that he looked upon the great mass of mankind as the non-elect, doomed by an eternal decree to damnation, who yet made use of his creed as an argument for charity. "Poor things!" he would say, on shewing kindness to the

"Universal Redemption and Future Punishment" are rather oddly the title of Ser. XIII. The reader is prepared to learn that Dr. Bruce adopts the Arminian side of the question concerning the design and efficacy of the death of Christ. By "universal redemption" he is far from meaning universal salvation: nay, he says in the next sermon, (p. 289,) that it is not quite clear nor absolutely necessary for us to understand "in what sense Christ's dying for all men is to be understood; how far his salvation will affect those who died before his manifestation, and those who, in these latter days, have never heard the name of Christ." Some Calvinists have gone further than this; witness Dr. Watts in his younger and more "orthodox" days.

With regard to "future punishment" the preacher rejects at once the doctrine of endless torments, but he is equally peremptory in denying the restoration of the wicked. The object of punishments, in the world to come, he asserts, (p. 264,) is not "amendment and reformation, *for* this is our only state of probation." Is not this a mere *petitio principii*? The whole question is, whether the future sufferings of the wicked will be corrective or vindictive. Dr. Bruce allows that the terms *ever*, *for ever*, &c., bear a limited meaning; that limitation, in reference to future punishments, being the duration of the existence of the subjects of them. His scheme, then, is that of destruction, "lasting misery, followed by extinction of being:" "the sinner is never to be restored to favour, but must spend his whole existence in misery, and terminate his sufferings only by *annihilation*:" and "the execution of this dreadful sentence (he says) may even operate as an *edifying example* and a *vindication of Divine holiness and justice*" (p. 271). Now when it is considered how large a proportion of mankind, even in Christian countries, must on every plan of moral computation be reckoned sinners,—that, according to the preacher, the miserable fate of all unbelievers is certain,—and that it is doubtful what will become of the myriads that lived

---

unregenerate, "we must make them as happy as we can here, for they will be miserable enough hereafter!"

before Christ, and the myriads that since his advent have lived and died in ignorance of his very name;—what a prospect have we before us! Is Christianity indeed good news? Is not, on the contrary, the peculiar revelation of Christianity, the resurrection of all the dead, a tremendous threatening, of power sufficient to blight the heart of every believer with a curse?

Differing on this point *toto cælo* from the preacher, we should argue that under a wise, not to say benignant, government, even upon earth, the object of punishment must be the melioration of the punished. To punish one being for the sake of "an edifying example" to others, is liable to some of the strongest objections which Dr. Bruce himself brings against the notion of vicarious sufferings. And vindictive punishment is the act of a being swayed by passion rather than reason, or of one who is conscious of want of power to effect his object, the changing of the offender, by any other means, or of one who delights in misery for its own sake.

The raising of the dead to life, in order to torment them in various degrees and for various periods, with a view to their ultimate annihilation, would be a miracle of vengeance! And it is, we confess, as little reconcilable to our view of the character of the Supreme FATHER, as the gross and barbarous doctrine of endless misery.

After the many remarks that we have made upon these Sermons, there is but little in the XIVth and last, "On the Necessity of Redemption," that calls for our strictures. The position implied in this title is not closely argued: we question if the discourse would make any impression upon an intelligent unbeliever. Dr. Bruce here attributes explicitly the creation of the natural world to Christ, and ascribes to him, without one word of explanation, the power of *raising himself from the dead*! (P. 288.) He maintains, indeed, the supremacy of the Father, (and so in a metaphysical sense do Bull and Waterland,) but in the following passage, which is scarcely consistent with the admission, before pointed out, of the possibility of man's salvation without Christ's death, Christ is represented as being in rela-

tion to us all that we hold to be implied in the name and character of God.

“It is possible, that without the voluntary interposition of the Son of God, this world would have been lost; and that it would not have been consistent with the inscrutable counsels of Divine Wisdom, with the essential attributes of the Divine nature, with the relations in which we may stand to the rest of God's spiritual creation, and with the effect to be produced throughout the various classes of intelligence, that it should have been saved and restored to immortality, without this magnanimous humiliation, this heroic condescension of that exalted Spirit.”—P. 289.

Freely as we have animadverted upon these Sermons, we cannot drop this Review without expressing our respect for the author, and our hope that his volume will attract public attention, and particularly in Ireland. We are not wicked, we hope; but we confess that we should like to see Dr. Bruce called out into the field of controversy by the “orthodox” of his own “island of saints.” Theological warfare is necessary to make logical, critical and, in the true sense, *sound* divines; and nothing but this appears to us to be wanted to rouse the Protestants and Presbyterians of Ireland from the apathy, which, with regard to political as well as religious questions, has, with some fitful exceptions in the former point of view, prevailed in that country, and proved its bane.

ART. III.—*A Letter addressed to the King, by Thomas Thrush, on Resigning his Commission as a Captain in the Royal Navy, on the Ground of the Unlawfulness of War.* 8vo. pp. 32. Harding. 1825.

**T**HIS is in every point of view an interesting letter. The writer is actuated by pure Christian motives, and proves his sincerity by making large sacrifices for the sake of conscience. We enter not into his argument against all war, as well defensive as offensive, grounded upon the prophecies of the Old Testament and the precepts of the New; our object being merely to exhibit to our readers this singular case of Christian integrity. The writer is known to our readers as an able advocate for Unitarianism; and we may be permitted to add that

his conduct in resigning his popular and gainful profession gives weight to his declaration of faith in a reformed system of Christianity. His Letter is as respectful to the High Personage to whom it is addressed as the rules of courtesy can be conceived to require. He thus relates his conversion to a *pacific* creed:

“With much zeal and sincerity I entered into the Naval Service of your Majesty's revered father, and swore allegiance to him. This allegiance is now, of course, due to your Majesty as his lawful successor. When I entered into this solemn contract, I entertained no apprehension that I was acting in opposition to the principles of the Christian religion; nor did any apprehension of this kind ever arise in my mind during the time I was actively employed in the service of my country. Nay, so far from suspecting that I was departing from Christian rectitude, it appeared to me almost certain, if I should lose my life in the service of my king and my country, that this would serve as a kind of passport to the favour and acceptance of God. This opinion, which has been frequently inculcated by ministers of the Gospel of Peace, as well as by Pagan writers, is, I believe, generally entertained by those who think at all when they enter the naval or military profession.

“Those, Sire, who live much in the world are imperceptibly led to think, and act, upon the principles of those with whom they associate. Though, in the busy scenes of naval service, I never entertained an idea of my profession being irreconcilable with the religion of Christ; yet, after passing several years in a retirement bordering on seclusion; and after more closely inspecting the Christian precepts, and reviewing my past life, it appears to me that while I have been serving my king and my country, if not brilliantly, yet faithfully, I have been acting in open disobedience to the plain and positive commands of another and a superior Master,—a Master whose claims upon my allegiance are prior, and paramount, to those of your Majesty, or of any earthly sovereign.”—Pp. 7, 8.

“When the first impressions, Sire, were formed in my mind concerning the unlawfulness of Christians entering into or remaining in the military profession, I cannot exactly recollect. To my shame, I may, I believe, say that I never thought seriously on the subject till within the last four years. Whenever I heard feelings of disapprobation expressed concerning war, I was led to regard them, as Bishop Horsley did, as a species of puri-



tanical cant ; so fully was I satisfied that war, and consequently my profession, was perfectly consonant with the precepts of Christianity. About the time I have mentioned, owing to circumstances which I need not state, I began to entertain doubts on this subject. These doubts gradually gained strength ; and early in the year 1822 I came to the resolution to investigate the subject more closely than I had hitherto done ; and if, after such investigation, it should appear to me that my profession was irreconcilable with the precepts of Christ, I determined to resign my naval rank and half-pay, although I placed a high value upon the former, and the latter forms a large portion of a very limited income ; and I was thereby subjecting myself, and not myself alone, to a very considerable change in my mode of living, and this at an advanced period of life, when its comforts and conveniences are most wanted.

"To take a step so highly important to me in many points of view, but particularly in a religious one, upon the first impression of my mind, would have been highly improper ; for even the best informed persons frequently change their opinions, and see the same transaction in different points of view at different periods of time. From the very novel nature of the act I contemplated, I thought it possible that this might happen to myself ; and that, in my ardour to do what I deemed an act of religious duty, I might hastily take a step of which I might hereafter see just cause to repent, and when repentance could not avail me. I was also aware, that what I proposed doing, being so much at variance with established custom, might be attributed to vanity, or an affectation of singularity—motives by which, as far as I know myself, I have never been greatly influenced. Added to these considerations, I felt much difficulty as to the manner in which I should withdraw myself from my profession. It appeared to me, (though it may savour of vanity thus to express myself,) that the measure I contemplated was one of very great importance both in a political and religious point of view.

"Under these perplexing circumstances, I came to the resolution to retain my half-pay three years longer, should my life be so long spared, and to dedicate that time to serious inquiry on a subject constantly pressing upon my mind. This delay I considered as likely to cure me of any false notions that either ignorance, fanaticism, or vanity might generate. It has, Sire, pleased the Divine Disposer of events to grant me these years ; and I hope they have not been passed unprofitably. After every inquiry and consi-

deration on one of the most important subjects that can occupy the human mind, as far as my abilities and opportunities have enabled me, and after frequent and earnest prayer to that Being who alone has power over the minds of men, that I might do nothing dishonourable to Christianity nor injurious to society, I have seen no reason to regret the resolution I then formed. Some may blame me, and with seeming justice, for taking so long a time for consideration, on what I now speak of as so very clear a point. I do not, however, regret this delay, as it has effectually convinced me that I have acted not only from pure motives, but also on correct principles ; and I feel the fullest confidence that I shall never repent of the step that conscience has dictated. This delay has also enabled me to correct the false views I have entertained till within the last twelve months concerning what is called *defensive war*. On this subject I have, indeed, changed my opinions."—Pp. 24—26.

Mr. (for we may no longer say *Captain*) Thrush shews the justness of his principle that a man cannot "be at the same time a faithful follower of Christ and a warrior by profession," by referring to the case of the two military officers who were lately degraded by the sentence of a court martial at Malta, for refusing to obey an order to pay military honours to a Roman Catholic procession in that island.

"The moment a man sells himself to his sovereign, or to his country, for the purpose of human destruction, he loses *caste* (if I may be allowed the expression) as a Christian. He forfeits that liberty, that freedom to think, to speak, and to act, on moral and religious principles, which, as a Christian, it is his privilege, as well as his duty, to maintain.

"If a subject may be permitted to make the remark, your Majesty appears to entertain opinions similar to these. In confirming the sentence of a Court Martial held on a foreign station on two officers for disobedience of orders, your Majesty most justly observes, that "IF RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLES WERE ALLOWED TO BE URGED BY INDIVIDUAL OFFICERS AS A PLEA FOR DISOBEDIENCE OF ORDERS, THE DISCIPLINE OF THE ARMY WOULD SUSTAIN AN INJURY WHICH MIGHT BE DANGEROUS TO THE STATE.' Surely, Sire, this is equivalent to saying that men who are imbued with RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLES, or Christians, are unfit for the military service. Of the justice of your Majesty's remark, or of

the equity of the sentence of the Court, no one conversant in military discipline can entertain a doubt. Thinking men, who believe that their professional duty interferes with their duty to God, ought not to halt between two opinions."—Pp. 9, 10.

We have room for only another passage on the political consequences of the predicted universal diffusion of the gospel, in its moral spirit and power :

"When Christians, Sire, shall subdue the anti-christian spirit of ambition, of resistance, and revenge,—or, in the words of St. James, those *lusts* from whence wars arise,—and, instead of emulating

the heroes of antiquity, to which the present course of education propels them, they shall take Jesus Christ for their pattern :—when, like him, men shall think it more honourable to submit with patience to a blow, than to return it with interest :—when men shall prefer the approbation of God, to the admiration of their fellow-men ; or, in a word, when they become Christians :—then 'will they beat their swords into ploughshares ;' and 'nation will not rise up against nation, neither will they learn war any more.' This, Sire, is the language of prophecy ; and in the application of it, and of the precepts of Jesus, I trust that '*I have spoken forth the words of truth and soberness.*'"—P. 30.

## POETRY.

### STANZAS OCCASIONED BY THE EXECUTION OF GENERAL RIEGO.

Ungrateful Spain ! Riego's gone—  
Can lives like his be given in vain ?  
Was it for nought thy gallant son,  
The last of Spaniards, \* died for Spain ?—  
Go, hail, before yon iron throne,  
The *royal traitor's* abject reign—  
Forget, forgive, a realm undone,  
The stranger's sword, the vassal's chain !

But no, wrong'd land ! it cannot be—  
Thou wert not made the clime for slaves :  
Thou yet hast sons who feel for thee,  
Whom the yoke bows, but not depraves.  
The stranger's eye from far may see  
There sleeps a storm on Spanish waves :  
The lordly race will yet be free,  
Or proudly rest in freemen's graves.

What though along their lovely land  
The venal Gaul his steed has driven,  
To bind again with ruthless hand  
Her chains, for one bright moment riven ?  
Her gray Sierras still command  
A thousand scenes to glory given,  
Where Freedom's flag will yet be fanned  
By all the winds of smiling heaven !

Riego's gone—and Spain once more  
Obeys a princely reptile's nod,  
Who claims (the tyrant's *only* lore)  
The right to wrong the world of God :—  
A meaner miscreant ne'er before  
On God's free world to scourge it trod :  
Alas, that *such* have power to pour  
The blood that stains a despot's rod !

\* It was, I believe, C. Cassius, who was called *Ultimus Romanorum*.

As die the brave, Riego died—  
 With freedom's martyrs lives his name;—  
 But, oh! that, stretched in martial pride,  
 His corse had grac'd the field of fame!  
 Yet Russell's nerve the scaffold tried,  
 And Wallace met the tree of shame:—  
 Round each dark spot where freedom sighed,  
 Such memories twine a sword of flame.

Riego's sword is broke—but not  
 Lost is his glory, near or far;  
 His fame shall yet be unforgot  
 In future fields of happier war:—  
 In the freed peasant's peaceful cot  
 His praise shall wake the sweet guitar  
 While Bourbon's name his gore shall blot,  
 His own shall shine—his country's star!

And thou, his land!—thy Pyrenees,  
 Were they not pil'd to fence the *free*?  
 Still wilt thou drain the bitter lees  
 Of woes and wrongs for years to be?—  
 Rise in thy might—arise, and seize  
 The birthright long withheld from thee;  
 And sound, in every Spanish breeze,  
 The dirge of buried Slavery!

*Crediton.*

#### HYMN OF MARY MAGDALENE.

These lines are founded on the supposition, that, previously to her acquaintance with our Lord, Mary Magdalene had been an *erring* woman. They contain only allusions to the Jewish Scriptures, with which she might have been familiar, and to the discourses of our Lord, many of which she had heard.

GLORIOUS Father! lo, before Thee  
 Bends an erring child of clay;  
 Humbly there she dares implore Thee,  
 That her feet no more may stray:  
 Hear in pity, Lord of Nature!  
 Since our frailty Thou dost know;  
 Lead, oh lead, Thy pardoned creature  
 Where redemption's fountains flow!

O'er\* my soul and all her errors  
 Pitying stretch Thy golden rod,  
 Shew Thy power without its terrors,  
 Call the suppliant to her God:  
 Bid the tardy gleaner gather  
 In the living field of heaven;  
 Let the prodigal a Father  
 Find in Thee—the past forgiven!

Never more shall sin's dominion  
 Then enthrall this ransom'd breast;  
 Heavenly hope shall spread her pinion,  
 Earthly passion sink to rest:—

\* These four lines are allusive to the appearance of Esther in the presence of Ahasuerus.



Never more in pleasures idle  
 Shall my spirit's lamp decay,  
 But to Christ's eternal bridal  
 Light my steps and cheer my way !

*Crediton.*

POETICAL VERSION OF A PASSAGE FROM MILTON'S PROSE.

COME, therefore, Thou who holdest the seven stars  
 In Thy right hand, appoint Thy chosen priests,  
 As order'd and appointed in old time,  
 To minister to Thee, and duly dress  
 And pour the consecrated oil for aye  
 Into thy holy, ever-burning lamps.  
 Thou hast sent out the spirit of deep prayer  
 Upon thy servants over all the earth  
 To this great end, and stirred their hallow'd vows,  
 Like sound of many waters, round Thy throne.  
 Now may each say, Lord ! Thou hast visited  
 This land—the utmost corners of the earth  
 Hast not forgotten, tho' mankind had thought  
 That Thou hadst left us for the verge of heaven,  
 The extremest verge, and hadst abandoned all  
 Thy marvellous works among the later sons  
 Of this our age. But, Lord ! accomplish now,  
 And perfect Thy all-glorious deeds. Men leave  
 Their works unfinish'd ; but Thou art a God,  
 Thy nature is perfection—seasons, times,  
 Roll at Thy feet, and at Thy bidding come,  
 And at Thy bidding go. Our fathers' days  
 With many revelations Thou, O Lord,  
 Didst dignify above the days of old ;  
 So now to us, unworthy, even to us,  
 Thou canst vouchsafe a portion of Thyself  
 And Thy own Spirit. Who shall prejudice  
 Thy all-directing will ? Thy power and grace  
 Departed not with the primeval times,  
 (However fond and faithless men may deem,)  
 Thy kingdom is at hand, even now, and Thou  
 Art standing at the door. Come forth, come forth,  
 Out of Thy royal chambers, Prince of kings,  
 Of all the kings of earth. Put on the robes,  
 The visible robes of highest majesty  
 Imperial. Take Thy glorious sceptre now ;  
 The earth is waiting, and creation sighs  
 To be renewed.

A.

OBITUARY.

1825. March 26, Mr. THOMAS BIGGIN GASKELL, aged 28, at the house of his father, Roger Gaskell, Esq., of *Warrington*. This excellent young man inherited from his mother a pulmonary complaint, and although deprived of the benefit of her valuable instructions, as she died when he was only nine months old, his mind was a transcript of his amiable and pious mother's. His constitution received a cruel

shock, about a year ago, which considerably impaired his health. He appeared, however, gradually to recover ; and in November he removed to Glasgow in order to attend some of the College Lectures, having passed a session there in the winter of 1820. It is presumed the climate of Scotland was too bleak for his delicate frame. He took a severe cold soon after he was settled in Glasgow,

which produced a cough and hoarseness. These continued, with occasional remissions, until he determined to return to his native air. He arrived at Warrington on Sunday, March 13, when his friends were most painfully confirmed in the alarming apprehension that he was approaching the last stage of a consumption, by the heart-rending opinion of the physicians who were consulted. The ravages of his disease proceeded with a rapidity scarcely paralleled, which baffled all medical aid and the tenderest assiduities of friends. Thus, in the flower of youth, was he cut off. "His sun has set while it was yet day." The life of this most amiable young man offers but little to catch the public eye: he was of a retired disposition, and loved not to obtrude himself upon general notice. But his death, to those who knew him, to an affectionate father, a numerous train of relatives, and an extensive circle of friends, is a subject of the most agonizing grief and poignant sorrow. Integrity most inflexible, generosity most disinterested, philanthropy most universal, and piety most sincere and fervent, formed the most distinguished features in his character. His love of peace and the diffusion of happiness prompted him to soften asperities of temper and to perform unbounded acts of kindness. Although indisposition much impeded his studies, his mind was well stored with knowledge; and at one period of his life he was inclined to devote himself to the Christian ministry. In the Unitarian congregation at Warrington he was an active, valuable and zealous member, and it always afforded him a pious pleasure to hear of the successful spread of genuine, unadulterated Christianity. It has been justly observed, by persons but little acquainted with him, that his countenance was a perfect index of his heart; it beamed, on all occasions, with a glow of benevolence. During his short confinement he received his friends with his accustomed smile of serenity and delight, and the grateful expressions of acknowledgment of the soothing attentions of friends ministering to his comfort, though uttered in the feebleness of extreme debility, arose from a heart overflowing with the sincerest gratitude, and glowing with the tenderest love and friendship. As was his life, so was his death—not a murmur escaped from his lips; and he breathed his last sigh with as much composure and quiet as if he had been falling asleep. In the removal of such a character as this, in the midst of usefulness, the light of nature offers not a ray of consolation or of hope to cheer and enlighten the darkness and gloom of the grave. Mysterious indeed it does appear.

But, as this excellent youth lately remarked, on an awfully sudden bereavement of a near relative, "all is wise and right." The Christian revelation dispels every doubt and dissipates every fear. In God's all-wise designs nothing premature, nothing fortuitous can ever occur. Under this delightful, this animating assurance, survivors have only to follow the example which their lamented young friend has exhibited for their imitation, and to wait with pious confidence for the blissful period when they and he will be reunited in brighter worlds, and in scenes and circumstances which will not again be beclouded or disturbed by death.

H. G.

"At Stockton-upon-Tees, on the 31st ult., (March,) Mr. JAMES CROWE, merchant, aged 69 years, a member of the Unitarian congregation of that place. His piety was genuine and sincere, uncontaminated by moroseness or bigotry. His attachment to the Dissenting interest was candid and liberal, embracing universal charity. In private life he exhibited a most amiable character, as an affectionate relation, kind master, and sincere friend. In business he evinced the strictest honour and integrity, and his whole conduct was an eminent example of the practical effects of the religion he professed."—*Durham Chronicle*, April 9.

This is a strong but not overcharged or indiscriminating portrait of a character, whose removal from the sphere of virtuous exertion in the present state, has occasioned a chasm in the circle of his relatives and friends not easily to be supplied. In the particular incidents of the life of this excellent individual there is little to call for a detailed notice; its uniform and consistent tenor formed its crowning ornament. His sphere of action was comparatively limited, but if, to have lived less for himself than for others, to have declined no exertion of body or mind which might subserve the interests of his friends, his neighbourhood, his country, or his religion; to have fearlessly encountered obloquy and suspicion by the assertion of unpopular principles in difficult times, can stamp the character of public spiritedness, few have more nobly merited the title of a "public man" than the deceased; few have better deserved to be held up as an example of the benign influence of unsophisticated Christianity upon man as a social being, at once enlarging his views and awakening and directing his sympathies for the benefit of his fellow-men.

Mr. Crowe was, on his mother's side, descended from the family of Cooke, one of the oldest and most respectable in

Stockton, and from which, being of the Established Church, the office of mayor of the borough had not unfrequently been filled. His father was a leading member of the congregation of Protestant Dissenters, the services of which were, for many years, conducted upon a neutral principle, including various shades of religious sentiment. The subject of the present obituary does not appear to have embraced any very decided theological opinions until the accession of the Rev. B. Evans to the ministry in that place, whose ingenuous avowal of the principles of Unitarian Christianity, whilst it offended the prejudices of several of the weaker brethren, contributed to settle and establish a consistent, rational faith in some of the more enlightened. From this time Mr. Crowe continued in the steady and fearless profession of a creed "every where spoken against." In the last attempt made by the Dissenters to obtain the repeal of the Test and Corporation laws, he acted as one of a meeting of deputies at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and Mr. Pitt's treatment of their claims finally dissolved the warm attachment which Mr. Crowe had felt towards him upon his first entrance into political life. In relation to this great question, Mr. Crowe never experienced that apathy which has so extensively circulated amongst Protestant Dissenters, and he therefore hailed the recent symptoms of a disposition to sleep no longer under the operation of proscriptive and stigmatizing enactments. Though his property and the influence of his character qualified him to take the same lead as his ancestors in the civil affairs of his native town, the existence of that profanation, called the sacramental test, effectually precluded his offering himself as a candidate for the office of mayor, whilst it was not unfrequently filled by persons whose qualifications were nominal in every point of view. Thus, upon a small scale, we see exemplified the baneful operation of intolerant laws in excluding from opportunities of social usefulness men whose talents and public spirit would otherwise have ensured to them the suffrages of their fellow-citizens. The cause of the Abolition of the African Slave-Trade found in Mr. Crowe an early and an active partisan. His zeal and exertions on this subject are amongst the earliest and most salutary recollections of the present writer.

The dawns of liberty in France were hailed by the deceased with that enthusiasm experienced by every warm friend to the interests of his species; and his sympathy, with the cruel persecutions which Priestley, Winterbotham, Palmer, and other excellent men underwent, during the reign of anti-jacobinism, was

cordial and sincere, and, as might have been expected, rendered him for a time an object of suspicion, if not of dislike, amongst his ultra-loyal neighbours.

An incident which occurred about this time may illustrate the manner in which political feeling intercepted the ordinary courtesies of life towards those whom the soi-disant friends of government chose to brand with disaffection. The workmen employed by Mr. Crowe, in pulling down an old house, discovered in a chimney, a bag containing nearly £100 in old English coins; the occurrence was soon reported to the Bishop of Durham, by whom the money was claimed in the character of the Lord of the Manor, as *treasure-trove*. With the exception of some few pieces, which Mr. Crowe, in ignorance of the bishop's rights, had previously distributed to friends as curiosities, and which he offered to reclaim, the whole contents of the bag were immediately transmitted to the bishop, whose wonted munificence was, however, on this occasion, restrained to a dispensation with the offer to reclaim—not extending to the return of a single coin for Mr. Crowe's own use.

It was not assigned to the deceased to sustain the parental relation in its natural sense, but it pleased Providence to call forth his exemplary prudence and his affectionate counsels for the benefit of many who yet live to bless his memory, not only as the faithful guardian of their temporal interests, but as the main source and spring (under the Divine blessing) of every thing estimable and honourable in their character and principles. Such was his striking regard to justice, and his zeal in whatever he undertook, that he was very frequently placed in situations of trust, and on one occasion, was unexpectedly appointed an executor of the will of a gentleman of large property, whose only previous connexion with him arose out of a matter of arbitration in which Mr. Crowe had decided in favour of the opposite party. Indeed most truly descriptive of the predominant habit of his mind are the lines of Virgil,

"Justissimus unus  
Qui fuit in Teucris et servantissimus  
æqui."

To his continued zeal and attention the present small but improving society of Unitarian Dissenters in Stockton, is, in a great measure, indebted for its existence. Under very difficult circumstances, in many respects resembling those in which the Wolverhampton congregation has long been placed, the Stockton Unitarians were for a time compelled to make use of a large room, in which Mr. Evans, after a long secession from the



services of the pulpit, regularly officiated in the morning, and Mr. Crowe conducted the devotions of the afternoon, reading, generally, some well-selected discourse. And here, it should not be forgotten, how animating and beneficial have been the effects of that association, however imperfect, which has resulted from the establishment of the Unitarian Fund. It is not too much to say, that in circumstances like those above referred to, something of despondency must have paralyzed the insulated efforts of the most zealous and enlightened friends of truth; but by means of the occasional visits of missionaries, and the opportunities of contact and extended sympathy which the anniversary meetings supply, the smallest country societies are upheld and bound together, however discouraging their local circumstances may be. The deceased had ultimately the gratification to see his fellow-worshippers restored to their accustomed meeting-house, and under more promising auspices than before their expulsion. To promote the success of their little institutions was the leading gratification of his latter years; to hear of their proceedings was the most pleasing solace of a tedious illness; and almost his last thoughts, indistinctly articulated, appeared to have reference to the proper arrangement of a Sunday-school recently established amongst them. A few days before his death the Lord's supper was, at his request, administered to him and several members of the family, by the Rev. Mr. Meeke, in attending to whom the expiring energies of his nature were for the last time exerted. His funeral was numerously attended by his townsmen, whose respect was as marked as it was merited. The Rev. Mr. Wellbeloved, of York, most kindly accepted an invitation to conduct the services of the chapel on the ensuing Sunday morning, and delivered a very acceptable and consolatory discourse from 2 Cor. i. 3, 4, to a numerous auditory, and has since added to the obligation of the deceased's friends by allowing them to print a few copies for distribution, as the most grateful memorial of this solemn occasion. R.

April 20, at *Poole*, of hydrocephalus, aged 12 years, WILLIAM OLIVE NAISH, only child of Mr. Thomas Naish. He was interred in the ground belonging to the Unitarian chapel in this town.

May 8, MRS. HORSEY, wife of the Rev. John Horsey, of *Northampton*.

— 11, in the twentieth year of his age, after an illness of between three and

four months, JOHN HARDY, second son of Thomas Hardy, Esq., *Walworth*. This excellent young man had made attainments, both intellectual and moral, which seemed to promise a career highly honourable to himself and extensively useful to others. He had strengthened his mind by application to the severer sciences, but his delight was to exercise it, and it was exercised successfully, on the great truths of divine revelation. He was a practical illustration of the connexion of those simple and rational views of scripture doctrine which were the object of his firmest faith, with deep and fervent piety, with moral purity, and with all the best affections and noblest charities. He also experienced, to the fullest extent, their consolatory power under the pressure of disease, and in the agonies of death. Although the hope that such principles and acquirements would have adorned life is thus prematurely blighted, there is yet the soothing conviction that they destroyed the sting of death. He has fallen asleep in Jesus. May his example influence the young, leading them "to know the God of their fathers, and serve him with a perfect heart and with a willing mind," and strengthen his deeply-afflicted parents and relatives to say, Father, not our will, but thine be done!

F.

Lately, the Rev. PETER ELMSLEY, the celebrated Greek scholar. He was born in 1773, and educated first at a school at Hampstead and afterwards at Westminster. His extraordinary proficiency in classical learning caused him to be placed in the sixth or highest form at this seminary; but he was precluded by his age from becoming a member of the foundation. He went, therefore, on his own resources, to Oxford, where, without any of its rewards or emoluments, he obtained a reputation for deep and extensive learning which no under graduate had for many years obtained. He took orders soon after leaving the University, and proceeding M. A. in 1797, was presented, in 1798, by W. J. H. Blair, Esq., to little Horkeley, a small chapelry in Essex, which he retained to his death; but the whole emoluments of which, after ceasing to reside there, he bestowed on his curate. He never held any other preferment in the church. By the death of his uncle, Mr. Peter Elmsley, the well-known bookseller, he shortly after inherited an independent fortune, which left him at liberty to devote his mind to those literary researches which were its resource and delight, especially to Greek philology, which he soon chose

as his favourite province. He resided for some time at Edinburgh, and became intimately acquainted with the distinguished young men who set on foot the Edinburgh Review in 1802. To this publication he contributed several articles on Greek literature: the Critique on Heyne's Homer in the 4th No, on Schweighauser's Athenæus in the 5th, on Bloomfield's Prometheus in the 35th, and on Porson's Hecuba in the 37th. In the Quarterly Review he wrote, among other articles, that on Markland's Supplices. The only instance (it is believed) of his taking up his pen for a political purpose, was in a Critique on Lord Clarendon's Religion and Policy in the 38th Number of the Edinburgh Review. His more ostensible contributions to classical literature are well known: an edition of the Acharnanes in 1809; of the Œdipus Tyrannus in 1811; of the Heraclidæ in 1815; of the Medea in 1818; of the Bacchæ in 1821; and lastly, of the Œdipus Coloneus in 1823. For the sake of collating MSS. he visited France and Italy several times, and spent the entire winter of 1818, in the Laurentian Library of Florence. In 1819 he accepted of a sort of commission from our government jointly with Sir Humphrey Davy, to superintend the developement of the papyri found at Herculaneum. The experiment, as is well known, proved abortive, and Mr. Emsley returned to England in 1820, his constitution impaired by a fever with which he was seized at Turin. Henceforward he lived principally at Oxford: he took the degree of D. D., became

Principal of Alban Hall and Camden Professor of History in 1823, and was justly expected to succeed on the next vacancy of a canonry of Christ Church. His astonishing comprehensiveness and exactitude of learning was united to a sound and clear judgment and an habitual impartiality. Averse to all that wore the appearance of passion, or even of as much zeal as men of less phlegmatic temperaments cannot but mingle with their opinions, he was generally inclined to a middle course in speculation as well as practice, and looked with philosophic tranquillity on the contending factions, religious or political, whom history displayed to him, or whom he witnessed in his own age. If he spoke with asperity or marked contempt of any, it was of hotheaded and bigoted partisans, whose presumptuous ignorance is so often united with disingenuous sophistry. These were frequently the objects of a vein of pleasantry, wherein he particularly excelled. In the quick perception of the ludicrous, and in fondness for comedies and other light reading, as well as in his erudition and sagacity, he bore a resemblance to Porson. His life was uniformly regular, and his conversation, though free from solemnity, was strictly correct. His last months called forth the qualities which support and dignify the hours of sorrow and suffering: a steady fortitude that uttered no complaint and betrayed no infirmity; with a calm and pious resignation, in that spirit of Christian philosophy he had always cultivated, to the pleasure of his Creator. (*Gent. Mag.*)

## INTELLIGENCE.

### DOMESTIC.

#### RELIGIOUS.

#### *Somerset and Dorset Unitarian Association.*

THE half-yearly Meeting of this Association, was held at Honiton on Thursday, April 14th, 1825. The chapel of the Rev. Mr. Hughes was opened for divine service twice in the day. In the morning, the Revds. Acton and Wright performed the devotional parts, and Dr. Davies preached a very interesting discourse from John xvii. 3. Its defence of Unitarian principles, and its truly Christian spirit, gratified all who heard it. In the evening the Rev. Mr. Smethurst introduced the service, and the Rev. H. Clarke, of Frenchay, gave a sermon in his usual extemporaneous manner, which possessed great merit, and was heard with deep attention.

The business of the day was more than usually interesting. Several members of the Society, and the committee in particular, have been anxious to extend its usefulness by the introduction of missionary preaching; and an address was circulated in the month of March, with a view of obtaining the general assistance of the Society to the measure. [See Christian Reformer for March, p. 107.] A copy of the report &c., may not be uninteresting.

#### *Report.*

The business of this Committee has, in former years, been of a nature which did not require the presentation of a formal report of their proceedings. A change in this respect renders it expedient that, in resigning the power entrusted to them, they should advert to the course of their transactions during the past year.

The circulation of cheap tracts has

been continued; and the Committee in making a recent distribution, have been induced to recommend a change in the mode. It appears to them expedient to allot to every subscriber, *one* copy of each tract which the Society may publish or circulate; and to place the remainder at the disposal of the minister of each congregation, or of a Committee, with an understanding that subscribers who can distribute the tracts advantageously, will render material service to the Association by applying for them, and employing them in this way.

The printed circular drawn up by the Secretary at the suggestion of the Rev. S. Fawcett, and sanctioned by the Committee, has no doubt made it known throughout the district, that a plan is in contemplation for promoting the objects of the Association, by the employment of a supernumerary or Missionary Preacher.

The Committee are enabled to report that, since the above-mentioned circular was printed, a liberal subscription has been entered into at Bridport, and at Taunton, for providing pecuniary means to accomplish the plan; and they confidently hope that the ministers of Unitarian Societies, in the other places immediately concerned, will express their concurrence by such additional subscriptions, as will render the execution of the scheme easily practicable. Encouraged by promises of support already received, and desirous that there should be no unnecessary delay, the Committee have been employed in obtaining information as to the practicability of engaging suitable agency for carrying the intended plan into effect. They have had some correspondence with the Gloucester, Wilts, and Somerset Unitarian Missionary Society (at whose late meeting the secretary attended). The members of that Society are very desirous of all possible union and co-operation; and will readily concur in a plan for the exchange of Missionary Preachers, which exchange would ensure to the Somerset and Dorset Association the services of Mr. H. Clarke. Your committee have likewise ascertained, that the Society may obtain during some months in the approaching summer, the assistance of Mr. Howarth, a senior student at Manchester College, York, of whose qualifications very favourable accounts have been, from various quarters, received.

The Committee cannot retire from the station assigned to them, without expressing their satisfaction at the improved prospects which are opening to the Society; and the devout hope that the blessing of heaven will prosper its endeavours to advance the cause of pure and undefiled Christianity in the world.

Messrs Wright, H. Howse, and E.

Nias, having attended this Meeting as a deputation from the Somerset, Gloucester, and Wilts Association, and stated the desire of that Association to co-operate with this Society,

Resolved, That this Meeting duly appreciate the expression of friendly regard offered by the Somerset, Gloucester, and Wilts Unitarian Missionary Association; and will be eager to concur with its members in promoting the common cause, by the exchange of Missionary Preachers, the joint publication of tracts, and any other advisable mode of co-operation.

Resolved, That this Society are desirous of uniting, in a similar way, with the Devon and Cornwall Unitarian Missionary Society.

Resolved, That it appears to this Meeting desirable for the Association to connect itself with the London Unitarian Fund.

More than forty friends of the Society, among whom were several ladies, dined together between the services. In the course of the afternoon, the Meeting was addressed by Messrs Acton, Maurice, Smethurst, Wawne, Wright, and others; and the sentiments which the occasion called forth were highly honourable to the speakers, and to the cause they advocated. Several allusions were made to the morning's discourse; its spirit was commended and enforced. Charity indeed, seemed to pervade all hearts. To an ardent desire for the diffusion of Christianity in its purest and most unexceptionable form, was united a love for all the brethren who profess that holy religion. Those who were present will not readily lose the impressions they received—impressions of philanthropy which nor time nor circumstance should ever efface.

E. W.

---

*Somersetshire, Gloucestershire, and Wiltshire Missionary Association.*

(Established at Bath, Sept. 8, 1824.)

It has often, and with much truth, been observed, that though Unitarian Christianity is making rapid progress in various parts of this kingdom, yet there are many districts wherein it is but little known, and others, where, although there are a few Unitarian congregations, little or no effort is made to increase them, or to extend the beneficial influences of the doctrines they profess to places where they are scarcely known. These observations are particularly applicable to the counties of Somerset, Gloucester, and Wilts. Influenced by this state of things, some respectable individuals, seriously concerned for the wider diffusion of Uni-



tarianism, having formed a society for that purpose, have agreed to the following resolutions:

1. That this Society be called, "The Somersetshire, Gloucestershire, and Wiltshire Unitarian Missionary Association."

2. That its object be the preaching and otherwise promoting Unitarian Christianity in places where it is not at present known, and reviving the cause where it is on the decline.

3. That it be supported by subscriptions of four shillings and upwards per annum, and donations to any amount.

4. That any congregation or fellowship fund subscribing to this Society not less than one guinea annually, shall be entitled to vote by a representative on all questions at general meetings.

5. That a Committee (three of whom to be competent to act) shall be annually elected, with power to add to their number, who shall appoint their own times of meeting, and on special occasions be summoned by the Secretary.

6. That a Treasurer and Secretary be annually elected, who, with all the ministers of Unitarian congregations in the district, shall be, *ex officio*, members of the Committee.

7. That Sub-treasurers be appointed in each congregation to receive the various contributions, either weekly, monthly, quarterly, half-yearly, or annually; and that the assistance of the ladies in each society be respectfully solicited in this laudable work.

8. That Half-Yearly Meetings of the members and friends of this Association be held either at Bath, Bristol, Trowbridge, Warminster, or elsewhere within the above-named counties, the time and place to be fixed by the Committee, and due notice of the same to be given in the Monthly Repository, Christian Reformer, and Christian Reflector.

9. That at one of the General Meetings in each year, the Treasurer do produce an account of receipts and disbursements, and the Secretary a report of the transactions of the past year.

10. That it be particularly recommended to the Committee to request the assistance of Tract Societies in granting donations or cheap supplies of their publications calculated to diffuse Unitarian Christianity.

11. That, in consequence of losses of property sustained by different Societies, the Committee do take into consideration whether some plan might not be devised for registering trust-deeds, or other instruments left to congregations in this district, and to confer, as occasion may require, with the Association formed for that purpose in London.

12. That Mr. Nias be the Treasurer,

and Mr. H. E. Howse, Jun., the Secretary for the ensuing year.

13. That any sums contributed to this Association for any particular specified object shall be sacredly appropriated to that and no other purpose.

N. B. This last resolution was added at the first Half-Yearly Meeting, held at Bradford, on Friday the 1st of April.

### Bolton Anniversary.

THE Third Anniversary of the Congregation assembling in the Unitarian Meeting-house, Moor Lane, Bolton, was held on Sunday and Monday, April 3rd and 4th. The morning service on Sunday was opened by the Rev. W. Shepherd, of Gateacre, and the Rev. R. Cree, of Preston, delivered an admirable sermon on the Evidences of the Resurrection of Jesus, from Luke xxiv. 48. The afternoon worship was conducted by Mr. Cree, and Mr. Shepherd preached on the principles of Dissent and Christian Liberty, Matt. xv. 9. Mr. Harris introduced the service in the evening, and Mr. Cree gave a masterly delineation of the spirit and tendency of orthodoxy, 2 Thess. ii. 4. On the Monday evening the Rev. W. J. Bakewell, of Chester, introduced the service, and Mr. Harris preached from 1 Pet. iv. 14—16, shewing that all suffering was for man's improvement and happiness. The collections, which were towards defraying the expense incurred in erecting the school-rooms and vestries, amounted to £32.

On Monday about two hundred persons, of both sexes, sat down to a cold dinner, in Mr. Watson's Cloth-hall, the Rev. George Harris presided, and Mr. Salter was vice-president; on the right and left of the president were the Rev. W. Shepherd, Rev. Robert Cree, the Rev. W. Bakewell, and A. Crompton, Esq., of Lancaster.

As soon as the company were seated at the table, Mr. Harris delivered a short prayer; and a hymn was sung after the cloth was removed.

Then followed various sentiments and speeches, after which another hymn was sung; and the Lord's prayer, and a benediction being pronounced by the president, the meeting broke up at five o'clock.

On Tuesday, the children educated in the Sunday-schools belonging to the meeting-house, and their teachers, were entertained at dinner in the Cloth-hall, rather more than two hundred being present. After dinner, a hymn being sung, they were addressed by Mr. Harris, Mr. Bakewell, and Mr. Knowles, and were dismissed about three o'clock,

after singing and joining in prayer to the Source of knowledge, the Giver of all good.

*Kentish Unitarian Baptist Association.*

THE Annual Association of the Kent Unitarian General Baptists was held at Cranbrook, Tuesday, 3d of May, on which occasion a very excellent sermon was preached by Mr. R. Ashdowne, of Canterbury, from John xv. 17. After the conclusion of the religious service the business of the Association was proceeded in till two o'clock, when friends to the number of about sixty, including females, retired to an inn, and partook of a comfortable dinner. They then returned to the chapel and transacted business till five, when nearly 150 persons sat down to tea. The business was then once more resumed, and at half-past six the whole was concluded by solemn prayer and thanksgiving. Soon after eight o'clock, the friends, without distinction, reassembled at the inn and took supper together, and after the cloth was removed the following subject was proposed for discussion, viz. What Encouragement to Perseverance has the Advocate of Pure Christianity?—which elicited a number of useful and animating remarks. Thus did our meeting conclude, as it had commenced, in peace, in harmony, and in love.

M. H.

*General Baptist Assembly.*

THE Anniversary Meeting of the Unitarian Baptists was holden on Tuesday, May 24th, at the chapel in Worship Street, London. The Rev. Dr. Evans, of Islington, and the Rev. W. Chinnock, of Billingshurst, conducted the devotional services; and a sermon, on 1 John v. 12, *He that hath the Son, hath life, &c.*, characterized by good sense and deep but rational piety, was delivered by Mr. T. Moore, of Godalming, Surrey.

At the Meeting for business the Chair was filled by Mr. S. Love, of Filston Hall, near Sevenoaks. The letter from the church at Bessel's Green, of which the Chairman has long been one of its most valuable members, gave a gratifying account of the success of Mr. Briggs's labours in establishing religious worship at Chipstead, in Kent; that from the Cranbrook church gratefully acknowledged the liberal assistance it had received, its pecuniary burden having been wholly removed. The church at Dover anticipates the speedy liquidation of its debt also—and both these churches have had an increase of *baptized* members during the past year. The letters from several

other churches described their state as being similar to what it was at the last anniversary; others, that their cause had retrograded.—The Rev. G. Duplock, after a two years' residence at Ditchling, has embraced the opinion held by his church on the subject of Baptism. A well-deserved tribute of respect was paid to the members for having acted consistently as Protestant Dissenters towards their minister, and to him for his integrity in avowing his change of sentiment, the result of careful examination. Among other resolutions, the following were unanimously adopted by the Meeting:—  
“Resolved, that this Assembly has learned with great pleasure that the debt on the Chapel at Cranbrook has been liquidated, and cordially unites in expressing its sense of the liberality of those Friends and Churches by whom the required sum has been contributed, and especially of those whose views on the subject of Baptism are at variance with our own.”

“Resolved, that this Assembly is deeply impressed with a sense of gratitude to the Senior Divinity Students of Manchester College, York, for their past and continued ministerial services afforded at the chapel of our Baptist brethren in that city,—for their zeal in collecting subscriptions to defray the expense of erecting the chapel at Welburn, and for their candidly and cordially uniting with our brother *Mason* in maintaining divine worship in that place: and, that the Secretary communicate to those Gentlemen our sincere thanks—which they are respectfully solicited to accept.”

The Ministers and their Friends afterwards dined together at the White Hart Tavern, Bishopsgate Street, Mr. *Eaton* in the Chair, and the evening was spent in great harmony.

*Ditchling Annual Meeting.*

THE Annual Meeting of the Church of General Baptists at Ditchling, was holden on Sunday, May 15th, on which occasion the Rev. W. Chinnock, of Billingshurst, preached both morning and afternoon to very full audiences.

Previous to the morning service the rite of baptism was performed: and after the afternoon service, the Lord's Supper was commemorated. Tea was afterwards provided in the Meeting-House, of which about one hundred and sixty persons partook. An address was delivered after tea, and the company separated at six o'clock. The whole day passed off with much cheerfulness, and afforded ample evidence of the happy and useful tendency of meetings of this description. It is impossible to witness, on an occasion like this, the open-hearted greetings

of friends who have been long separated by distance of residence, without experiencing a renewal of some of the best feelings of which the heart is susceptible.  
D.

#### *Unitarian Fund and Association.*

THE Nineteenth Anniversary of the Unitarian Fund was held on Wednesday, the 25th inst., at the Finsbury Chapel. The devotional services were conducted by the Rev. W. Chinnock, of Billingshurst, and the sermon was preached by the Rev. C. Berry, of Leicester. The preacher, from Acts xx. 20, suggested some considerations in recommendation of Christian zeal, which, from the truly Christian simplicity and fervour of the discourse, could not fail of impressing every hearer. After the religious service, J. T. Rutt, Esq., was called to the Chair, and the business of the Society was transacted. The Committee's Report, read by the Rev. W. J. Fox, the Secretary, was unusually interesting, especially that part of it which related to Christianity in India. It appears that very liberal subscriptions have been made towards the support of the Rev. W. Adam as an Unitarian Missionary at Calcutta, as well as towards the erection of an Unitarian Chapel in that city. The Society expressed a strong desire to forward both these objects; and as our American brethren are equally zealous in their promotion, there can be no doubt of their accomplishment. [The lists of subscribers, both to the Missionary and the Chapel, will be hereafter published. We hear with pleasure that sums for the former of these purposes have been transmitted to India from the friends at Liverpool.] The Report is to be printed in the next Fund Register. A discussion took place on the projected Unitarian Association on a comprehensive plan, and the meeting adjourned to the next day at the London Tavern to take it into consideration; when the new Society was formed on the plan which will be found stitched up with the present Number, and the Unitarian Fund and the Unitarian Association for the Protection of Civil Rights were formally united with it. To the plan is attached the list of officers for the new Institution.—On the Wednesday, the friends of the Unitarian Fund dined together at the London Tavern, in number about 300, Wm. Smith, Esq., M.P., in the Chair. Many interesting speeches were delivered by the Chairman, Mr. Fox, and others, which we regret that we have no means of reporting.

The Report of the Unitarian Associa-

tion for the Protection of Civil Rights, at the Annual Meeting on Thursday, the 26th inst., turned chiefly on the Marriage Bill which has passed through the House of Commons, and is now waiting for its second reading in the House of Lords. Happy indeed shall we be to inform our readers in the next Number that the Bill has passed into a law; but if we are again disappointed, we shall not abandon hope of ultimate success.

#### *Subscriptions for the Spread of Unitarianism in India.*

SIR,

I HAVE the gratification of announcing to the readers of the Monthly Repository, that the statement recently circulated (chiefly amongst the ministers of our denomination) of the necessity of contributing to the support of the Rev. W. Adam, if his services as an Unitarian Missionary at Calcutta were to be retained, has called forth the most prompt, general, and encouraging assurances of support.

There is no longer any doubt about Mr. Adam's being enabled to remain at his important station; and I confidently hope that such arrangements will, through the zeal and liberality of the Unitarian public, be found practicable, as will place the Unitarian cause in British India on a firm and lasting basis.

By letter or personal communication, I have been favoured with intimations of annual assistance towards this great object (besides those from individuals, and liberal donations from the York students and others, which will be hereafter announced) from the ministers, or other authorized persons, connected with the following congregations: Several of those in London and its neighbourhood, Plymouth, Lynn, Norwich, Exeter, Wolverhampton, Bridport, Stockton, Sheffield, Manchester, (Moseley Street and Cross Street,) Kendal, Yarmouth, Kidderminster, Halifax, Bradford, York, Wakefield, Todmorden, Brighton, Leeds, Evesham, Newcastle, Derby, Chichester, Yeovil, Bristol, and indirectly from Chesterfield and Birmingham (New Meeting).

Although some of these letters contain definite statements of the support which may be relied upon from that particular society, yet as others consist of promises of collections, &c., which it is intended speedily to make, or report subscriptions which are yet in progress; and as fresh communications arrive daily, I must postpone till next month any more particular acknowledgment to my correspondents. It will then be practicable for me to convey a more adequate idea of what I cannot but regard as the most



decisive and splendid demonstration of zeal which has yet occurred in the history of Unitarianism.

It is also proper for me to mention, that several of the letters contain important observations on the future conduct of the mission, which I shall take care to bring under the consideration of the Committee.

W. J. FOX.

*Dalston, May 27, 1825.*

P. S. It will be convenient for all the remittances to be made to the Deputy Treasurer of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, Thomas Hornby Esq., 31 St. Swithin's Lane, Lombard Street. The Annual Subscriptions should be reckoned as for the current year.

*Testimony of Christian Respect to  
Rev. B. Mardon, A. M., by the  
Unitarians of Paisley.*

THE above gentleman being about to leave Scotland, his friends in Paisley considered it indispensable, that, previous to his departure, some expression of public esteem and regard should be given him by the congregation. He has been upwards of nine years minister of the Unitarian congregation in Glasgow, during which period, he has kept up a regular monthly sermon in Paisley on the second Sunday of every month. They therefore, on Wednesday, May 4th, presented him Schleüsner's Lexicon, (recently published in this country in three volumes,) elegantly bound, with the following inscription inside of the cover of each volume :

Presented  
The  
REV. BENJAMIN MARDON, A. M.,  
By the  
Unitarians of Paisley,  
As a Testimony  
of  
Gratitude and Esteem,  
For his  
Zealous and Gratuitous  
Labours there,  
While stationed  
in  
Scotland.

The congregation assembled at eight o'clock P. M., and Mr. Mardon constituted the Meeting by a suitable and impressive prayer. Mr. Robert Boag, our senior elder, then addressed the Meeting. He remarked, that it was now upwards of twenty years since the Society was first established; and though begun in much weakness, yet that Providence had raised up instruments both within and without

to set their shoulders to work, and thus public worship and instruction have been regularly maintained, so that we may say, "Hitherto hath the Lord helped us." He then alluded to those whom the Unitarian Fund enabled to visit us from the south, one of whom he said, though dead, still speaketh; our worthy friend Mr. Wright, was particularly and gratefully remembered; nor was the worthy and learned predecessor of Mr. Mardon forgotten (the Rev. James Yates, now of Birmingham). He then adverted to the regular and interesting services of Mr. Mardon, which had called forth the present spontaneous expression of our gratitude and esteem. And in presenting him with the book, hoped, that while it would recall to his recollection the gratitude of the people of Paisley, it would be equally instrumental in enabling him to illustrate and defend those important truths which were at once the means of our connexion, and so essential to the grand designs of the gospel—the extirpation of persecution, bigotry, superstition, and vice, and the promotion of the virtue and happiness of the whole human family.

Mr. Mardon then rose, and thanked the Meeting at considerable length. He expressed himself as not having had the slightest expectation of such a mark of friendship and regard. And though he was by no means insensible to the approbation of his friends and brethren, he was well aware that a Christian minister should, and he hoped *he* always would, be actuated by higher motives. He referred to the pleasure which he had ever experienced in his visits to Paisley, and the Christian spirit with which he was always received; and he considered, that had he done any less in the situation which he held, than he had done, he could not have satisfied his own mind, or justified himself. He hoped he would continue to merit our good opinion, by steadily and perseveringly continuing those studies and efforts which the present gift was so well calculated to assist him in. In concluding, he wished us every prosperity, and hoped, that though he could never expect to meet us all again in this world, that he would meet us in another, and a better, where our faculties would be expanded, and our intellectual pleasure and improvement continue throughout the never-ending ages of eternity.—Mr. Boag concluded with prayer, and the meeting adjourned.

*Removals, &c. of Ministers.*

THE Rev. GEORGE HARRIS has given notice of his intention to resign his situation at Bolton at the close of September

next; and has accepted the unanimous invitation of the Unitarian Christians of Glasgow, to undertake the pastoral charge of the congregation in that city.

Mr. BEARD, of the College, York, is chosen minister of the new congregation meeting in the Greengate Chapel, Salford, near Manchester.

#### NOTICES.

The Anniversary of the Kent and Sussex Unitarian Christian Association will take place at Chatham, on Wednesday, June 29th. The Rev. B. Mardon, late of Glasgow, is expected to preach on the occasion.

#### *Eastern Unitarian Society.*

THE Yearly Meeting of the Eastern Unitarian Society will be held at Framlingham, in Suffolk, on Wednesday and Thursday, the 13th and 14th of July. Mr. Bowles is expected to preach on the Wednesday evening, and Mr. Tagart on the Thursday morning.

EDWARD TAYLOR, *Secretary.*

#### *Resolutions of Dissenting Bodies with regard to the Catholic Bill.*

##### DISSENTING MINISTERS.

Library, Red-Cross Street, May 3, 1825. At an adjourned Meeting of the General Body of Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the Three Denominations, resident in and about London and Westminster, the Rev. JOHN PYE SMITH, D.D. in the Chair,—

It was resolved, That as a Body, we wholly disclaim every sentiment of religious intolerance towards our fellow-subjects of the Roman Catholic persuasion; and express our earnest hope that the Legislature will, at length, deem it proper to take measures for the relief of all classes of His Majesty's subjects, who may lie under penalties and disabilities for conscience' sake.

##### DEPUTIES.

At a special general Meeting of the Deputies from the several congregations of Protestant Dissenters of the Three Denominations, Presbyterian, Independent and Baptist, in and within twelve miles of London, appointed to protect their civil rights, held at the King's-Head Tavern, in the Poultry, London, on Friday, the 29th day of April, 1825, WILLIAM SMITH, Esq. M. P., in the Chair,—

##### RESOLVED,

That this Deputation is anxious to disavow any concurrence in, or approval of, the Petitions lately presented to Parliament (purporting to be from Protestant Dissenters), in reference to the

claims of the Roman Catholics for relief from the operation of existing laws; and that it will continue at all seasonable opportunities, to urge upon the Legislature (as it has hitherto done), the impolicy and injustice of every sort of penalty or disability, civil or political, for conscience' sake.

That the above Resolution be signed by the Chairman, and inserted twice in the Morning Chronicle, Times, Morning Post, Globe, and Courier Newspapers, and the different periodical religious publications.

(Signed,) W. SMITH,  
Chairman.

##### RESOLVED,

That the thanks of this Meeting be given to the Chairman for his able conduct in the Chair this day.

##### PROTESTANT SOCIETY.

At a Monthly Meeting of the Committee of "The Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty," held April 25, 1825, ROBERT STEVEN, Esq., in the Chair,—

It was unanimously resolved—I. That THIS COMMITTEE perceive with regret, that the presentation of about *twenty-five* Petitions from persons calling themselves "Protestant Dissenters," against THE BILL depending in Parliament "for the removal of the disqualifications under which Roman Catholics now labour," has involved the THOUSANDS of Congregations of Protestant Dissenters in England and Wales, in the imputation of indifference or hostility to those great principles of Religious Freedom, for which their forefathers contended, and to which they continue ever attached.

II. That THE SOCIETY, by whom this Committee are appointed, and which includes enlightened and liberal Members of the Established Church, and several hundred Congregations of Protestant Dissenters of all denominations in England and Wales, have repeatedly declared their belief, "that the right to Religious Liberty is a universal, paramount, unalienable right,—that religious opinions should not alone qualify or disqualify for Public Offices—that all restraints on their expression by penalties or exclusions, are acts of oppression and of wrong—that the connexion of privileges and emoluments with particular opinions may create hypocrites or martyrs—but that the unrestricted allowance of all religious opinions and diversities of worship, is essential to the rights of conscience, favourable to the promotion of piety, and propitious to the harmony and improvement of mankind."

III. That THIS COMMITTEE can never be unmindful of the needless, oppressive, degrading, and unjust restrictions imposed

by "THE TEST AND CORPORATION ACTS" on Protestant Dissenters, nor cease to desire their repeal:—But, being convinced that the concessions proposed to be made, by the depending Bill, will not give to the Roman Catholics in England or Ireland any political advantage over Protestant Dissenters in those countries, THEY will not, as Protestant Dissenters, interfere in any manner that may prejudice or prejudice the Bill, but will leave the measure to the Wisdom and Justice of Parliament, on which—with confidence—The COMMITTEE rely.

THOMAS PELLATT, } Secretaries.  
JOHN WILKS, }

BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

AT a General Meeting of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, held at the London Tavern, May 26th, 1825, THOMAS GIBSON, Esq., in the Chair,—

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY,

That the Members of this Society eagerly avail themselves of the earliest opportunity afforded to them of conveying, on the part of the Unitarian Dissenters of England, to their fellow-christians of the Roman Catholic persuasion, their thorough disavowal and disapprobation of the Petitions lately presented by persons calling themselves Protestant Dissenters, against the repeal of those intolerant laws which disgrace their country's name—their sorrow at such a stigma having to any extent been attached to a body of which they have been proud to form a part—their sympathy and cordial good wishes in favour of every effort to break the chains imposed by interested or short-sighted policy upon the sacred Rights of Conscience—and their unshaken determination on all occasions to vindicate for others that freedom which they claim to be their own inalienable right, and to uphold and maintain the impolicy, injustice, and oppression of every sort of disability or exclusion on account of differences in matters of religion.

That this Resolution be communicated to the Secretary of the late Association of Ireland, and to the Secretaries of the Catholic Associations of England.

MISCELLANEOUS.

*Libel on Mr. and Mrs. Cooper.*

ON Sunday, May 1st, a gross and scandalous libel on Mr. and Mrs. COOPER was published in the *John Bull* and the *Sunday Herald*, two newspapers in the interest of the West Indians. The morning following, Mr. C., with the advice of his friends, commenced legal proceedings; and as soon as arrangements could be made for the purpose, Mr. Brougham

was instructed to move, in the Court of King's Bench, for a Criminal Information against both the papers. A Rule, *Nisi*, was obtained, which so much alarmed the defendants that they immediately made overtures of reparation and apology. This gave a new turn to the affair: the prosecutors, having nothing in view but the vindication of their characters, willingly adopted a merciful course, which induced the *John Bull*, of May 15th, to publish the following statement:

"A fortnight since, we published, as an extract from the *Jamaica Gazette*, an affidavit made by a person of the name of Arkinstall, reflecting in severe terms on the conduct of Mr. and Mrs. Cooper, while on Georgia Estate, in the island of Jamaica. Mr. and Mrs. Cooper have made affidavits within the last few days, contradicting Mr. Arkinstall's affidavit; and we have no hesitation in expressing our belief that the statements in it are false and calumnious, and our regret in having given them a place in the columns of this paper."

On the same day, the *Sunday Herald* apologized in the following terms:

"We are sorry to have been instrumental in propagating a statement highly injurious to Mr. and Mrs. Cooper, by copying into our paper, a fortnight ago, the affidavit of Mr. Arkinstall, taken from a Jamaica paper. Mr. and Mrs. Cooper have since fully met by their own affidavits the statements contained in Mr. A.'s affidavit, and we can have no hesitation in expressing our belief that such statements are false and calumnious, and in avowing our regret that our columns should have been any way instrumental in extending the circulation of the calumny."

Monday, the 16th, both offenders repeated their apology in the Court of King's Bench by Counsel, a report of which appeared in most of the daily papers: we insert that which was given in the *Morning Chronicle*:

The KING v. The SUNDAY HERALD.—Mr. BROUGHAM had on a former day obtained a rule against this Newspaper, for publishing a libel against Mr. and Mrs. Cooper, reflecting upon the characters of the applicants. Mr. GURNEY now appeared on behalf of the Paper, and suggested that an ample apology had been made by the defendants before this application was made. The paragraph complained of had been copied from a Jamaica newspaper, under a supposition that the matter therein contained was true. Being now satisfied of its falsehood, the defendants expressed their deep regret that they had been made the instruments of circulating matter so scandalous of the characters of Mr. and Mrs.



Cooper. Upon payment of costs, the Learned Counsel trusted the Court would discharge the rule.

Mr. BROUGHAM for the prosecutors admitted, that after the ample and humble apology made, he was instructed not to press the application; but he hoped that the defendants would take warning not to repeat slander of this description, without taking the trouble of ascertaining its foundation beforehand.

The COURT under these circumstances, discharged the Rule, upon the defendants undertaking to pay the costs of the application.

The KING v. The JOHN BULL.—Mr. ADOLPHUS appeared on behalf of this paper, the publishers of which had inadvertently copied (without comment) the same libellous matter. The defendants had since made an ample apology, and had corrected in their paper the error into which they had fallen. Under these circumstances he trusted the Rule would be discharged on payment of the costs.

Mr. BROUGHAM, on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Cooper, expressed himself content with the apology made, and would therefore withdraw the motion on the terms proposed.—Rule discharged on payment of costs.

*Glasgow College, 30th April, 1825.*

THIS day the Annual Distribution of Prizes was made in the Common Hall, by the Principal and Professors, in the presence of a numerous meeting of the University, and of many reverend and respectable gentlemen of this city and neighbourhood.

In the list we observe the names of the following Unitarian Students:

Prizes were adjudged on Mr. Coulter's Donation, for the best Translation of the *Phædon* of Plato, to Henry Green, A. M., Kent. In the Natural Philosophy Class, for propriety of conduct, exemplary diligence, and eminent ability, to William M. James, A. M., Glamorganshire. In the Ethic Class, for superior merit in the

Composition of Essays, and for distinguished eminence in the various duties and business of the Class, in the Senior Division, to Weatherly Phipson, Birmingham; in the Junior Division, *First Prize*, to William Ainsworth, Preston, Lancashire. For the best Translation of the *Table of Cebes*, to Henry Green, A. M., Kent. In the Logic Class, for general eminence and superiority in the customary exercises and examinations of the class during the whole session, to Henry M. Bowles, Yarmouth. For the best Analysis of the Faculty of Imagination, to William Ainsworth, Lancashire. In the Private Greek Class, for the best Essay on the object of the Dionysian Criticism, and how far it may be useful to Modern Writers, to Henry Green, A. M., Kent.

The Senate of the University have, during the Session, after the usual public and private Examinations, admitted to the Degree of Master in Arts, William Gaskell, Warrington; William M. James, Merthyr Tydvil, Glamorganshire; and Henry Green, Maidstone.

#### PARLIAMENTARY.

THE Unitarian Marriage Bill has passed through the House of Commons, and is now before the House of Lords. The Marquis of Lansdowne has given notice of its second reading on Thursday, the 2nd of June.

The Catholic Bill was lost on the second reading in the House of Lords by a majority of 48. The speeches of Lord Liverpool and the new Bishop of Chester, (Dr. Blomfield,) were decidedly and remarkably hostile to the measure.

On this subject the country has been much excited by a speech of the Duke of York's, declaring unalterable hostility to the Catholic Claims. We shall hereafter insert it in this work, together with a number of passages from speeches in both Houses during the Session, relating to the Roman Catholics and the Protestant Dissenters.

## NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

The Works of the late Dr. Lightfoot, Master of Catherine Hall, Cambridge. Edited by the Rev. J. R. Pitman, A. M. 13 Vols. Demy 8vo. 7l. 16s.

A Treatise on Judicial Evidence, extracted from the MSS of Jeremy Bentham, Esq. By M. Dumont, Member of the Representative and Sovereign Council of Geneva. Translated from the French. Royal 8vo. 12s.

The Life of Frederick Schiller, comprehending an Examination of his Writings. 8vo. Portrait. 10s. 6d.

The Life of Bernard Gilpin. By W. Gilpin, A. M. With an Introductory Essay, by the Rev. E. Irving. 12mo. 3s.

Lambeth and the Vatican; or, Anecdotes of the Church of Rome, the Reformed Churches, and distinguished Sects and Sectaries of the Christian Religion

in all Ages; collected in the Public Libraries of Italy, France and England. By a Member of the University of Oxford. 3 Vols. Portraits, Autographs and Relics. 17. 1s. Extra Boards.

An Account of the Life and Writings of Thomas Brown, M. D., late Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh. By David Welsh, Minister of Crossmichael. 8vo. Portrait. 14s.

Memoirs of Moses Mendelsohn, the Jewish Philosopher; including the celebrated Correspondence on the Christian Religion with J. C. Lavater. By M. Samuels. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

An Attempt to Establish the First Principles of Chemistry by Experiment. By Thomas Thomson, M. D., Regius Professor of Chemistry in the University of Glasgow. 2 Vols. 8vo. 17. 10s.

Grammar of the Hebrew Language with Points. By Moses Marcus, Curate of Brigstock cum Stanton, Northamptonshire. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The Advancement of Society in Knowledge and Religion. By James Douglas, Esq. 8vo. 9s.

Considerations addressed to the Electric Reviewer, in Defence of those who maintain that Baptism should precede Communion. By Joseph Kinghorn.

Remarks on Volney's Ruins, or a Survey of the Revolutions of Empires. By D. A. Hailes. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

#### *Roman Catholics.*

A Letter to Charles Butler, Esq., of Lincoln's Inn, in Vindication of English Protestants from his Attacks upon their Sincerity in the "Book of the Roman Catholic Church." By C. J. Blomfield, D. D., Bishop of Chester. Third Edition. To which is added, Postscripts in Reply to Mr. Butler's Letter. 8vo. 1s.

A Letter to the Right Rev. C. J. Blomfield, D. D., Bishop of Chester, from Charles Butler, Esq., in Vindication of a Passage in his "Book of the Roman Catholic Church," contained in a Letter addressed to Him by His Lordship. Third Edition, revised and enlarged. 8vo. 1s.

Letters to Charles Butler, Esq., on the Theological Parts of his Book, &c. By H. Phillpotts, D. D., Rector of Stanhope.

The Accusations of History against the Church of Rome examined, in Remarks on Mr. C. Butler's Work, &c. By George Townsend, M. A., of Trinity College, Cambridge. 8vo. 6s.

Two Letters addressed to the Author of the Book of the Roman Catholic Church, upon Certain Passages in his Book. By a Lay Member of the University of Oxford. 4s.

A Defence of the True Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ; with a Confutation of Sundry Errors concerning the Same. By the Most Rev. Thomas Cran-

mer, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury. To which is prefixed, an Introduction, Historical, &c.: and a Vindication of the Character of the Author against some of the Allegations recently made by Dr. Lingard, &c. By H. J. Todd, M. A. F. A. S. 8vo. 6s.

Caution to Protestants and Warning to Catholics, a Sermon at Colchester, Jan. 9, 1825. By W. Marsh, M. A. 1s. 6d.

Observations on the Answers of the Right Rev. James Doyle, D. D., Bishop of Kildare, to the Committee of the House of Commons. By Dr. J. L. Villanueva. 1s. 6d.

A History of the Penal Laws against the Catholics from 1688 to the Union. By Sir Henry Parnell, Bart. Fourth Edition. 8vo.

Tracts upon some Leading Errors of the Church of Rome. By George Hamilton, M. A., Rector of Killermogh. 1s.

Catholic Miracles. To which is added, A Reply to Cobbett's Defence of Catholicism. Seven Designs by Cruikshank. 2s. 6d.

The Dawn of the Reformation: or, The Lollards. 18mo. Portrait of Wickliffe. 3s. 6d.

A Few Remarks in Defence of the Protestant Religion, in Answer to the Rev. Dr. Baines. By Henry Wansey, Esq. 1s.

A Discourse on Transubstantiation, by Dr. Harris, at Salters' Hall, 1734, reprinted by Rear Admiral Bullen. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Proceedings of a General Court Martial, at Malta, March 1, 1824, on Lieutenant G. F. Dawson, of the Royal Artillery, for hesitating to assist in the Ceremonies of the Church of Rome. 2s. 6d.

The Ghost of the Catholic Association of Ireland, addressing His Majesty's Ministers, the Orangemen, Liberal Protestants and Catholics. 1s.

A Letter to the House of Lords on the Proposition for Pensioning the Roman Catholic Clergy of Ireland. 6d.

Popery and the Popish Question, being an Exposition of the Political and Doctrinal Opinions of Messrs. O'Connell, Keogh, &c. &c. By Rev. George Croly, A. M. F. R. L. S. 8vo. 5s.

Idolatry the Prevailing Practice of the Church of Rome, in a Letter containing Remarks on the Evidence of the Roman Catholic Prelates, before the Committee of the House of Commons, addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury. By Wm. Borradaile, M. A., Vicar of Wandsworth. 1s. 6d.

#### *Ireland.*

The Beauties of Ireland: being Original Delineations, Topographical, Historical and Biographical, of each County. By J. N. Brewer, Esq. Vol. I. Twelve Engravings. Demy 8vo. 17. 4s. Royal 8vo. Proof Impressions of Plates, 17. 16s.

**The Proceedings of the Catholic Association in Dublin, from May 13, 1823 to Feb. 11, 1825.** 8vo. 8s. 6d.

**An Authentic Review of the Principles, Measures and Designs of the Catholic Association.** By Amicus Hibernicus. 8vo. 2s.

**Catholic Rent and Catholic Association: an Address to Protestants of every Denomination.** By a Layman. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

**The Secret Politics of the Times Newspaper detected; or its Wavering Principles as they regard the Affairs of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, unmasked.** By M. M'Dermot, Esq. 2s.

**The Evidence on the State of Ireland, before the Committees of the Two Houses, by the Irish Catholic Bishops, Mr. O'Connell, &c.** 8vo.

**Twelve Letters on the State of Ireland, addressed by J. K. L. (Dr. Doyle) to a Friend in England.** 8s.

**Present State of Ireland, with a Plan for improving the Condition of the People.** By James Cropper. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

**Catholic Emancipation calmly considered.** 1s.

#### Sermons.

**Discourses on our Lord's Sermon on the Mount.** By the late Edmund Butcher. 5s. boards.

**On Various Subjects.** By W. Paley, D. D., late Archdeacon of Carlisle. Edited by E. Paley, Vicar of Easingwold. 2 Vols. 8vo. 18s.

**Calvinistic Predestination repugnant to Scripture: in a Series of Discourses in the Chapel of Trinity College, Dublin.** By Richard Graves, D. D., M. R. I. A., King's Professor of Divinity, Dean of Ardagh, &c. 8vo. 12s.

**The Doctrines of the Church of Geneva illustrated, in a Series of Sermons preached by modern Divines of that City.** Edited by the Rev. J. S. Pons, one of his Majesty's Chaplains, at the Dutch Palace, St. James's. 8vo. 10s.

**From the French, translated, abridged and adapted to the English Pulpit.** By M. H. Luscombe, LL.D., Chaplain to H. R. H. the Duke of Cambridge. 8vo. 9s.

**A Course of—on Justification by Faith, preached before the University of Cambridge, in January, 1825.** By J. W. Whittaker, B. D., Vicar of Blackburn. 8vo. 5s.

#### Single.

**Preached in the Church of Hatton, near Warwick, at the Funeral of the Rev. Samuel Parr, LL.D., March 14, 1825.** By S. Butler, D.D., Archdeacon of Derby, and Head Master of Shrewsbury School. 2s. 6d.

**Delivered at the Meeting House, Blandford Street, Manchester Square, April 18, 1824, on the Death of Mr. John Keeble, late Minister of the above Place.** By John Chin, Walworth. With a Memoir. 1s. 6d.

**On the Evidence of a Divine Superintendence exhibited in the Works of Nature and in the Affairs of the World.** By T. Heineken, Bradford. 8vo. 1s.

**On the Duty of Frequent Communion at the Lord's Table.** By J. Courtney, M. A., Rector of Goxhill, Yorkshire. 8vo. 6d.

**Preached at the Consecration of Christ Church, North Bradley, by the Bishop of Sarum, Sept. 2, 1824.** By C. Daubeney, LL.D., Archdeacon of Sarum and Vicar of North Bradley. 8vo. 2s.

**On Behalf of the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, preached at St. Mary, Aldermanbury, Feb. 27, 1825.** By H. B. Wilson, D. D. F. S. A., Rector. 8vo. 1s.

**On the Principles and Tendencies of Congregational Nonconformity.** By Joseph Fletcher, A. M. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

**An Assize Sermon at St. Lawrence's, Reading, at the Berkshire Lent Assizes, 1825.** By George Hulme, A. M., Chaplain to E. Fuller Maitland, Esq., the High Sheriff. 1s. 6d.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from Crediton; an Observer of the Times; — on the Mosaic Mission; and S.

Various articles of Review are lying by us.

No. II. of the Puritans is unavoidably postponed to the next number.

A Continuation of the Critical Synopsis of the Monthly Repository has been received from America.

#### ERRATA.

P. 84, col. 1, line 44, for "horrors," read *horror*.

— line 47, for "perilous," read *familiar*.

— 85, col. 1, line 7, for "happily," read *haply*.

— 221, col. 1, line 15 from the bottom, for "Pretenders," read *Pretender*.

— 223, col. 1, line 26, for "elegibilities," read *eligibilities*.

— 224, col. 2, line 14, for "neglect," read *employ*.