

THE Monthly Repository.

No. CCXXXV.]

JULY, 1825.

[Vol. XX.]

A Vindication of Minute Accuracy, in respect of the Text, Translation, and Interpretation, of the Scriptures.

July 2, 1825.

— juvat INTEGROS accedere fontes,

Atque haurire.

LUCRET.

PERHAPS it may not be unreasonable to lay before the readers of the Monthly Repository a few observations on *the value of minute accuracy in the criticism and interpretation of the Bible*. The strictures which I shall have occasion to make, will have been suggested by passages that presented themselves in a recent course of reading.

Dr. Bruce * appears to depreciate this accuracy, where the text of the Scriptures is concerned. He takes for granted, that his auditors and readers cannot "refrain from smiling, when they hear the nature of the Supreme Being, and the faith and salvation of Christendom, suspended on the transposition of a letter, or the construction of a particle, the insertion of a dot, or the omission of some grammatical or rhetorical mark." What is Dr. Bruce's meaning? His statement, if it be correct, should excite indignant disgust, rather than risibility. The question at issue, between Christians of opposite denominations, is, whether or no the texts under consideration, and as they stand in the received editions and translations, be genuine Scripture; whether or no they proceed from evangelists and apostles? Is there any thing which can fairly be deemed ludicrous, either in this inquiry itself, or in the legitimate and customary means of bringing it to a conclusion? Suppose that the point in dispute were the text and readings of the best MSS., &c. of a profane author—Cicero, for example, or Virgil:—suppose, too, (it is an allowable supposition,) that some very interesting matter of fact or of opinion were *suspended* on the due arrangement of the controverted passage—what scholar would treat the case with levity? Is it not his business to ascertain, first, what has really been said

by ancient writers, and afterwards, in what signification it has been said?

Persons well acquainted with polemical theology, know that Dr. Bruce's representation is exaggerated. The whole stress of Trinitarianism is not placed on the texts which he has in view. Even assuming that it is, Arians would seem to be as truly and as deeply involved in the question of the genuineness of such passages as Unitarian Christians. All sincere and enlightened believers in the gospel, will be zealous to draw the line between spurious and authentic Scripture. How can the discrimination be effected without the aid of biblical criticism, without minute accuracy in the exercise of it? When we acknowledge the value of the end, yet despise the only means by which it can be attained, we are grossly inconsistent with ourselves.

It would be, in many respects, a happy circumstance, if the controversy of the Trinitarian with those who oppose him, were decided by *criticism* rather than *interpretation*. Expositors may be very learned, wise, and pious: nevertheless, in their characteristic employment, we find them susceptible of various and hurtful influences, from causes not always under their controul. The canons of interpretation, so far as respects the practical use of them, depend greatly on men's prejudices, attachments, connexions, and diversities of sentiment. Not so the canons of *criticism*, in the restricted and just meaning of that term. These are fixed, impartial, universal, produced, fortified, occupied, by inquiries into facts, not into opinions. Accordingly, to the award of Biblical Criticism well-educated divines, of all denominations, bow with instant and implicit deference: * whether they

* Sermons on the Study of the Bible, &c., pp. 126, 127, 301, 302.

* So the Unitarian Christian, on the authorities cited by Griesbach, surrenders a part of the received text in Matt. xix. 17.

style themselves Trinitarians, Arians, or Unitarians, they reject, with hardly a single disagreeing voice, the forgery in 1 John v. 7.

Has Dr. Bruce no controversy except with Unitarian Christians? The volume of Sermons, on a part of which I am animadverting, forbids this inference. Now is not Biblical Criticism, in the correctness of its researches and determinations, one of his instruments of vindication or attack with reference to Trinitarians?*

But he seems to exult in the persuasion, that of the passages on which the Arian relies for his characteristic tenet, none are expunged by means of this criticism, or differently read. Granting, for a moment, the soundness† of his conviction, I cannot therefore acquiesce in the propriety of his using such triumphant language. Arianism, under any modification, was no early or permanent article of faith in the Christian church: and the state, nature and result of ancient theological controversies may, in some measure, be known through the history of the text of the New Testament. Passages, moreover, conceded to be genuine, will yet fall within the scope of interpretation. If then the Scriptures are left to expound themselves, the Unitarian Christian has not more to dread from the weapons of his Arian than from those of his Trinitarian antagonist.

That verbal and philological criticism on the Sacred Volume, which encounters Dr. Bruce's sneers, has exercised, and, by exercising, has invigorated, mighty minds. In controversies which this gentleman would describe as "abecedarian" and interminable, such men as Newton and Bentley and Porson have engaged; how honourably and successfully, no theological scholar can be ignorant. It is a mistake to conceive that the investigations of philology, whether they be directed towards classical writings or towards the Scriptures, can be pursued effectually by individuals of narrow understandings, or that they have a tendency to contract and weaken the mental powers. To the great names which I have mentioned, let

those of Hemsterhuis and Ruhnken, of Dr. Samuel Clarke and Bishop Marsh, be added, in refutation of this error. In the critic no ordinary good sense and penetration must be united with accurate and extensive knowledge: by these qualities essential aid has been afforded to the progress of scriptural learning and religious truth. There have been discussions which Swift and Pope attempted to ridicule as "abecedarian:" satire was levelled by those authors even against persons whose memory every man of letters will revere; and the most sagacious philologist of any country or age was pointed at as a

" — word-catcher, who lives on syllables."

Can Dr. Bruce imagine that Bentley and criticism were degraded by such attacks? Will he not confess that the dishonour belonged exclusively to Pope and his associates?

The best critical editor of the New Testament, is Griesbach. Nor were his labours chiefly mechanical, or his merits little more than the merits of an indefatigable and plodding student. They who render themselves masters of his *Commentarius Criticus*, will own the superiority of his intellectual character, will be sensible that the criticism of the Bible is no trivial and subordinate occupation. This department of theology, while it is far less precarious than *interpretation*, demands, however, equal, if not greater, discernment, and, in general, a more concentrated and fixed attention.

I take for granted that Dr. Bruce employs the *interpretation* of Scripture, when he reasons against Trinitarian Christians, on the one side, and Unitarian Christians, on the other. On controverted points of doctrine and of duty, it is a copious and legitimate source of argument. Yet how easily may a man of respectable talent, who, nevertheless, little relishes the toil of scriptural inquiry, jeer at studies of this nature! "What," he may exclaim, "shall the questions, who is the object of a Christian's worship, and what are the tenets of the gospel—shall the faith and practice of Christendom, be *suspended* on the nicely-varying shades of words and phrases? Our scheme is consistent and rational, and requires no such

* Sermons, ut sup. pp. 302, 303.

† Ephes. iii. 9 (see Griesbach in loc.) disproves the assertion of Dr. Bruce.

support. Why not acquiesce at once in the language of unbiassed translators, whom we can understand as readily as we can the authors of other books, rather than perplex ourselves with an analysis of the original writings? Does *salvation* rest on the correctness of the expositor?" All this, I repeat, may be fluently alleged—and it may as promptly be answered by a reference to the government of God and the frame of man. If Dr. Bruce's position be solid, we have only to embrace and hold fast

"All that the nurse and all the priest has taught,"

and utterly to dis sever scholarship and care and enlightened judgment from theological pursuits.—Let us now pass from this very estimable person to divines of a more distant age; from the *text* of the Scriptures to a rule which should not be neglected in the *translation* of them.

The rule is, *that the diligence of the translator should be unremitted; few if any difficulties being insuperable by such diligence. Let him, therefore, be as minutely accurate as possible.*

In the preface to the larger copies of the Received Version the following singular passage occurs:

"—it cannot be dissembled that, partly to exercise and whet our wits, partly to wean the curious from loathing of them [the Scriptures] for their every-day plainness, partly also to stir up our devotion, to crave the assistance of God's Spirit by prayer, and, lastly, that we might be forward to seek aid of our brethren by conference, &c. &c.—it hath pleased God in his divine providence, here and there to scatter words and sentences of that difficulty and doubtfulness, not in doctrinal points that concern salvation, but in matters of less moment, that fearfulness would better beseech us than confidence."

Beyond question, it is a general principle of the Divine administration, that man's assiduity, and his consciousness of dependence, shall be heightened by the difficulties accompanying his pursuits. Were nothing further than a truth so obvious and so important conveyed by the language which I have copied, I should have only to adopt it, with unqualified and

cordial assent. Yet King James's translators evidently mean to say, that obscurities in the style of the Bible are specially ordained by Heaven, for this purpose. On what authority do they make the statement? Does the Bible itself contain any such intimation? Or do they appeal to the reason of the case? But are not the records of revelation designed to be understood? At the same time, are they not written in the dialects of their several countries and ages? Why then resort to so infirm and equivocal a principle, by way of accounting for the existence of verbal difficulties, when those difficulties arise, in the main,* from the date and nature of the languages? Nor are such perplexities insurmountable: many of them have vanished before the increased erudition and diligence of theological scholars; and we may with justice conclude that, in the progress of years, this will be the fate of most of the remainder. What we chiefly need, is a larger number of well qualified and unremitting labourers.

In some instances, spurious humility, which, in truth, is conceit and self-importance, may be nourished by the exceptionable sentiment that I have quoted. A scriptural phrase, for example, baffles the inquiries, penetration and knowledge of a young student in divinity; though, as we might well suppose, its meaning has been clear to critics of sound and tried judgment, and of the greatest name. It has embarrassed his faculties (which, really, can be no disgrace to him): and hence he concludes that it was left obscure, in order to embarrass every man's faculties, and to humble human pride! Who does not perceive that such an argument is utterly inconsequential; that such a decision bespeaks any thing but diffidence?

Let a few words be added on minute accuracy in the interpretation of the Sacred Volume.

This accuracy, employed on single passages and terms, is far preferable to what some divines are fond of call-

* Other causes might, no doubt, be assigned. Among these is a fondness of *allegorical* interpretation: upon which subject the late Mr. Conybeare's lectures well deserve perusal, though they may not always command assent.

ing the analogy of faith; by which expression they intend a creed already formed, and made a standard for the expositor. Such a method of investigating the Scriptures, is *synthetic*, or *systematical*, and should, I presume, be, as much as possible, discouraged. If it be fair and lawful in regard to one set of theologians, it is fair and lawful for *all*; or rather, it is universally fallacious and inadmissible. Should it be alleged, that the Bible is consistent with itself,—this consistency, I answer, cannot be effectually ascertained, except by the aid of *analysis*. The just order, is, first, to examine the texts themselves; afterwards, to compare them with each other; and, lastly, to illustrate those which are obscure by those which are perspicuous. A late excellent and accomplished individual* was “no friend to very minute verbal criticism” in scriptural studies. He did not look in the sacred writers for “that precision and accuracy in the use of words, which are to be found only in the most accurate and philosophical authors.” If, indeed, he adverted to words purely Greek and classical, he was correct in his expectation; though even in the “Greek of the Synagogue” there appears to be a reasonable degree of accuracy and precision—a degree of both sufficient for all the general purposes of the critic. In interpreting passages of doubtful import, Mr. Wood trusted for assistance rather to comprehensive principles, than to verbal inquiries. He was qualified for making application to both: and in such hands as his both may safely and advantageously be employed. Not so as to inferior men: and it is only where verbal investigation affords a very scanty help, that recourse should be had to considerations of another kind. The rules, for instance, of Biblical Criticism, and even those of interpretation, are more definite than the opinions of the several classes of Christians respecting “the general nature and design of Revelation.”

N.

* The Rev. Wm. Wood, Memoirs of him, by Wellbeloved, pp. 26, 27.

SIR,
 I do not wish to see the cause of Unitarianism aided by a single erroneous interpretation of Scripture, (any more than by the “disingenuous artifices”* of any Unitarian preachers,) I was not sorry to find that the Reviewer of Dr. Spry's Two Sermons in your last Number, in treating of Hebrews i. 2, has rejected the interpretation of Grotius, which, however, as the interpretation of so great a man, Valkenaer justly thinks ought to be *modestly* refuted. It is an interpretation to which I never could subscribe, as I do not remember in the course of my reading to have met with a passage in which *δια* with the genitive must necessarily be rendered *propter*, though I think I have seen one or two in which it might be rendered indifferently by *propter* or *per*. In the passage produced by the Reviewer from Thucydides, L. v. § 53, *δια* does not govern *τε θυματος*, but *την εσπραξιν* which follows. In L. vi. § 57, I have always thought that *δε ονπερ*, which is the reading of several manuscripts, ought to be restored. It is at length adopted in the useful edition of Haack, and will, I doubt not, be retained in the edition publishing by Poppo. Of Josephus I can say nothing positively. I think that he uses *αφικνεισθαι δια λογων*, which I suspect to be one of the expressions referred to by the Reviewer. This expression, meaning to hold a conversation, is analogous to *δε' εχθρας αφικνεισθαι* and many others in the best Greek authors. It is used by Euripides in the Medea. Vide desideratissimi Elmsleii notam ad v. 842. But whatever may be the justice of

* The Bishop of Chester has lately affirmed, that several Presbyterian congregations have been “deluded into Unitarianism by the most disingenuous artifices on the part of some of their preachers.” I wish that his Lordship, of whom I have been accustomed to think too favourably to suppose that he has thrown out a random charge without imagining that he has facts to support it, had thought it worth his while to inform us what these artifices have been, and by whom they have been employed. At present the imputation is too vague to be refuted, and, as it falls on no one *individually*, may be supposed to be applicable to many.

these remarks, one thing I well know: that my venerable friend Mr. Belsham, with whose ardour in the pursuit of religious knowledge, and scrupulous care to derive his faith from the Scriptures alone, I have been acquainted for more than forty years, values truth infinitely more than any interpretation of Grotius, or of any other man.

E. COGAN.

SIR,
I EXTRACT from the Missionary Register of this month, under the head of "Abstracts of Addresses at Various Recent Anniversaries," the following lamentation, ascribed to "M. Von Bulow," and said to have been uttered "at the Continental Society Anniversary." Can any of your readers give me information concerning the alarming work here denounced? Orthodoxy, according to M. Von Bulow, would appear to be in a bad plight in Germany.

EPISCOPUS.

You must have heard of Infidel doctrines and books, but I do not know any Antichristian creed which has been so deceitfully introduced, and so systematically taught, as that which is contained in a work called "Hours of Devotion," first published in 1807, in eight volumes, in German, and which has gone through ten editions, and been translated into French and Danish. It is with many their Bible—the instrument to promote true Christianity! I will give only one sentence as a specimen.

In a chapter respecting the different religions, the author says, "The Jew, who cries with devotion in his synagogue to God his Father; the Turk, who, according to the doctrine of his supposed prophet, in the Mosques of the East, bends his forehead to the dust before the Omnipresent; the ignorant Heathen, who, for want of better instruction, elevates his hands to an idol, at the same time that he fervently prays to the corruptible dust, he does not less direct his prayer to the Most High God—these are all sacred to me: they have all one God, to whom they cry, 'Allah,' 'Abba,' 'Father.' They look, with me, with tranquil expectation to the same eternity."

The contents of this work are Christianity without Christ. Deceitful it is, for it speaks seemingly with the greatest reverence of the Redeemer, the Saviour, the Son of God: but even as this only comes to be a peculiar phraseology, so it

makes all the positive declarations of the Bible to be nothing more than metaphors, figures, parables, elegant flourishes, oriental language! The doctrine of a prince of darkness, the author calls blasphemy—the day of judgment, a dream of ignorant men! And this Antichristian religion is taught from the pulpits in the universities and in the schools of the continent.

Critical Synopsis of the Monthly Repository for July, 1824.

R EPORT OF UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION. In my notice of this Association last month, I find I mistook its character and object. In the present Report, its title is carried out at full length—"for protecting the Civil Rights of Unitarians." My few remarks would probably have been more applicable to such an institution as "The Unitarian Fund."

We have been laughed at for using in America the word "influential." I should suppose it was employed in this report by good authority.

Should Unitarianism ever gain the ascendancy in England (and why may it not, even though it be as erroneous as was Henry the Seventh's or Oliver Cromwell's religion?) by all that is Christian in practice, generous in feeling, and just and right in government, do not treat your Trinitarian minority as the majority now have treated you. Do not, by a vote of 105 to 66 in your House of Lords, insist that Mr. Belsham shall marry the Bishop of St. David's or some juvenile Quarterly Reviewer. Do not mock a zealous young Calvinistic couple at the most moving period of their lives with Arian and Humanitarian texts quoted by a cold-blooded Unitarian dignitary. How it would shock them to be obliged to listen to the following form—"Hear what the man Christ Jesus saith, That which God hath joined together," &c.!

On what principle are four of the Association's Committee made ineligible for one year, if they have all attended to their duties with requisite assiduity and punctuality? And why must any proposed alterations be first notified to the Committee?

I am anxious to see what the united energies of all your Unitarian Societies will accomplish. Must not the subscriptions be raised, and thus cut off a large number of associates who

are at present able to contribute only a particular sum to their favourite subdivided pursuit? You must either do great things after this new proposed movement, or the whole Unitarian interest will be likely to sink in character and importance. It will be a critical effort. Will not the objects in view be too multifarious and unwieldy for one body? There must be Sub-committees—but it is impertinent for *me* to be recommending such things.

Letter from Dr. Doyle. To say nothing of a little dimness in the general outline of this writer's positions, his plan seems to me to be absolutely crazy.

G. B. W. on Dr. Priestley's Opinions, has pursued a very neat, and I imagine, successful argument.

Mrs. Hughes on Unitarian Education. I agree with these suggestions. I never think the better of a person, who says that he teaches his children no religious opinions.

Remarks on Matt. xix. 28. Good.

Dr. Hartley's Letter to his Sister. This letter must have been written not long after the author's correspondence with Dr. Priestley alluded to in p. 389. If it were written before that correspondence, the argument of G. B. W. will want support, since in that case Hartley must have already entertained the sentiments which yet Priestley says, he "made appear to Hartley's satisfaction." It would be nearly decisive of their question, if the disputants on this subject in the Repository could ascertain the date of the letter.

Judge Hale, &c. I like this correspondent's modification of the maxim *De mortuis*. The original form of it savours of superstition.

Correspondence between an Unitarian and a Calvinist.

This is the most serious, impassioned, yet argumentative letter that the Unitarian has thus far written. His words, sentiments, and paragraphs flow on in a strain that reminds one of the simple *entraînante* eloquence of Rousseau.

I am sorry to meet with a puerile argument in a series of such masterly reasoning; yet I cannot otherwise regard the writer's attempt to prove that evil persons in the future state ought to be considered *children of*

men, because Abraham called Dives by the appellation child! The whole passage seems like a word-catching, punning proclusion, introduced to overthrow the reader's gravity, rather than strengthen his conviction. I pretend not to instruct this writer in a point of criticism; and therefore presume he must only have forgotten for a moment that *children of men* is a Hebraism, equivalent simply to *men*. It would be useless to urge other critical considerations which exist to the same purpose.

Ought he not to have stopped an instant near the beginning of his letter, where he maintains that "those only shall be saved who do the will of the Father," and have explained how he regards the proposition quoted as consistent with his general belief on the subject? What, too, correspondently with the rest of the letter, does he mean near the close by saying that he is far from being confident as to his final preservation?

Mr. Le Grice on Consistency. This writer incorrectly compares an Unitarian's taking the sacrament to "perjury." The perjurer tells not the world of his mental reservation, nor protests every where aloud against the tyranny which compels him to swear. If he did, his oath would not be taken. So that our reasoner commits the illogical fault of borrowing an illustration from an unanalogous, or rather, a morally impossible case.

"To say that Unitarians may be members of our Church, seems a strange assertion." I can tell you of a fact still stranger. It is, that your Church and Government set up claims which compel honourable and high-minded men to torture themselves into a specious, distressing, and, alas! assailable code of ethics.

"What need of the repeal of any test?" What need of any test?

"If such a system were to prevail, we should trust no one, we should respect no one." Believe it not. It would be the very thing aimed at by the law—a feigned outward consent. All things would go on so quietly, so smoothly. The Church would bear such unresisting sway. You do not make yourselves very anxious and prying concerning the sincerity of more than suspected unbelievers.

"Hooper and Ridley might with

the same consistency have continued in the Church of Rome."

But Unitarians do not pretend that they can be consistent, unless they accompany their compliance with opposite protestations. Had Hooper and Ridley made such an open protest, while complying with Mary's laws, they would have been burned up. They chose to be burned for something worth while.

"The shrewdness of vulgar minds is quick." And therefore there are many more cunning, compliant members of the Church of England, than easy, recluse, studious, conscientious, well-supported theologians are apt to suspect.

But all this, I allow, is only nibbling at the writer's main reasoning, and might be carried on through several other passages of his letter, which are open to cursory remark.

If I could follow up Mr. Le Grice's strongly and ably defended argument, and shew (which I am quite willing to suppose I could not) that it is absolutely untenable, it might prove a much greater disservice to Unitarians and other Nonconformists than would at first thought be imagined. Let him exhibit the inconsistency of conforming Unitarians in its most glaring and convincing light. Let him drive every one of them from his pale. Let the principle of his argument be carried out into its whole legitimate scope and practical effect—and what will become of the Church of England? For, be it remembered, that not Unitarians alone must secede in order to preserve their consistency. Every man in the three kingdoms, who cannot yield a full, unqualified, explicit assent to each of the Thirty-nine Articles—every man who cannot approve cordially of the whole system of rites and ceremonies by law established, must stand aloof, and add a new recruit to the ranks of dissent. If Mr. Le Grice's principle were strictly acted upon, it would in the first place cut off at one blow from the Church all those who regard the Thirty-nine Articles as articles only of peace, and not of positive assent. In the next place, it would huddle together in a separate throng, the not innumerable mass of sceptics and concealed infidels. In the third place, it would arouse to critical examination and re-

flection, and therefore, as we may judge from former experience, in many cases to consequent dissent, that vast herd of unthinking church-goers, who comply with their country's religion, from habit, from patriotism, from convenience, from fashion, from sentiment, and a long catalogue of other acquiescing and self-complacent motives. And after a process so sifting as this, would not Mr. Le Grice's remnant be, like Isaiah's, "very small and feeble"? Perhaps he would prefer a result so pure and unmingled. True. But what then will become of his national religion? Perhaps, however, he would not fear lest his church should constitute a triumphant majority, even though it were to undergo the most jealous and extensive expurgation. He is of course much better acquainted with the subject than myself; yet I have imbibed, I can scarcely enumerate from how many quarters, an entirely different opinion. Our zealous ecclesiastic would not have even a child of an Unitarian exposed to the benign influences of the Establishment. Manfully does he argue the general cause of Unitarians. Indeed, it is a new thing under the sun, and a more remarkable "feature of the age" than Mr. Le Grice pointed out in his June communication, that a member of the Church of England should undertake to winnow his mother-pale from every particle of inconsistency or other exceptionable chaff which the winds may have lodged within it. Let him go on, and he will have the prayers and good wishes of every Dissenter in the realm. He is no seeker, I presume, of ecclesiastical promotion. The powers that be, would scarcely thank him for introducing a wedge, which, if allowed fairly to operate, must very soon overthrow the Church from its lowest foundations.

Mr. J. P. Smith in Reply to Chenevière. How much soever M. Chenevière may be in the wrong, and I have formerly allowed that there were some unjustifiable things in his Defence, yet it is very evident Mr. Smith is not the man to take him to task. Such an exhibition of prejudice and irritation I have scarcely ever witnessed. How imprudently this writer lays himself open at almost every sentence! We have an author in America, be-

tween whom and Mr. Smith there seems to be a strong sympathetic resemblance. I allude to Dr. Miller. Both are Calvinists; both champions of their cause; both smooth as oil; but containing under a sweet and fair exterior of style, a miserable bitterness, which seems to partake almost of the spirit of that malignant personification in whom they believe, and of whom they profess to be afraid. But Dr. Miller, I allow, quite beats his competitor in this last-mentioned quality. He is a great deal more liquid, but a great deal more acrid, and presents an unrivaled specimen of that smiling and hating, caressing and stabbing, praying and denouncing, blessing and cursing, weeping and vindictive compound, which is seldom seen on this earth, but in a few rare instances of exquisite and essential Calvinism.

It is an amusing spectacle to witness Orthodoxy reading lectures to Unitarianism against intolerance. Providence, I believe, has lately permitted one or two little "fantastic tricks" to be played in the insignificant canton of Geneva for three purposes; partly, to shew how the most remote and unexpected evil influences must necessarily spring from ecclesiastical establishments of an originally intolerant character; partly to suggest the great solemn doctrine of a moral retribution going on even in this world; but principally, by exciting the clamorous and sympathetic indignation of orthodox Christians throughout Europe, to push home into their very bosoms a living personal lesson of the wickedness of persecution, bigotry and uncharitableness, and mercifully to entrap them into improvement by a condemnation drawn out of their own mouths. Whoever reads Mr. Smith's letters to M. Chenevière, must perceive, that while a few rough blows descend upon the shoulders of his immediate victim, and many more of them take no effect upon him, the most vigorous and searching lashes of his scorpion fall far beyond, arousing all the echoes with the shrieks of guilty and startled orthodoxy.

Was ever challenge so mad as that wherein this writer dares the Professor of Theology at Geneva to present citations that may justify his faithful representations of Calvinism? A si-

milar challenge was thrown down in this country at Professor Norton, of Cambridge. But, before long, that learned writer brought out a mass of extracts from the most authentic and received Calvinistic divines, which actually frightened and surprised his rash opponents, and either reduced them to utter silence, or compelled them to shift altogether their ground of attack. Mr. Smith, I think, must have for one moment forgotten into what an awful magazine he has presumed to cast his contemptuous spark.

Bigotry of the Evangelical Magazine. The P.S. of this contributor suggests a very apt illustration of the subject I have last touched upon.

Correspondence between Mr. Howe and Lord Erskine. A green spot, on which I have breathed, and feel refreshed.

Review. Worsley on Nonconformity. Being myself a descendant from the Nonconformists of England, I need not very strongly assure the Reviewer with what gratification I have perused his interesting article. Mr. Worsley's production, I should think, was fortunately timed in appearing nearly at the same period with Mr. Southey's engaging and specious *Book of the Church*. (Woe worth the affected title!)

Musæ Solitariae. It is to be hoped your correspondent is not so entirely absorbed in the practice of music as to prevent his giving us more of his discriminating and tasteful speculations. A department occasionally devoted to sacred music and other fine arts would not be inappropriate to the general purposes of the Repository. Many useful remarks might be made on such subjects, and a true taste in consequence be extensively encouraged and preserved.

Poetry. Thoughts on the Influences of Religion. And it is poetry.

Satiric Fragment on the Trinity. I once saw a proposition of Euclid (Book I. Theor. 5) rendered into verse. A theological argument in poetry on the Trinity seems to belong to an analogous class of literature. But there is both talent and wit in this fragment. Is it a compliment or otherwise to say, that many things about it render it worthy of being imagined a suppressed portion of Don Juan?

Sonnet. The author is quite justified in subscribing his name (Joseph Dare) to this inspired effusion. He will forgive me for an odd speculation which his signature suggested to my mind. "How dare you deliver me such a paper?" said Charles II. to a person who presented him with a petition in behalf of the abridged liberties of the people. "Sir," replied he, "my name is DARE." "For this reply, but under other pretences," says Hume, "he had been tried, fined, and committed to prison. The Commons addressed the King for his liberty, and for remitting his fine." The boldness of this promising young Sonneteer, in giving the public his name, and particularly, his connexion with the Whiggish Monthly Repository, inspired me with an idle imagination that he might be a direct descendant from the quick-witted patriot of olden time.

Obituary. Here are noticed three venerable men, who had advanced beyond the septuagenarian limit, and died in the profession of our pure faith. Hallowed be their memories, and diligent their successors to follow in their worthy footsteps!

Is it customary to meet in the Gentleman's Magazine with sentiments so liberal as those contained in the extracted notice of Baron Maseres?

Intelligence. Manchester College. An Institution so admirably organized and administered as this appears to be, must sooner or later occupy a commanding space in the attention and patronage of an enlightened age.

Kent and Sussex Association, &c. &c. What other sects in England, beside the Unitarians, hold these social religious meetings, where both sexes unite in improving and decent conviviality?

At Ipswich, I observe that only about twenty ladies graced the presence of sixty gentlemen or more. I trust this is not a symptom of the relative proportion of Unitarianism between the sexes in that neighbourhood. Is the softer part of creation there afraid to speculate in controversy? Or did the retiring habits of the majority keep them away from the festive board? In America, it is true that some of our most virulent Trinitarians are among the females, and often do they scratch a man's reputa-

VOL. XX.

3 E

tion out of favour with astonishing adroitness and success. But, generally speaking, our Unitarian places of public worship exhibit a generous moiety of attendants from among the daughters of Adam, and not infrequently the proportion is greater still.

Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty. Mr. Wilks is a Niagara of eloquence. Let me ask, what I think I asked in connexion with the Unitarian Association before, how is the Protestant Society to maintain its ground, if the Catholic Association of Ireland is to be put down? Wherein do the two Institutions differ, in point of principle? Does your Legislature proceed on supposed immediate expediency, or on broad general principles?

New Publications, &c. I desiderate a short, compressed, faithful account of every one of these publications. Has there ever existed a Review confined entirely to this simple plan? The catalogues of the old Critical and Monthly are far from satisfying me. Aikin's Annual Review approached in some particulars nearer to my conception. Some of the German Reviews almost hit it. Perhaps such a work would be too little discursive for the popular taste; perhaps one half of the books published are unworthy of a description; and the affair, to be faithfully and thoroughly done, would require too many contributors for the common run of encouragement.

*Kenilworth,
June 18, 1825.*

SIR,
MY feelings of indignation were not a little roused, on reading, in your last Number, (p. 305,) the following prelude to the "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."

My indignation was roused, I say, Sir, that in this 19th century, when the world has made such astonishing progress in theological, as well as in every other kind of knowledge, any writer should be found, who would allow himself to give credit to a supposition which has not, I will venture to say, even a shadow of evidence to support it. True it is, Sir, that Mary

Magdalene *has been supposed* to be "the woman who was a sinner," mentioned in the 7th chapter of Luke; true it is, that this supposition has been countenanced by the Editors of our Common Version, who have inserted in their summary of this chapter, the words, "Mary Magdalene anointeth Christ's feet;" true it is also, that the great masters of painting have commonly given to their representations of penitent females the appellation of Magdalenes; and that the same name has been, and still continues to be, applied to houses for the reception of women of infamous character, who have become penitent. But what does all this prove? It proves nothing at all, but that the name of a most pure and virtuous woman has been most unjustly traduced. It might have been expected, Sir, that when your correspondent at Crediton recollected how Mary Magdalene accompanied her beloved Saviour, "through every city and village;" how she "ministered to him of her substance;" how she followed him up from Galilee to Jerusalem, at the last passover; stood by him when he was hanging on the cross; "sat over against the sepulchre" where his body was deposited; brought spices to embalm it; ran to tell Peter and John that it was taken away, and that she knew not where it was laid; and was the very first person to whom our Lord appeared after his resurrection;* —it might, I say, have been expected that, when your correspondent recollected all these unequivocal signs of no ordinary excellence, he would have paused before he hazarded a single word which was injurious to a character so venerable. But no! it was enough for him, that he had found a subject for his muse; and on this subject (though that which gave it all its point, was, as he himself confesses, a mere *supposition*) he forthwith sits down to write. Without allowing himself even a few minutes to consult a Concordance, and examine whether the supposition had any good foundation or not, he sits down and asperses the character of a most amiable wo-

* See Luke viii. 1—3; Matt. xxvii. 55, 56, 61; Mark xv. 40, 41, 47, xvi. 1; Luke xxiii. 49, 55, 56, xxiv. 1; John xix. 25, xx. 1—18; Mark xvi. 9.

man, who has every claim upon our esteem and veneration. As well might he have written "a hymn to the *ever-blessed* and *most adorable* Trinity," on the *supposition* that the Trinity is a doctrine of the Bible; for there is quite as little evidence that Mary Magdalene was what she has so often been represented to be, as there is, that the doctrine of the Trinity is contained in the New Testament.

But what is the origin of this error, it will be asked? It arose, I conceive, in this way. It has been supposed, that "the woman who was a sinner," mentioned in the 7th chapter of Luke, as having anointed our Lord with ointment, was the same with Mary, the sister of Lazarus, who is recorded in John xii. 1—8, xi. 2; Matt. xxvi. 6—13; and Mark xiv. 3—9, to have done the same thing; and it has also been supposed that Mary Magdalene and Mary, the sister of Lazarus, were one and the same person. But both these suppositions are totally destitute of foundation. The woman mentioned by Luke was not Mary, the sister of Lazarus; for, 1st, the latter was a woman of good character, of unblemished reputation. 2dly, The anointing, mentioned by Luke, was done at Nain, Capernaum, or some other place in Galilee; but Mary, the sister of Lazarus, dwelt at Bethany, and her anointing was done there. 3dly, The anointing, mentioned by Luke, was in the early part of Christ's ministry, for it is recorded in the 7th chapter of his Gospel; and it is said, chap. viii. 1, that "*afterward* he went through every city and village preaching;" but the anointing spoken of by the other Evangelists, is placed by one of them, *six*, (John xii. 1,) and by the others, only *two* days (Matt. xxvi. 2; Mark xiv. 1) before the passover, at which our Lord was crucified. 4thly, The circumstances are very different, for, in Luke, it is Simon the Pharisee* who takes offence at our Lord's

* It is little to the purpose to say, that the name of the *host*, on both occasions, was Simon; for, on the one, it was Simon, a Pharisee; on the other, Simon the leper; and the name was very common among the Jews. We have no fewer than *nine* Simons mentioned in the New Testament. Vide Schleusner sub voce Σίμων; vide etiam Cler. et Hammond in loco.

suffering himself to be touched by a woman who had been a sinner; in John (xii. 4) it is Judas, one of the disciples,* who murmurs at the expense; and our Lord's vindications of himself on the two occasions are quite different.

Nor is the other supposition better founded, namely, that Mary Magdalene and Mary, the sister of Lazarus, were one and the same person. That they were different persons is clear from these considerations: 1st, Mary Magdalene was so called from a town situated on the shores of the Sea of Galilee; Lazarus and his sisters were inhabitants of Bethany, near Jerusalem. 2dly, Mary Magdalene is several times named with other women, who attended our Lord in some of his journeys, and came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, at the last pass-over; but Lazarus and his sisters resided at Bethany, nor do we read of any attendance which either of those sisters gave our Lord, except at the place of their ordinary residence. 3dly, Mary Magdalene is particularly mentioned with others, whom our Lord had miraculously healed of their infirmities; and out of her, it is said, went seven demons; but nothing of this kind is either said or hinted, of Mary, the sister of Lazarus. Thus does it appear, that Mary Magdalene was not the same with Mary, the sister of Lazarus; and *much less* was she the same with the woman mentioned in Luke, the 7th chapter.† Such,

* Matthew (xxvi. 8) says "When *his* disciples saw it, they had indignation," &c.; and Mark, (xiv. 4,) "There were *some* that had indignation within themselves," &c.; but the difference involves no contradiction.

† It is truly surprising, that both Dr. Whitby and Dr. Priestley, though both possessing right views on this subject, should still retain so much of the vulgar error, as to give the name of *Mary* to the woman mentioned in Luke. Dr. Whitby says, "This *Mary* was a woman of that city, i. e. either of Nain or Capernaum, the only cities mentioned here; whereas Mary, the sister of Lazarus, was of no city, but of the town or village of Bethany." Dr. Priestley has this note on Luke vii. 37: "This city was certainly in Galilee, for Jesus was not yet gone to Judea; and therefore this *Mary* could not, as some have supposed, be Mary, the sister of

then, and so unfounded, is the supposition in question. A *more* unfounded one, your readers will, I think, agree with me, never entered into the head of the most fanciful theologian, in the darkest times of Gothic ignorance. When your poetical correspondent reads the above, he will, I am sure, regret that he has contributed to perpetuate an atrocious calumny; and I will venture to hope that, in future, he will seek subjects for his muse, in the rich fields of nature, and in the pages of authentic and well-ascertained history, instead of having recourse to *suppositions*, which are at once unfounded and injurious.

I conclude with recommending him to read a beautiful little paper of Mrs. Cappe's in her "Reflections on the Public Ministry of Christ" (sect. xxiii.); and Dr. Lardner's "Letter to Jonas Hanway, Esq.,"* from which, indeed, part of the above has been abridged.

A Query.

SIR,
JESUS is reported to have said to his disciples, previous to his ascension to heaven, that there were "things written in the *Psalms* concerning him." (Luke xxiv. 44.) If some one of the learned and candid writers, whose contributions adorn your miscellany, will state which are those passages in the *Psalms* wherein the writers can, by any obvious and unstrained mode of interpretation, be considered to have had the future advent of the Messiah in view at the time of composing them, he will confer a favour on one who is

ALMOST A CHRISTIAN.

SIR,
I HAVE been struck with a trio of circumstances similar to each other in one respect, but exceedingly unlike in others, which have taken place within a few years, and which will

Lazarus, who was of Bethany, near Jerusalem. Nor is it at all probable that it was Mary Magdalene." But where, it may be asked, is there a particle of evidence to prove that her name was *Mary* at all? As well may we suppose it to have been Martha, or Anna, or any thing else.

* Inserted in his Works, Vol. XI. 8vo.

probably excite the admiration and regret of your readers, as they have mine. A due consideration of them may operate as a caution against the reprehensible conduct which they evince, and be of essential service to society in the way of instruction and advice.

A preacher of unpopular doctrines having been appointed to harangue a congregation from the rostrum on such subjects as his and their sentiments of religion warranted him to do, took occasion in his primary address, or in one very soon after his inauguration, to assure them that he would never be deterred from speaking out what he deemed true, without restraint or reserve, let who would be offended at his freedom, or accuse him of his carrying speculation to excess and extravagance. Having given an ample outline of the topics on which he meant to insist, he declared his intention, in the most solemn manner, of never declining to discuss them as occasion might offer, and to confirm them by arguments the most convincing that should suggest themselves to him, and in language the most explicit and forcible he could adopt. But not content with the most positive and unrestricted asseveration of his purpose, he concluded with affirming in the exact form of words used by those who bind themselves by the awful sanction of an oath, that he would uniformly preach in the manner he had described, "*So help him, God!*" It is unnecessary to say precisely where or when this was done; suffice it to observe that it was in a large manufacturing town, before a considerable and not unenlightened audience, and by a young man who had enjoyed the advantages of a learned education of the second class, and who was himself no mean proficient in biblical lore and general knowledge.

A second instance of a voluntary and uncalled-for use of the same form is still so fresh in the recollection of the public, that it will not be requisite to allude to it in more than a few words. It was at the close of a defence set up by a person of respectable family, who stood at the bar of justice charged with the perpetration of a deliberate and barbarous murder. He had accumulated a variety of instances professing to be taken from

the records of criminal law, from which it appeared that mere circumstantial evidence against a prisoner was not to be relied on so as to justify a condemnatory verdict, even when it assumed the most specious and plausible aspect. Distrusting, however, the operation of this address on the minds of the jury, he appealed in the most confident manner to the Searcher of hearts in support of his innocence, and declared in the firmest and most determined tone, that he was guiltless of the crime laid to his charge, "*So help him, God!*"

The third instance is still more recent than the one just mentioned, and the impression it made upon many minds was more deep, and probably will be more lasting, than that made by the preceding cases. A prince of royal blood, pleading the eventual scruples of his conscience, should he ever succeed to the throne, and lamenting the suffering which the agitation of a certain question had excited in the bosom of his venerable sire, assured the august assembly to which he had presented a petition from a clerical body against the claims of Catholic Christians, that for his part he never would concede those claims, that he would oppose them upon every occasion of their assertion, and that he would invariably refuse his concurrence with every proposition of this sort, "*So help him, God!*" It is very singular that three such very dissimilar characters should, upon three very dissimilar occasions, agree in this one point of having recourse to the language of an oath in confirmation of their purposes and intentions, thus overlooking the prohibition of the divine law, which requires men to "*let their yea be yea, and their nay, nay,*" and solemnly pronounces in regard to antijudicial proceedings at least, "*that whatever is more than this cometh of evil.*" The preacher's act reminds one of the offence which Henry the Seventh alleged against a nobleman by whom he had been entertained, namely, that "*of violating his laws in his very presence.*"

Whatever may be pleaded in extenuation of the conduct of the criminal grounded on the strong and deep-seated love of life, in the second case, no words can express the horrid enor-

mity of a solemn, public appeal to Heaven in attestation of what was utterly false, and known to be so by the appellant. To what higher degree of iniquity than this can any man proceed? What addition of criminality can be made to such behaviour? What more flagrant example can be adduced of impiously hurling defiance against the authority of the Almighty?

It is manifest that in this case adjuration was resorted to from a suspicion that asseveration of itself, however strongly worded and boldly pronounced, would be insufficient to convince those whom the speaker was most anxious to convince; and it is much to be feared that a suspicion of this kind lurks in the breast of all who imitate this example. Some, indeed, may be inclined to carry their fears even farther, and think there is some ground to apprehend a want of that integrity of which a truly honest mind is conscious, and a desire to conceal it from others the more easily and securely to carry on the work of deceit and dissimulation. The third case was accompanied with circumstances so different from those of the preceding ones, as to preclude any palliation of it on the score either of youth, or the dread of death. The juror was mature in years, well experienced in the ways of mankind, not accused of any offence, moving in a very exalted sphere, and enjoying privileges which fall to the share of a very small portion of the human race. Could such an one feel within himself a distrust of the people's reliance upon his word, especially when every word proceeding out of such a mouth must be a word of *honour*? Or shall any one presume to indulge a thought for a moment that there existed the slenderest degree of conscious insincerity? Now, as the declaration referred to a line of conduct designed to be taken and persisted in for the future, it may without any impropriety be viewed in the light of a vow, or an engagement entered into with the Powers above for a special purpose. But it might have occurred to the prince, that, as we are all the creatures of circumstances, no one can tell under what view he may behold the very same case, accompanied, as it eventually may be, with extremely varied circumstances. It is impossible to ascertain

the evils that may arise from the declaration of a purpose never to be altered; evils both to others and the party himself; evils which may involve posterity in the most fearful calamities, and occasion infinite regret to the author of them. When men are cut off from all hope of attaining advantages to which they deem themselves justly entitled, they are sometimes driven to measures of which they would not have entertained the most distant thought so long as the smallest glimmering of hope remained. Despair prompts them to outrages of the most alarming kind; they believe that, let them act as they will, their condition cannot be deteriorated, and in such a state it affords them pleasure to be able to revenge themselves upon their opponents, though without the least chance of benefiting themselves. It is a consideration of the most serious nature, that if so tremendous an evil as war, for instance, should be excited by the refusal of just and reasonable claims, the horrible consequences of it must be chargeable on him from whom this refusal emanates. It is scarcely possible to concede too much where the concession would insure peace and prevent the calamities of bloodshed; but it is a most melancholy thought that wars have arisen, and may again arise, from a partial leaning to one set of men, and a denial of common justice to others. The illustrious personage who confirmed his determination to resist the petition of millions feeling themselves aggrieved and injured by the language of an oath, will, most probably, one day regret his precipitancy, his violation of that simplicity of language which religion enjoins, his countenancing by his example an unnecessary and therefore irreverent appeal to Heaven, and his pledging himself to a course of conduct which he cannot reconcile to the principles of the faith he professes, and from which he cannot recede without violating his word, staining his honour, and exposing himself to the pity of some, the contempt of others, and the concurrent disapprobation of his countrymen and his own conscience.

OTAIOTAINAINAIOΣ.

The late Dr. Rees on the Moral State of Man by Nature.

[Amongst Dr. Rees's MSS., his executors have found the following paper which they have kindly put into our hands. It was evidently drawn up for the Monthly Repository, but probably withheld from the writer's well-known disinclination to theological controversy. Being designed and preserved as an explanation of his opinion on an important subject, there is now, we conceive, no impropriety in its publication. The Reviewer of Dr. Rees's Sermons in our XVIth Vol. pp. 610, 611, had pointed out a passage which he thought objectionable as savouring of the doctrine of hereditary depravity, which he was persuaded the enlightened author did not intend to inculcate. This gave occasion to these "Queries." Ed.]

Queries addressed to the candid Reviewer of Rees's Practical Sermons.

I. **D**ID man suffer any injury either in his mental or corporeal frame by the introduction of sin, and, as I conceive, of death, into the world? Have we not reason to believe, that if man had not sinned, he would not have known death? Does one evil, converted ultimately indeed into a benefit, follow the other; and is it not reasonable to imagine, that it would have been prevented in a state of innocence? By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin.

II. Was not the constitution of man, or human nature, as far at least as it depends upon the material part, *vitiating* or impaired by the influence of sin and death?

III. Are not the senses and passions and instincts of the frame of man, depending upon the connexion of mind with matter, in a more disordered state and more susceptible of impressions and biasses unfavourable to rectitude of judgment, volition, and conduct, than they would have been, if man had retained his innocence and his *corporeal health*, if I may so call it, soundness and vigour?

IV. Was not sin a kind of disease of the human frame; and did not the seeds of this disease live, and a degree of tendency to disorder, if not disorder itself, remain? And was it not transmitted from one generation

to another? Upon this supposition I am able to understand and explain the language of Scripture in many passages, which would be otherwise of difficult interpretation. If this be the state of man, a certain degree of infelicity attends it (but no demerit or guilt), which is amply compensated and repaired by the dispensations of Providence and the grace of the gospel, of which intimations were given soon after the evil commenced.

V. Have we not observed, that certain dispositions are connected with and result from certain constitutions? What is the *sin that easily besets us*, the well-circumstanced sin, the sin to which some persons are naturally inclined, or the master-passion in the mortal frame of man? This constitutional propensity disposes some persons to one sin more than to others, and all more or less to some gratification which, though not at first culpable, soon becomes criminal and guilty, and needs correction and restraint.

VI. Would not inclinations so unfavourable and even hostile to virtue spring up more readily, and be more cherished and indulged, in such a state of body and mind, than in a constitution unimpaired, or not vitiated, by sin and death?

VII. Although in these inclinations, or yet their first rise, there is nothing criminal or culpable, yet are they not more likely to become impediments to virtue and injurious to it, than if man had been introduced into the world in a different state? As the instruments of virtue by which it acts, and by means of which it is maintained or obstructed in its exercise, are they not more or less favourable to a right conduct than if the human frame were differently constituted? This state of human nature I denominate the degeneracy of mankind, using that term rather than depravity, to which, however, I have no objection, because it has been technically abused and misapplied; but sinfulness or guilt has been unjustly charged upon it. Imputation of sin and culpable depravity are terms I never use, because they express opinions which I have not entertained for more than half a century.

VIII. Appealing to fact and experience, do we not find that at a very early period instincts and passions

manifest themselves, which require not only direction, but restraint and government, because they would otherwise lead to moral evil and culpable conduct? I will not say that these are evil; but they are separated from evil by a very thin partition, and a very slight deviation towards excess would subject them to this denomination. They need being attentively watched and sedulously guarded:—and is not this the important object, and does it not furnish occasion for exhibiting the great benefit, of early education? Let those who have had children, whose dispositions they have diligently noticed, or who recollect what they themselves experienced in the earliest operations of their minds, consider and answer these questions.

That we should be introduced into the world in this state is no more an objection against Providence than that we should be placed in a state of probation, and attain to the happiness of virtue by previous exercise and trial. The great and good Being who has made us what we are and placed us in the stations which we occupy, has rendered our nature and condition infinitely improvable. If we labour under a moral disease, on account of which he will impute no blame to us, he has mercifully provided a sufficient remedy; and all the disadvantages resulting from our nature and state, as we are social beings, will sooner or later be abundantly compensated.

Unitarian Booksellers and Publishers.

Maidstone, June 13, 1825.

“Profound and glowing thought, though breathing only from the silent page, excites a kind of omnipotent and omnipresent energy.”

DR. CHANNING.

SIR,

THOSE who believe Unitarianism to be the doctrine of the gospel, in which class, it is presumed, may be included a large majority of your readers, will readily listen to any suggestions for the more extensive diffusion of its sacred doctrines. After all that has been attempted to be done by preaching and by conferences, by private conversation and public dispute, I am persuaded that no mode of spreading truth so effectual has been

discovered, as by bringing into action the energies of *the Press*. We are daily hearing, and justly too, of the wonderful influence of this mighty engine, in the destruction of the strong holds of political tyranny. The British and Foreign Bible Society have finely exemplified the vast importance of the same machinery, and its incomparably greater utility when leagued with Christian truth. Why then shall not the British and Foreign Unitarian Society recently formed, and upon which all the friends of our cause will, I trust, implore the Divine blessing, have an eye to the same invaluable instrument; and, occupied as it will probably be in missionary exertions and epistolary communications, let the diffusion of the most complete, candid, and courteous defences of our doctrine in books, form a particular object of its fostering care? To this end it is not sufficient that an author should labour. A publisher is in these days as necessary as an author.

If the plan cannot otherwise be accomplished, I would propose that a part of the resources of the British and Foreign Unitarian Society be directed to the establishment of a bookseller in the most eligible situations, for the propagation of the Unitarian doctrine. The services of such persons faithfully devoted to the cause, without any apprehensions of worldly loss, will be incalculable to our common interests. And when such a coadjutor is not to be found, it is not to be expected that truth will make the progress which we desire: e. g. I believe it to be the fact, that there is no bookseller, either in Glasgow or Edinburgh, who will run all the risks to which he would be exposed by daily presenting some of our ablest Unitarian books in his shop-window. In some of the towns of England, where, however, the risk to a bookseller is much less, our Unitarian societies are alike destitute of this advantage. This ought to be looked into, and one would think that in many cases the deficiency might be supplied. When Unitarian books are sent for sale, it should be insisted on, that they be *fairly* and *regularly* presented to the public view, with the new works of the day.—Before I close, I will say a few words on Unitarian *publishers*, who may or may not be

booksellers. Every effort in our denomination should be made to encourage and indemnify such, for we cannot suppose that the time is come when public patronage will entirely supersede the necessity of private recommendation. Has the valuable edition of Dr. Priestley's Works met with all the encouragement and *timely* attention which its vast importance to generations yet unborn so richly deserves? Has the sale of the Examination of the Charges of Archbishop Magee, yet justified the learned author in undertaking his more direct reply to the doctrine of Atonement and Sacrifice? Or has the sale of the principal scriptural work issuing from the British press in the present century, viz. Belsham's Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, remunerated the *publisher*, as he may reasonably expect from so wealthy a body as the Unitarians? The object of these remarks will be answered, if a determination is strengthened to promote the *publication* and *disposal* of able works, which explain the Bible according to the Unitarian scheme. Thanks to the labours of Lardner, Wakefield, Priestley, Lindsey, Kenrick, Belsham and Wellbeloved, &c., this is not a vain attempt.

B. M.

*Christian Prayers and Discourses;
an Extract from an American Sermon.*

SIR,

PERMIT me to occupy a small portion of your valuable pages, by giving an extract from a Sermon delivered at the opening of the Congregational Church, in Salem, Massachusetts, on the 7th December last, by the Rev. Henry Colman. It contains sentiments worthy to be recorded in golden characters. The entire sermon is replete with good sense and earnest piety, and, I am glad to find, has lately been reprinted in Liverpool.

H. T.

"Serious prayers are not those elegant and eloquent addresses to an audience of which we sometimes hear the world speak in terms that make our hearts ache; but they are the simple and unaffected effusions of a grateful, humble, and devout soul,

when it places itself in the conscious presence of God, and comes to hold communion with the Father of our spirits; and when, overwhelmed with the recollection of God's goodness, mercy, and forbearance, it presses forward with the feeble offering of thanksgiving, and, trembling and humbled under a conviction of its own sinfulness, ingratitude, and defective obedience, in the spirit of the prodigal it pleads for mercy for itself, and for those frail, imperfect and sinful creatures in the same condemnation, whose feelings and purposes it endeavours to utter before God.

"Serious sermons are not those rhetorical and philosophical orations, which dazzle us by the beauty of their imagery, or confound us by the abstruseness of their speculations, and leave us only in admiration of the talents of the speaker; nor those beautiful and superficial moral essays on the nature of virtue and vice which fall upon the heart like the rays of a December noon; nor those learned displays of biblical criticism concerning some disputed reading, which, however useful to the theological student in his closet, only serve to unsettle the faith and lessen the reverence of common Christians for the Scriptures themselves; nor philosophical defences of the gospel against objections which never entered into the imagination of any but the vain man, who wishes to display his skill in their refutation; nor vindictive denunciations of the sentiments and characters of Christians who differ from you, which only serve to inflame the worst passions of man, and bring to our remembrance, with feelings of extreme mortification for our present degeneracy, the times when it was said by the Hearthen of the disciples of Jesus, 'Behold, how these Christians love one another!' nor those pourings forth of unintelligible jargon, and those darkenings of counsel by words without knowledge, concerning points of faith, which, according to Milton, furnished a subject of interminable discussion to the spirits of Pandemonium; where

"Others apart sat on a hill retired,
In thoughts more elevate and reasoned high
Of Providence, foreknowledge, will,
and fate;

Fixt fate, free-will, foreknowledge absolute,
And found no end, in wandering mazes lost.'

"But serious sermons are such reasonings concerning righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, as made a Felix tremble; or such words of truth and soberness as almost persuaded Agrippa to become a Christian; or such appeals to the common sense and consciences of men, as when Jesus demanded of his hearers, why they did not of themselves judge what was right; or such illustrations of the great principles of human duty, drawn from the relations of life, as are given in the story of the Good Samaritan; or such lessons of humility as we find in the parable of the Pharisee and Publican; or such melting appeals to the best feelings of our nature, and such affecting exhibitions of the tenderness and mercy of God, as are displayed in that most beautiful, touching, and instructive of all parables, the Prodigal Son; or such plain and practical rules of duty as are inculcated in the Sermon on the Mount. Serious sermons, in fine, are those simple, perspicuous, direct addresses to the understandings and consciences of men, which make them forget the preacher and think of themselves; which shew them what is obligatory, and what is practicable; which press the authority and motives of the gospel upon them in all their force; which lead men to extend their views and live for God and for eternity, and which compel men to ask themselves often and most seriously, 'What shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?'"

SIR,

I AM so little accustomed to the language of praise, that I feel an awkwardness little consonant with the consciousness that I merit it. I must not, however, dissemble that I am truly grateful to your American Correspondent (p. 324) for his remarks on my *Illustrations*, and the more so as the critic is far beyond ordinary writers.

The parable of the Unjust Steward is very difficult, and was but imperfectly comprehended by me when I wrote my ill-fated book, the *Illustrations of the Four Gospels*. I will now give a more adequate view of that parable, referring the reader to it in

VOL. XX.

3 F

Luke xvi. 1—10. It was usual with rich proprietors of lands to divide their domains into distinct parcels, and assign each to a tenant, who recompensed the owner, not by a stated sum of money, as in modern times, but by a certain proportion of the produce. The term *debtor*, therefore, corresponds with what we call a *tenant*, and his *debt* to an *annual rent*. These tenants had their farms secured to them by leases, and a person was appointed, whose office it was to grant them, and to collect the rents or debts when due. This officer, from his concern in his master's affairs, received the name of *οικονομος*, a *domestic manager* or *steward*. The measure of oil was probably a *bath*, which consisted of seven or eight of our *gallons*; the measure of wheat, an *homer*, which comprehends seven or eight bushels. Such was the custom which supplied what may be called the machinery of the parable. Its design, which is obscure, is best learnt from the context. Our Lord at this time was in the house of a Pharisee, where he was invited to an entertainment. The publicans and sinners, most of whom probably were Gentiles, pressed around to hear his discourse, and the Scribes and Pharisees expressed their displeasure at the kind attention which he paid those despised but well-disposed persons. This led him to predict the conversion of the Gentiles, under the figure of a sheep for a time lost, but after a diligent search, recovered, Luke xv. 3. The same idea he pursues and delineates, with still more tenderness and beauty, in the parable of the Prodigal Son. The transition from the recovery of the Heathens to the apostacy of the Jews, was natural. Accordingly in this parable, which is the third on the occasion, he describes under the similitude of a *faithless steward* the conduct of the Jewish teachers in regard to the people. In this point of light, the parable is just and beautiful. It is then levelled against the Scribes and Pharisees, or the established priesthood of Judea, who, as teachers of religion, were managers of the temple, and stewards between God and his chosen people.

The propriety of the parable rests on two points: the first is, its fitness to the character and conduct of the

priests; the second, the degradation and ills that awaited those wicked men by the destruction of the Jewish hierarchy, which our Lord foresaw, and of which he spoke as if it had already taken place. When the steward found that he was to be called to an account, and to be stripped of his office, "he called every one of his lord's debtors, and said unto the first, How much owest thou unto thy master? And he said, An hundred measures of oil. And he said unto him, Take thy bill, and sit down quickly, and write fifty. Then he said to another, And how much owest thou? And he said, An hundred measures of wheat. And he said, Take thy bill, and write four-score. And the master commended the unjust steward because he had done wisely."

Two questions here present themselves, the solution of which is attended with serious difficulties: In what respect could the conduct of the unjust steward in ordering the debt to be diminished, correspond with that of the Jewish priest? And how could his master commend him for his wisdom at the very moment when he was degrading him for injustice and faithlessness? The answer to the first of these questions is furnished by the charge which our Lord elsewhere brings against these men, namely, "They bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders." These heavy burdens were certain rites and observances which they enjoined on the authority of Moses or of God. The pretended object for these was zeal for religion; but the true end was, under the mask of religion, to gratify their avarice and ambition. Here they acted precisely like the rapacious steward of a beneficent master, who wished to let his estate to people on reasonable terms and consistent with their good. But the steward in his perfidy frustrates this benevolent intention of his master. He raises the rents to an exorbitant demand, and puts the extra charge in his own pocket. In the end, however, his unjust dealings are brought to light, and he goes to the several tenants and requires them to reduce their respective debts to the standard which might correspond with the just claims of his master, wishing, however, it to be

understood that he did this from his own good-will to the debtors, whereas in reality it was to meet the scrutiny or penury that awaited him. Though his motive, like the rest of his conduct, was crafty and unjust, the reduction of the rent to each tenant was in itself perfectly just, and in this view deserved the commendation bestowed upon him by his benevolent master. But how was this reduction likely to serve him in his degraded state? How likely to provide for his wants? Here the calamities which awaited the Jewish priests emerge before the eyes of Jesus. He sees their hierarchy and their rich endowments destroyed—he sees them, precisely like the French emigrants at the late Revolution, scattered in foreign countries, begging their bread, and claiming subsistence from the pittance of their own people, and that under the pretence that, as they no longer contributed to the religious establishment of their country, they owed the ministers who still survived among them, whatever small portion they had it in their power to pay. Thus the old steward, not willing to allow that he was steward no longer, founded his claims for maintenance on the removal of a burden which was effected sorely against his will, and imposed by his covetousness.

But how does the sequel accord with the parable? "And I say unto you, make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, that when ye fail they may receive you into everlasting habitations. He that is faithful in that which is least, is faithful also in much: and he that is unjust in the least, is unjust also in much. If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true riches? And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another man's, who shall give you that which is your own?" These words are not only difficult but incomprehensible, as they are totally inapplicable to the case of the steward whom Jesus was addressing. The difficulty arises from a circumstance peculiar to the situation of the speaker, which we should not have felt, had we been present. From the beginning of the chapter to the eighth verse, Christ addressed himself to the *old* steward, who stood on one hand. Having finished his case, he

turns, as was natural, to him who was to be the *new* steward, that is, the disciples who were on the other hand. He knew the errors to which they were then liable, and he reads them a lesson as to the conduct they should pursue in their new office, that is, in the propagation of his religion. He had already directed them to part with all they had, and follow him: they saw moreover the sad effects of avarice in the old steward, and they were in danger of running into the *opposite* extreme of total carelessness of, or contempt for, worldly things. This propensity our Lord observes, and he guards them against it. His words are to this effect: "Though called upon as my apostles to be above the love of the world, you are not to despise worldly goods or to neglect that prudence and industry by which you may turn the temporal blessings of Providence to the best advantage. When you travel from one place to another in preaching my gospel, do not despise, either as publicans and sinners, or as heathens, those whom you address, nor withhold from them that tribute of respect which they may claim as men of rank and wealth. Copy not the pride and avarice, but the industry and sagacity of the Pharisees in the prosecution of your cause. Use every innocent means to conciliate men to you, and avail yourselves of their good-will and a sense of the obligations you confer upon them, to procure subsistence and hospitality when you stand in need of them on your journeys. Endeavour to make those who are now friends to mammon, friends to you and your cause. With those who thus may become friendly, use your influence, and claim for your personal use, when in want or without a settled house, a part of that debt which is due to the stewards of Christ. They will then supply your deficiencies, and accommodate you with habitations on earth, as permanently as the nature of your service will allow you to stay with them; and when they quit the world, as many of them may before you, they will hail you, as the honoured instruments of saving them, into their eternal habitations in heaven. Cultivate, therefore, the principles of prudence and justice, and render them habitual to you by practice. Avoid, indeed,

the unjust conduct of the old steward; but avoid also the opposite extreme of carelessness and contempt of temporal blessings, which will not fail of bringing down upon you and your cause the charge of folly, enthusiasm, or insincerity. Your conduct will then be dignified and uniform; and the effects of your virtue and wisdom will display themselves in the most inconsiderable, as well as the most important concerns committed to your inspection and care. Remember that if you be deficient in worldly policy, in domestic economy, or in the regulation of your temporal concerns you will be deemed little qualified for the management of religious affairs. These indeed are the concerns, which most belong to you as immortal beings, and therefore may be called your *own*. And who will trust them in your hands, if you are not to be trusted with the inferior concerns of this world, which, as being *uncertain* and *transient*, are foreign to your profession and hopes, and belong rather to those who come after you than to yourselves?"

J. JONES.

I have called my Illustrations an ill-fated work. It was printed at the expense of my booksellers. The edition consisted of a thousand copies. Fifteen years after the publication, I inquired into the fate of my book, and I was told, that three hundred were sold and given, and seven hundred sold for waste paper.

SIR,

July 17, 1825.

ALLOW me, through the medium of your liberal publication, to address a few remarks to your correspondent W., whose letter on the subject of the Mosaic Mission appeared in the last Number of the Repository (p. 335). I am quite at a loss to understand on what grounds those who call themselves Christians can justify such sceptical sentiments as your correspondent avows respecting the miracles recorded in the Old Testament. If we thus explain away all that appears miraculous in the Jewish dispensation, we evidently destroy its pretensions to be considered as a revelation from heaven. But in so doing, we sap the very foundations of Chris-

tianity itself. For Judaism and Christianity are inseparably connected. They are merely parts of one and the same system. Every page of the New Testament bears testimony to the connexion, and contains some acknowledgment, direct or indirect, of the divine origin of Judaism. Jesus himself declares, that he came not to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfil them. (Matt. v. 17.) Continual appeals are made to Moses and the prophets as his forerunners, and their predictions are repeatedly alluded to or cited as having received their accomplishment in him. The fulfilment of prophecy, the completion of that series of divine communications, the commencement and progress of which are recorded in the Old Testament, is uniformly represented as the great purpose of his mission. For he is not brought forward to our notice simply as a divinely-commissioned teacher, but as *the Messiah*, who had been long foretold and expected: and this title, which designates his office and character, and his claim to which it appears to have been the main object of his miracles and resurrection to establish; this title, be it observed, has a retrospective meaning, and implies a previous revelation. By destroying, therefore, the evidence of that previous revelation, we strike at the very root of Christianity itself, which, is no other, in fact, than Judaism under an improved form. To admit the divine authority of Jesus, and, at the same time, to deny that of Moses and the prophets, to whom he so frequently appeals, appears to me a strangely inconsistent scepticism, which requires from your correspondent some further explanation.

I.

SIR,

July 3, 1825.

I AM obliged to your American correspondent for the notice he has taken of my letter on the proposed American Quaker Creed, (pp. 325, 326,) in his *Critical Synopsis of the Monthly Repository for June, 1824*.

He says, "I hope this writer means not to be *satirical*, when he compares reason to the *solar light*, and revelation to a *lamp* enlightening reason's path."

In the passage alluded to (XIX. 339, col. 2, line 28,) there is an error of

the press, substituting "*solar*" for "*sober*," which, though pointed out for correction with my next article, dated July 30, 1824, inserted p. 544, has not, I believe, been noticed in your journal. It would have been utterly inconsistent with the whole tenor and object of the letter, to compare "*reason*," though one of the best gifts of God of man, "*to the solar light*," and "*revelation to a lamp* enlightening reason's path." My aim was to preserve in your pages the proposed inaccurate, inconsistent and unscriptural creed, "as a useful warning against any similar departure from the sober path of reason, enlightened by the *lamp of genuine revelation*."

That is, to hold up the Scriptures as containing "a true record of special revelations from God," which the authors of this Creed did not appear to me to treat with proper respect and veneration, under the groundless notion of their own equal, if not superior, claim to inspiration.

Your correspondent also observes, "The change of "*him*" into "*himself*," in the 5th article of the Quakers' Creed, seems, at first sight, "*atrocious*." And how does he attempt to remove the character of this first impression, so much more severe than mine? By shewing that they were well warranted in taking such a liberty with the language of the text, Matt. xi. 27; Luke x. 22? No such thing. But, says he, "when we remember for a moment their sincere and undoubting belief in the identity of the Father and the Son, it can scarcely be called the *literary* or even *pious fraud* it seems to be."

Whether your correspondent be "satirical" or serious in this apology I am unable to decide; but in my strictures I confined myself to plain matters of fact, and to pointing out the dangerous consequences of making so very free with the text, apparently to make it comport better with the notions of these Creed-makers, who were preparing a yoke for their brethren, which the Society, in its collective capacity, wisely, and with great unanimity, rejected. I ought, perhaps, to mention, that in both editions of the "*Cabinet, or Works of Darkness brought to Light*," printed in Philadelphia, the above texts are given correctly, and may, therefore, have been

so printed in the original edition of the Creed, which consisted of 10,000 copies, and which was nevertheless rejected, and ordered to be suppressed, by the Yearly Meeting for Pennsylvania.

BEREUS.

*Remarks on the Resolutions of the
Dissenting Ministers respecting the
Canton de Vaud.*

SIR,

ON perusing the Resolutions of the General Body of the Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the Three Denominations (pp. 377, 378), I cannot avoid fearing that they have been passed without due deliberation. Religious intolerance is under every form justly to be detested, but the party preferring a charge of this nature against any people or government, ought not to mix any thing with it that is doubtful or unnecessarily irritating, and the accusers should "come into court with clean hands." The three first resolutions are what every liberal Christian must approve; but the fourth, which contains the accusation against the government of the Canton de Vaud, is confused and indefinite, and is presented to the public without any accompanying evidence. "This Body has received, from different and credible sources, the information, that in Switzerland, which used to be regarded as an asylum for those who fled from persecution, and particularly in the Canton de Vaud, under a Protestant Government and a Presbyterian Church, a severe persecution has been for more than a year exercised upon peaceable citizens," &c. Here the charge is first made against Switzerland generally, and secondly against the Canton de Vaud. Now a general charge of this serious nature ought not to have been advanced, unless the resolutionists were prepared to prove that all the cantons had been guilty of persecution. If they were not, each of the guilty cantons should have been named, for the Swiss cantons are as independent of each other, with respect to religion, as Great Britain and France. Several of the cantons have ever been Catholic of the most bigoted description, and it were surely beating the air to pass resolutions now against them. Though the Protestant cantons might formerly

admit refugees into their country, whose faith did not differ much from their own, yet I know no period in which they could be properly styled tolerant, and therefore nothing is gained by referring to their former history.

Since 1814, when the Pays de Vaud was established as a separate canton, with an orthodox state religion, it has not been distinguished by any great degree of political or religious liberality; but when specific charges of persecution are brought against the government and people, by so respectable a Body as the Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the Three Denominations, or any individuals acting in their name, all the facts and circumstances ought to have been well considered and both sides of the case examined.

I fear it will be found that much of the irritation existing in the Canton de Vaud, which has led to the acts complained of in the resolutions, has been excited by the indiscreet and intemperate zeal of a few English ladies and other strangers, whose interference, in defiance of the public authority, has goaded and exasperated the government of the canton. Nor can it be forgotten that this irritation has been increased by the conduct of the very gentleman who has been chosen by the Body to sign their resolutions. The last year he most unwarrantably and presumptuously passed sentence of condemnation on the people and pastors of the canton, as Semipelagians, and published to the world that they "were formalists in religion and held the truth in unrighteousness" (Mon. Rep. XIX. pp. 321, 404, 464, 520, 544, 668, 735); a sentence which they must think evinces as much of an exclusive, illiberal and persecuting spirit as any act of their own government.

If the object of the meeting were really to recommend to the government of the canton peace and conciliation, and a repeal of their edicts against Dissenters, prudence might have suggested the propriety of selecting some one to sign the resolutions who had not rendered himself obnoxious to the canton by such an unchristian-like aggression. The resolutions, from the signature affixed, will be read with particular distrust, and regarded as the ebullitions of in-

dividual hostility, rather than the deliberate act of a public body. The most dignified mode of seeking redress for the sufferers, and the most accordant with a Christian spirit, would have been to have addressed the government in the first instance by presenting a respectful petition and remonstrance through our ambassador, as the petition of the Protestant Dissenting Ministers of England of the Three Denominations. Had this been ineffectual it would then have been soon enough to have proclaimed the government and people of the canton as persecutors, and to have directed the prayers of the Dissenters against them, under the pretence of imploring consolation for the sufferers. (See the 7th Resolution.) Such a resolution is more likely to spread a hostile feeling in this country against the Government of the Canton de Vaud, than to benefit the few individuals who have incurred its displeasure. If "spoliation and destitution" have been their lot, a subscription would be a more Christian-like aid than a prayer; the good Samaritan did not leave the sufferer on the road to run and offer up a prayer for him in the temple before the public. We may also ask, Why public prayers have not been before recommended for the Waldenses, that long-suffering and highly meritorious people, who have endured so many hardships in the last ten years? Alas! the Waldenses are neither Calvinists nor Methodists, and their ministers are educated at Lausanne.

A PROTESTANT DISSENTER.

Remarks on the First Human Society, guided by the Clue of the Mosaic Record.

(From the German of Schiller.)

I. *Passage of Man to Freedom and Humanity.*

IN the leading-string of instinct, by which she still conducts the irrational brute, Providence was compelled to introduce man into life; and while his reason was yet undeveloped, to stand behind him as a watchful nurse. By hunger and thirst she indicated to him the necessity of support, and placed around him in rich store the means of supply; while by smell and taste, she induced him to choice. By a soft climate, she spared his naked-

ness; and by universal peace, secured his defenceless existence. The continuance of the race was provided for by natural impulse. As plant or animal, man was therefore completed. His reason also had begun from afar to unfold itself. Whilst nature thought, cared, and busied itself for him, his powers could with less hindrance and difficulty adapt themselves to quiet contemplation; his reason, distracted by no anxiety could, undisturbed, frame the machinery of speech, and tune the tender instrument of thought. With the eye of a blissful one, he still looked around him upon creation; his gay spirit apprehended all appearances without reference to self, and deposited them fresh and clear in an active memory. Soft and smiling then was the beginning of man's course, and this was indispensable in order to strengthen him for the impending contest.

Let us suppose, therefore, that Providence had left him standing on this first round of the ladder, man would have been the happiest and most intellectual of brutes; but from the guardianship of natural instinct, he never could have emerged; free, and therefore moral, his actions never could have become; the limits of the animal nature he never could have overstepped. In voluptuous rest, he would have lived through an eternal childhood—and the circle in which he would have moved, must have been the smallest possible from desire to gratification, from gratification to rest, and from rest again to desire.

But man was destined for another lot; and the powers that lay within him called him to a totally different species of happiness. What nature had undertaken for him in his infancy, he was now to perform for himself on arriving at maturity. He himself was to be the creator of his own happiness, and its kind and degree were to be determined by the share which he should take in its formation. *Under the tutelage of reason*, he was to learn how to recover that station of innocence which he now lost, and, as a free and rational spirit, was to return to the spot whence he issued, as a plant and a creature of instinct; from a paradise of ignorance and bondage, he is even after the lapse of centuries, to work his way up into a paradise of

knowledge and freedom, that is, into one where he will pay as invariably obedience to the moral law in his breast, as at first he did to instinct, and as vegetables and brutes do now. What was then inevitable? What necessarily occurred in advancing to this distant goal? As soon as his reason had tried its first powers, nature expelled him from her protecting arms, or, to speak more correctly, he himself, urged by an unknown impulse, and unconscious of the decisive action of that moment, burst of his own accord from the leading-string, and with his yet weak reason, only guided from afar by instinct, threw himself into the wild game of life, and opened for himself the dangerous road to moral freedom. If, therefore, we change the voice of God in Eden forbidding him the tree of knowledge into the voice of instinct drawing him back from it, his supposed disobedience to that Divine command will be nothing more than—a defection from his instinct—therefore the first manifestation of his self-agency, the first enterprise of his reason, the first commencement of his moral existence. This defection from instinct in man which indeed first introduced evil into the creation, but only thereby to make moral good practicable, is, without contradiction, the happiest and grandest occurrence in the history of man; from this moment, his freedom is dated; here is the first remote foundation laid of his morality. The preacher is quite right to speak of this occurrence as *a fall* of the first man, and in so doing, to deduce useful moral lessons; but the philosopher is not less right in congratulating mankind at large on this important step towards perfection. The former is right in styling it a fall—since man then became instead of a guiltless, a guilty creature; instead of a perfect pupil of nature, an imperfect moral being; instead of a happy instrument, a wretched artificer.

The philosopher is right to call it a giant step of humanity, for by it man became, from the slave of natural impulse, a free agent; from an automaton, a being of moral discretion; and with this step first trod on the ladder that after the course of many ages was to lead him to self-government. Now the way becomes longer

which he must take to enjoyment. At first he needed only stretch forth his hand to let satisfaction follow on desire, but now reflection, industry, and trouble, must intervene between the two. Peace was at an end between him and the beasts. Want drove them against his plantations, nay, even set them on himself, and by his reason he must artificially provide security and dominion over the powers refused him by nature; weapons must be invented, and his sleep protected from his enemies by strong habitations. But here already nature compensates with intellectual pleasures for the loss of vegetable enjoyments. The fruit of his own planting surprised him with a savour never before perceived; sleep stole over him after fatiguing labour and under a roof of his own construction, more sweetly than in the lazy rest of Paradise. In contest with the tiger who attacked him, he exulted in the discovery of his own strength and dexterity, and with every vanquished danger, could thank himself for the gift of his life.

He is already too noble for Paradise, and knows nothing of himself if, under the pressure of want and the burden of care, he wishes himself back in it. An ever impatient impulse, the awakened feeling of independence, would soon pursue him in his indolent bliss, and render disgusting joys not of his own procuring. This feeling would change paradise into a wilderness, and then make of that wilderness again a paradise. But happy for the human race had it found no worse enemy to contend with than the stubbornness of the soil, the fury of the beast, and a tempestuous nature! Want urged him, passions aroused him and armed him soon against his equal. With man he must battle for his existence; a long, disastrous, still-enduring contest, but one in which alone he can perfect his reason and morality.

II. Domestic Life.

The first sons whom the mother of men bore had over their parents a very important advantage; they were brought up by man. All the advances which the latter were compelled to make for themselves, and therefore much more tediously, turned to the account of their children, and were

made over to them in their tenderest age, even in their plays, with all the cordiality of parental love. With the first son therefore born of woman the mighty instrument begins to work—that by which the whole human race has preserved, and will continue to preserve its form—namely, tradition, or the handing down of ideas.

The Mosaic record abandons us here, and leaps over an interval of fifteen or more years, to present to us the two brothers already grown up. But this space of time is important to the human history; and if omitted in the documents, reason must supply the void.

The birth of a son, his support, nursing, and education, brought to the knowledge, perceptions, and duties of the first parents an important accession, which we must carefully trace out.

From animals, the first mother undoubtedly learnt the most indispensable maternal duty, as necessity probably taught her expedients at the birth. Anxiety for the children rendered her heedful of countless little comforts, till now unknown; the number of things of which she learnt to make use increased, and maternal love was rich and fruitful in invention.

Until now both had known only *one* social connexion, only *one* species of love, since each had in the other only one object. Now with a new object they became acquainted with a new kind of love, a new moral relation—*parental love*. This new feeling was of a purer kind than the first, being entirely free from selfishness, while the former was founded on mere gratification, and the reciprocal need of society.

They entered therefore with this fresh experience on a higher step of morals—they were ennobled.

But the parental love, in which both sympathized for their child, operated no trifling change in the relationship between themselves. The cares, the joys, the tender sympathy in which they united for the common object of their love, knit them together with a fresh and fairer band. Each on this occasion discovered in the other new beautiful moral features, and each of these discoveries elevated and refined their connexion. The husband loved in the wife the mother, the mother of

his beloved son. The wife honoured and loved in the husband the father, the supporter of their child. The bare sensual complacency in each other rose into reverence, and out of selfish love sprung the fair semblance of *conjugal* affection.

Soon were these moral acquisitions increased with new. The children grew up, and between them also there was gradually formed a tender tie. The child attached itself most fondly to the child, because each creature only loves itself in its like. With soft and imperceptible threads, *fraternal* love was woven. A new experience for the first parents. They saw now a picture of sociality, of friendly feeling *without* them; they recognized their own sensations, but in a more youthful mirror.

Until now, both had, while alone, lived only in the present and the past; but now distant futurity began to display its charms. As they saw their children grow up beside them, and each day develope a new capacity, smiling prospects opened in the perspective when these offspring should become men, like to themselves—in their hearts awoke a new feeling, *hope*. And what a boundless plain does hope lay open to man! Hitherto they had enjoyed each blessing once only, in the present—henceforward every future pleasure will be felt beforehand, with countless repetition!

And as the children really grew up, what variety burst at once on the first human society! Every idea imparted by the parents had imaged itself differently in each separate soul, and now surprised them with the force of novelty. Now the circulation of thought became a living principle; moral feeling was set in action, and by action unravelled; speech grew fuller, painted more accurately, and ventured already on finer feelings; new acquaintance was made with nature, and new modifications arose of what was previously known. Man was now almost wholly engaged in vigilant attention. No longer was there any danger of his sinking to an imitation of the brute!

III. *Diversity of Modes of Life.*

The progress of civilization manifested itself even in the first generation. Adam tilled the field; we see one of his sons adopt a new branch of

livelihood, the keeping of cattle. The human race, therefore, is already divided into two separate conditions, that of the agriculturist and the herdsman.

It was to the school of nature the first man went; and from her that he learnt all the useful arts of life. With attentive observation, he could not long remain ignorant of the arrangement by which plants reproduce themselves. He saw nature herself sow and water; his imitative impulse awoke, and soon want urged him to lend his arm to nature, and aid, by art, her spontaneous productiveness.

But it must not be supposed that the first agriculturist was at once a grower of corn, for which very great preparations are needful; it being conformable to the progress of nature to advance from the simple to the more complicated. Probably rice was one of the first grains cultivated by man, for nature invited him to this by its wild growth in India; and the most ancient historians speak of its cultivation as one of the earliest arts of agriculture. The man remarked that in a lasting drought plants wither, but that after rain, they rapidly revive. He remarked farther, that where an overflowing stream had left slime behind it, the fertility increased. He availed himself of these discoveries, gave his plantations an artificial rain and brought slime for his field, when there was no river near to bestow it. He learnt to manure and to irrigate.

More difficult appears the advance to the use of animals; but here, as every where, man began with what was natural and guiltless; and contented himself, perhaps for ages, with the milk of the creature, before he laid his hand upon its life. Doubtless it was his mother's milk that allured him to try the use of the animal's. No sooner had he become acquainted with this new sustenance than he secured it to himself for ever. To have a supply of this food at all times ready, he could not leave it to chance to conduct to him at the moment of hunger a creature affording it. It occurred to him, therefore, to assemble around him a certain number of such animals to procure a herd; these he must choose from among those who live in company, and transport them from a state of wild freedom into one of ser-

vitute and peaceful rest; that is, he must tame them. Before he ventured on those of wilder habits, surpassing him in weapons and in strength, he made an experiment on those inferior to himself in force, and endowed with less native ferocity. He herded sheep, therefore, more early than swine, oxen and horses.

As soon as he had deprived his animals of their liberty, he was compelled to support and provide for them himself. He became then a herdsman, and as long as society was small, nature offered his little herds food in abundance. He had no other trouble than to seek for one meadow, and when fed off, to exchange it for another. The richest superfluity recompensed his light toil, and the produce of his labour was subject to no vicissitude of season or climate. Uniform enjoyment was the lot of the herdsman, freedom and gay indolence his character.

Altogether different was the situation of the husbandman. As a serf, he was chained to the ground he had planted, and, with the mode of life he adopted, had surrendered all freedom of residence. Anxiously must he tend the precarious nature of the plant he cultivated, and aid its growth by art and labour, whilst the other left his flocks to provide for themselves. Want of tools at first made every operation more difficult, and his hands were scarcely adequate alone. How toilsome must have been his mode of existence, ere the ploughshare lightened it; ere he compelled the yoked steer to divide with him the labour!

The breaking up of the ground, the scattering the seed, the watering, the harvest, how many labours did all these include; and how much even after the harvest, ere the tediously-earned fruit of his industry could be enjoyed! How often must he guard his plantations, watch and fence them against the attacks of the wild beasts; how frequently even defend them at the hazard of life! And how insecure at last was the produce of his toil, subject to the influence of tempests and seasons! An overflowing stream, a falling hail, would suffice to rob him, when the goal seemed reached, and expose him to the severest want. Severe, therefore, unequal and precarious, was the lot of the agriculturist,

compared with the comfortable, peaceful destiny of the herdsman, and his soul must become savage in a body rendered rude by toil.

Should it now occur to him to contrast this hard fate with the happy life of the shepherd, the dissimilarity must strike him; he must, according to his sensual representation, hold the latter to be a favoured darling of Heaven.

Envy awoke in his bosom; this unhappy passion must awake with the first inequality among men. With jealousy he regarded the blessings of the shepherd, who peaceful fed his flock in the opposing shade, whilst he himself was pierced by the meridian ray, and labour forced the sweat drops from his brow. The careless gaiety of the pastor distressed him. He hated him for his good fortune, and despised him for his indolence. Thus he harboured a secret displeasure in his heart, to break out with violence on the first occasion. Nor could one long be wanting. The privileges of the individual had as yet no settled limits, nor were laws in existence to separate mine and thine. Each imagined that he possessed an equal right over the whole earth, for the division into property could only result from conflicting claims. Suppose, then, that the shepherd had with his flock exhausted all the neighbouring pastures, and felt no inclination to lose himself in a distant country, far from his family—what would he do? What course would he naturally adopt? He drove his herd into the plantations of the husbandman, or at least permitted them to wander thither unchecked. Here was rich store for his sheep, and no law to defend it against him. Every thing on which he could seize was his—thus reasoned childish humanity.

Now, therefore, for the first time, man came into collision with man; in the place of the wild animal with whom the cultivator had hitherto been engaged, stepped man, appearing now like a hostile beast of prey, who would lay waste his plantations. No wonder that he received him after the fashion of the creature whom he imitated. The hatred that for many years had been nursed within his bosom, aggravated his bitterness; and a murderous blow with a club avenged him at once

on the protracted fortune of his envied neighbour.

Thus mournfully ended the first collision of men.

IV. *Equality of Rank abolished.*

Some expressions of the record lead us to conclude that polygamy in this early period was rare; and therefore that it had already become customary to submit to marriage, and to be contented with one wife. But regular marriages appear to denote a certain measure of morality and refinement, scarcely to be expected in such an infant age. Men generally attain order only through the consequences of disorder, and lawlessness usually leads to the introduction of laws.

The prevalence of formal marriages appears, therefore, not to have rested on law so much as on usage. The first man could only live in wedlock, and his example had upon the second something of the force of authority. With a single pair the human race began. Nature, therefore, had proclaimed her will in this example.

If it be admitted that in the first ages the relative numbers of the sexes were equal, thus nature would have decreed that which man had not. Each took only one wife, because there was only one for his share.

When a sensible disproportion manifested itself in the numbers of the sexes, and there was room for choice, the ordinance was confirmed by observance; and no one lightly ventured on insulting the customs of his fathers by innovation.

In like manner, with the institution of marriage, a certain natural government established itself in society. Nature had laid the foundation of filial respect in making the helpless child dependent on its father; thus accustoming him from the tenderest age to honour his will. This feeling the son would retain through his whole life. Becoming himself a father, his son could not behold without reverence one so respected by his parent, and silently must pay his father's father a higher veneration. This regard to the family ancestor must increase in an equal proportion with each accession of family and higher step of age; and his greater experience, the fruits of so long a life, must, besides, give him a

natural superiority over his juniors. In every doubtful question the progenitor was the last appeal; and in the long observance of this custom was founded at length that natural, gentle supremacy, the patriarchal government; one rather securing than subverting universal equality.

But this could not endure for ever. Some were less industrious, some less favoured by fortune and by the soil, some born weaker than others; there were therefore the strong and the weak, the bold and the timid, the wealthy and the poor. The weak and poor must beg, the wealthy could give and refuse. The subjection of man to man began.

It was in the nature of things that extreme age should emancipate from toil, and that the youth should undertake the portion of the grey-headed sire, the son that of his hoary father. Soon was this natural duty imitated by art. In many the wish must arise of uniting the easy rest of age with the enjoyments of youth, and of procuring some one in future to perform the office of a son. The eye of such fell on the poorer and weaker, who either required support, or laid claim to superfluity. The poor and weak stood in need of their protection; they on the other hand made use of the suppliants' industry. The one, therefore, became the condition of the other. The wretched and more feeble served and received; the strong and rich bestowed and were idle.

The first distinction of ranks. The rich man became more opulent by the exertions of the poor: to increase his wealth he added to the number of his slaves: he saw many, therefore, around him, less fortunate than himself; many depended upon him. The rich man felt his importance, and became proud. He began to confound the instruments of his prosperity with the tools of his will. The labour of many was converted to the advantage of him, the one: hence he concluded that the many existed for the sake of the one. He had now only one little step to the despot.

The son of the wealthy man began to esteem himself more highly than the sons of his father's slaves. Heaven had favoured him more than these, therefore was he dearer to Heaven.

He called himself the offspring of Heaven, as we style Fortune's favourites her sons. Compared with him, the servant was only a son of man. Hence in Genesis, the distinction between the children of Elohim and the children of men.

Prosperity induced indolence, indolence conducted to voluptuousness, and finally to vice. To fill up life, the number of enjoyments must be increased; the common allowance of nature had no longer power to satisfy the reveller, who, in lazy rest, meditated on pleasure.

He must have all things better and in fuller measure than the bondsman. The servant contented himself as yet with one wife; he permitted himself more. But ever-during pleasure becomes flat and wearisome. He must consider then how to enhance it by artificial stimulants. A new step. He was no longer contented with the mere gratification of sensual impulse; he would unite many and refined enjoyments in one. Lawful gratifications no longer satisfied him; his desires rested on such as were clandestine. Woman alone ceased to charm him: he required beauty in her.

Among the daughters of his slaves he discovered fair females. His good fortune had made him haughty; pride and security made him insolent. He easily persuaded himself that all was his that was his slaves'. Because every thing depended on him, he thought every thing allowable in him. The daughter of his servant was too lowly for his wife, but might serve to gratify his passions. A new and important step from refinement to deterioration.

The example once given, the corruption of morals must soon become universal. The fewer compulsory laws they found to restrain them, or the nearer the society in which this depravity arose was to a state of innocence, the more furiously must it spread.

The right of the strongest was asserted; power authorized oppression; and for the first time tyrants appear.

The record speaks of these as the children of pleasure, the illegitimate offspring of unlawful connexion. If this be literally true, there is some-

thing peculiarly striking in the feature, never yet to my knowledge pointed out. These sons inherited the pride, but not the possessions of the father. Perhaps their father loved them, preferred them in his lifetime; but by his legitimate heirs they were excluded and banished as soon as he was dead. Expelled from a family on which they had been indirectly forced, they found themselves abandoned and insulated in the wide world. They belonged to none; nothing belonged to them; and there was no choice of life remaining, since there was no condition but that of lord or slave.

Without being the first, they held themselves too high for the last, and were besides too daintily brought up to learn to serve: what, therefore, could they do? The vain pride of birth, and strength of limb, was all that remained to them; only the remembrance of previous prosperity, and a heart embittered to society, accompanied them into want. Hunger made them robbers, success adventurers, and finally heroes.

Soon they became terrible to the peaceful husbandman and defenceless herdsman, and extorted from him, at their pleasure. Their fortune and conquering deeds diffused an evil renown; and the agreeable superfluity of their mode of life might well attract many to their standard. "So," as the Scripture says, "they became mighty, and a great nation."

This prevailing disorder in the first society would probably have terminated in order, and the destruction of human equality have led from patriarchal rule to monarchy. One of these adventurers, more powerful and bolder than his fellows, would have aspired to be leader. A fortified town would have been built, and the first state founded; but these appearances were too early for the Being who wields the world's destiny; and a frightful natural occurrence put a sudden stop to the career of refinement on which the human race was about to enter.

V. *The First King.*

Asia, abandoned by its human inhabitants at the deluge, must soon have become the prey of wild beasts,

who increased rapidly, and in greater numbers, in a country so fertile as that which the waters had left, and extended their dominion where man was too weak to restrain them. Every tract of land, therefore, built on by the new race must first have been wrested from the wild creatures, and then with stratagem and force be defended against them. Our Europe is now purified from these savage dwellers, and we can scarcely form an idea of the wretchedness they inflicted; but how fearful the plague must have been, we may partially gather from many passages of Scripture, as well as from the customs of the people of antiquity, particularly of the Greeks, who ascribed to the conquerors of wild beasts immortality and divine honours.

Thus the Theban *Œdipus* became king, because he rooted out the devastating sphinx; thus *Perseus*, *Hercules*, *Theseus*, and many others, earned their glory and apotheoses. Whoever, therefore, took part in the destruction of these public enemies was the greatest benefactor of men; and, in order to obtain, success must indeed have possessed an union of rare qualities. The chase, before war began to rage among men, was the peculiar business of heroes. It was probably concerted by numbers, who were led by the bravest, by him, namely, whose courage and intellect procured him a *natural* superiority over the rest. He gave his name to the most important of these warlike enterprises, and the name allured hundreds to join his train, to wage under him deeds of valour. As these hunting matches must have been carried on according to certain regularly planned dispositions, designed and directed by the leader, he tacitly confirmed himself in the right of appointing the tasks of others, and of making *his* will theirs. Insensibly they became accustomed to pay him obedience, and to submit to his better judgment. Having distinguished himself by deeds of personal bravery, by boldness of soul, and strength of arm, terror and astonishment so operated in his behalf, that they at last blindly yielded to his direction. If disagreements arose among his companions of the chase, such as could not long be

unknown in so rude and numerous a horde, he whom all feared and honoured, would be the most natural judge of the dispute, and reverence and awe of his prowess would suffice to give force to his sentences. Thus the first leader of the chase became an arbiter and judge.

The prey being shared, it was but equitable that the larger portion should accrue to the leader; and as he could not consume it himself, he would have the means of attaching others, and therefore of gaining partizans and friends. Soon a number of the bravest, which he would ever seek to augment by new benefits, assembled round his person, and imperceptibly he had formed a sort of body guard, a band of Mamelukes, who supported his pretensions with wild zeal, and deterred by their numbers all attempts at opposition.

As these huntsmen were useful to all land-owners and herdsmen, whose enclosures they guarded from devastating foes, a free-will offering might at first have been granted them for their beneficial labours, of the fruits of the earth and of flocks, which in the sequel might have been claimed as a deserved tribute, and finally exacted as a due and as an obligatory tax. These acquisitions the chief divided among the most efficient of his band; and by them continually increased the number of his creatures. As the pursuit frequently led him through meadows and fields, that suffered damage by the procession, many proprietors found it expedient to buy off the injury by a spontaneous gift, which he afterwards demanded of all those whom he *might* have molested. By these and similar means he increased his wealth, and by this—his followers, who at length grew to a little army, the more tremendous as they had been inured to every danger and difficulty in contest with the lion and tiger, and rendered savage by their rude trade. Terror preceded their names, and none dared venture on the refusal of their demands. If quarrels arose between one of the band and a stranger, the hunter naturally appealed to his leader and protector, who thus learnt to extend his judicial authority over matters distinct from the chase. Now he

wanted nothing of the king but the solemn recognition; and could this be well refused him at the head of his armed and imperious train? He was the fittest to rule, because the most powerful to enforce his commands. He was the universal benefactor of all, because they were indebted to him for peace and security against the common foe. He was already in possession of power, because the strongest were at his command.

In a similar manner did the ancestors of Alaric, of Attila, and of the Merovingi, become kings of their people. Thus was it with the Greek kings, whom Homer exhibits in the *Iliad*. All were at first leaders of a warlike multitude, vanquishers of monsters, benefactors of their nation. From military leaders, they gradually became umpires and judges. With the booty they acquired they purchased a faction, which made them powerful and awful. By violence they finally ascended the throne.

By some the example of the Medes is adduced, who spontaneously bestowed the royal dignity on him whom they had made useful as judge. But it is a mistake to apply this example in tracing the elevation of the *first* king. When the Medes made their king, they were already *a people*, already a formed political society: in the case under discussion, on the other hand, the first political society originated with the king. The Medes had borne the oppressive yoke of the Assyrian monarchs; the king of whom we now speak was the first in the world; and the people who subjected themselves to him a company of free-born men, who as yet had seen no authority over them. An already endured government may very easily be *renewed* in this peaceful way; but in so tranquil a mode, one new and unknown could never be instituted.

It appears, therefore, more conformable to the march of events, that the first king should be an usurper, placed on the throne, not by the spontaneous, unanimous call of the nation, (for nation as yet there was none,) but by violence, by good fortune, and by a daring soldiery.

COMAR YATES.

Burckhardt's Account of the Wahabees.

WE have frequently referred in the progress of our work to the sect of Mahometans in Arabia, who have assumed the character of Reformers of their religion; and we judge that our readers will be pleased with the further description of them in the following paper taken from the *Christian Examiner*, an American publication, for Sept. and Oct. 1824. We preserve the introduction of the Editor of that work, both on account of its containing a history of this literary article and of its suggesting so just and liberal a sentiment with regard to the limits of national hostilities. Ed.

Religion of the Wahabees.

[The Wahabees are a sect of Mohammedans, which has sprung up in recent times, and made great progress in Arabia. The following extract is from a letter written by the celebrated traveller, Burckhardt, at Cairo, in the year 1812, and lately published in the *Atlantick Magazine*, at New York. The letter was directed to Sir Joseph Banks, and was found on board a vessel taken by one of our privateers in 1813. The letter, and the notes accompanying it, are curious; and the only regret that can be felt by the American reader is, that documents of such a character should not have been transmitted immediately to their proper destination. The sanctuary of science and knowledge should be sacred even against the intrusions of war.

It will be seen by the extract that these Wahabees are a kind of reformers of the Mohammedan faith. They begin to reason, and discuss, and to ask the grounds of their belief. It will be seen, moreover, that such bold innovations have been met much in the same way, as the same propensities among Christians have been met by their brethren. The adherents to the old faith resist inquiry, endeavour to suppress controversy. By these wholesome restrictions, and circulating exaggerated accounts of the heresy of the rising party, they hope to stop the current of Reformation, and save themselves the trouble of

answering questions or of giving a reason.

The people, of whom Burckhardt is here speaking, are called Bedouin Arabs, and inhabit the country east and south of Palestine, and particularly those regions where the Israelites sojourned forty years in their wanderings from Egypt to the Holy Land.]

“Abd el Aryz, father of Ibn el Saoud the present chief of the Wahabees, had sent summonses all over the Mohammedan world, to engage the people to join his creed. Some of his missionaries were arrested by the Shah of Persia, while others penetrated to the shores of the Atlantick. The Moggribeen Olemas entered into discussion with him, which gave origin to several written dissertations of both sides. The principal points in dispute are; 1st, The Wahabees’ denial of Mohammed’s still living invisibly among the followers of his faith; 2nd, Of his being able to intercede at the Almighty’s throne, in favour of the departed souls of the faithful; 3d, Their irreverence for the saints in general, and for their influence in heaven, which they demonstrate by demolishing all the chapels constructed in honour of them; 4th, Their like sentiments with regard to the companions and followers of Mohammed; 5th, Their severity of discipline; 6th, Their refusing any authority to tradition, or Hadyth, as related of the companions of Mohammed. The champions of the established Turkish faith answer, and pretend that Mohammed is still alive; that he hears the prayers addressed to him by the faithful, and grants them as much as is in his power, partly by the faculties he himself possesses of working miracles, and partly by his applications to the Deity. The saints, indeed, they say, were but mortals, and no more; but their virtues have entitled them to the favour of the Almighty, which they are at liberty to invoke, and often to obtain for those earthly inhabitants and faithful Mouslims, who devoutly pray at their tombs. The same is the case with the companions of Mohammed, for which it is the duty of all the faithful to pray; therefore the Turks seldom mention the name of the prophet, without adding prayers for his family, and his companions;

but the Wahabees only pray, in that case, for his family. The only tradition which the Wahabees admit, is that which contains the sentiments of the prophet himself, and his own explanation of the difficult passages of the Koran, as related by his companions. But they resist all tradition of later times; even that which can be traced to the companions of Mohammed, as soon as they relate to *their own* opinions on religious matters, or to the opinions of the prophet himself, as reported by people who are not comprised within the class of 'the companions.' As to discipline, I have already mentioned several points, in which they (the Wahabees) disagree with the established religion. I only add, that all the Wahabees are enjoined to shave their head completely, without having any hair-lock on the top of it, as is generally done by the Turks; or else to leave the whole head of hair growing. The Hadyth says, 'Shave all, or leave all.' In general, the precepts of the Sunné, which, although not given in the Koran, are yet strongly insisted upon by the prophet, and enforced by his own example, are more in vigour among the Wahabees than the Turks, who evidently transgress the most conspicuous of these tenets. Thus, for instance, it is a precept of the Sunné, contained in the Hadyth,—'Gold and silver is only permitted to your women; it is unlawful for men.' The loud cries over the dead corpse are positively forbidden by Mohammed.

"It will be seen that those tenets shew a spirit of reform much to the credit of the founders of this religion. Religious dissertations, however, are entirely banished from the conversations of the Turks; and it is, therefore, rendered impossible that the Wahabees should get any partizans, in countries which they have not yet conquered; where the defenders of the old faith circulate the most absurd stories of the principles of the new sect; and where every word, contrary to the established doctrine, is looked upon as heresy, and punished as such. The tax-gatherers of the Wahabees, are called Mezekas, or Nowab.

"In reading over the seven or eight thousand principal Hadyth, ac-

knowledged as such by all the learned Mussulmans, and comparing them with the present manners of the Turks, innumerable instances are met with, of a total neglect of these precepts. The acquaintance with the Hadyth is, in my opinion, absolutely necessary, to get a clear insight into the spirit of the Turkish religion, which the reading of the Koran alone does not give. Moral precepts are much more enlarged upon in the Hadyth, than they are in the Koran itself; and, as it is generally Mohammed, the Arab, who speaks, his views and his mind, together with the customs of his times, may be better estimated, as it were, in his familiar conversation, than in the laboured language of the Koran."

Essex Street,
July 24, 1825.

SIR,

YOUR correspondent, Mr. Frend, (pp. 350—352,) having duly panegyricized Mr. Clarke's definition of Unitarianism, as happily corresponding with his own, proceeds to state and to deplore the unfortunate *obloquy* under which he thinks that Unitarian Christianity at present labours, "and for which," he adds, "it cannot be denied that some of our writers have afforded just grounds." How it is that *just grounds* can be afforded for *unjust* calumny, I stay not now to inquire. Happily your worthy correspondent, who loves to probe matters to the bottom, has discovered the whole secret of this business. "With the great truth," says he, "which we all hold, these writers have *mixed* up notions of their own on a variety of topics, such as liberty and necessity, *free-will*, atonement, the existence of the devil, the philosophical ignorance of Moses, and other subjects, and by their dogmatical conclusions on these heads, they have contrived so to *mix* with the simple doctrine of Unitarianism their own peculiar notions, as to excite an aversion to examine the great truth itself, and even an imputation that, under the mask of Unitarianism, we deny the important doctrines of Christianity, and are in fact only Deists under another name." The complainant further states, in aggravation, "I feel the more

—as *my name* has been placed in connexion with certain opinions, which I hold in utter abhorrence.”

I will not pretend to say whether your irritable correspondent had any of my writings particularly in view in this exhibition of grievances, but, conscious as I am that I have myself *mixed up*, and publicly professed most of the doctrines here stated, I am anxious, not, indeed, to defend their truth, for that, I trust, has been already done, far beyond the reach of your correspondent's imbecile attack, but to clear them from the unjust imputation of having accumulated obloquy upon the Unitarian cause.

That the doctrine which maintains that He, whom Trinitarians worship as God, equal with the Father, “was in the first state of his existence a man like ourselves, sin only excepted,” must necessarily give the greatest possible offence to our Trinitarian brethren, cannot be doubted for a moment: and this will inevitably expose those who hold that doctrine to great obloquy and reproach. But whether this obloquy will be much increased by the opinions which such persons may entertain concerning liberty and necessity, I must be permitted to doubt. As to *atonement*, the rejection of that doctrine follows, of course, from the doctrine of Christ's proper humanity. For the Trinitarian will naturally say, What is that atonement worth, which a human being can offer to offended justice? The Devil, indeed, cannot be well spared from the machinery of the fall. But the late Rev. Hugh Farmer did a great deal towards undermining his existence, and the learned John Simpson, of Bath, in his most valuable Essays, has given him the *coup de grace*, so that it is to be hoped, that no person pretending to Biblical Literature will again become the Devil's advocate. And, I trust, that the denial of his personal existence will not by men of consideration be regarded as a ground of obloquy.

Last, but not least, is the assertion of “the philosophical ignorance of Moses.” This, Sir, I am aware, is with your correspondent the galling point. It cannot be touched but he immediately winces. I will not, therefore, annoy him by repeating the ar-

guments I have elsewhere produced upon that subject, which he has never refuted, and never will. I will only allege an authority which, if it does not convince him, will at least convince his *readers*, that it is very possible for a divine to call in question the truth and inspiration of the first chapter of Genesis, without incurring obloquy by so doing. Nay, that such an one may deny the cosmogeny of Moses, and still remain an orthodox son of the Church, and even be a professor and lecturer in theology in the University. The authority to which I appeal is that of Dr. John Hey, Norrisian Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, from 1780 to 1795, a divine of a very different order, indeed, from your irritable correspondent.

“The natural philosophy of the Pentateuch,” says this learned Professor, “ought not to induce us to reject it. It is not at all likely that God, in order to enable a man to be a law-giver of the Jews, should reveal to him all the causes of the phenomena of nature.”

The same learned writer, speaking of the ninth article, says, “I should rather think that the intention of the compilers was to leave men a liberty of assenting, who should doubt whether the disorderly propensities of man were owing to Adam's transgression: my reason is, because many *serious* and *thinking* Christians have judged that the first part of Genesis is not a literal description of fact, but an allegorical story, like the Pilgrim's Progress. Now, it was probably far from the intention of our Church to exclude any such.” Hey, III. 152.*

The authority of Professor Hey will fully exculpate those who agree with the *many serious and thinking Christians* to whom he alludes, from involving themselves and others in *deserved obloquy* on that account. And the palpable mistake of your worthy correspondent in this case can only be attributed to his ignorance of the state of theological opinion: an ignorance

* See an excellent Collection of Extracts from Divines of the Church of England, published by Hunter, St. Paul's Churchyard.

for which he is by no means to be blamed, as his professional avocations can leave him but little time for speculative theology. But it is much to be desired that he were rather less dogmatical. This, however, is a failing to which those who are always insisting upon *one* question, without sufficiently diversifying it with others, are very prone: and it reminds me of a saying, which I have often heard from my late friend Dr. Kippis—Deliver me from the man who only reads one book.

Your correspondent, in contradistinction to some who, as he seems to think, are inclined to derogate from the honour due to Christ, expresses himself in very glowing terms upon this subject: and I cordially concur with him when he says, "If we contemplate him on earth, performing the arduous duties of his mission without fear and without reproach, how much beneath him do other mortals appear, whose deeds are emblazoned in the pages of history!" Jesus Christ is the greatest of all the prophets of God. He is the way, the truth and the life: his mission was sealed by his resurrection from the dead, and his ascension into heaven, and the gift of the holy spirit. He ever lives to make intercession for us; or, in other words, in some unknown way to act in behalf and for the benefit of his church. His powers are, probably, continually increasing, and his glory is unspeakable and incomprehensible. But for that very reason we have and can have no concern with it. And the more we attempt to comprehend and explain it, the more shall we puzzle and confound ourselves and others, and the more shall we *darken counsel by words without knowledge*. We can know nothing of Christ but what we learn from his gospel: in that sacred volume we are taught what to believe concerning him, and what duties he requires of his disciples. We learn to revere him as the great prophet of God, the founder of the new and final dispensation to mankind; and thus instructed, we receive him as our Teacher, we obey him as our Master, we love him as our great moral benefactor, we imitate him as our pattern, we triumph in him as our hope. Him, though unseen, "we love; in him,

though now we see him not, yet believing, we rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory."

All this I can understand and assent to. But when, in addition to this, I am told, "We cannot exalt the Saviour too highly: all our words fall short of the ideas entertained by a true Christian towards him." This, I say, is incorrect. For words may, and have, and do often express ideas more exalted than a *well-informed* Christian entertains towards his Master. Words will express that Jesus Christ was the great pre-existent Logos, by whose instrumentality the supreme God made and governs this world, or this system, or all worlds and systems, and many a *true* Christian has believed the doctrine, but no *well-informed* Christian will receive it as true. Again, words will express what the Socinians taught, namely, "that Jesus Christ who, in his first state of existence was a man like ourselves," was after his resurrection exalted to the supreme dominion over the whole created universe; but it would be difficult to find any Christian, of any description, in the present day, who would avow so extravagant an opinion. Upon the whole, it is our wisest part to be content with the plain doctrine of the plain Scripture, and not to puzzle ourselves or our readers with speculations upon subjects which, being beyond our comprehension, can be of no use to direct our practice.

T. BELSHAM.

SIR,
ALLOW a looker-on to say one word on the value of what are called "Ordination Services," which appears to me to consist not so much in the advice given on these occasions to young ministers, as in the favourable opportunity which they create of exciting public attention to the ministers and their congregations. Our elders of most talents and reputation are employed in these services; and all the circumstances are auspicious to a successful exhibition of our principles and views as Dissenters and Unitarians. Need more be said on behalf of them?

PRESBYTER.

POETRY.

SONNET,

Composed in Burbage Wood, October 3, 1824.

YE beautiful green woods, well pleased again
 I hail your deep'ning shades, and leave the joys
 Of poor humanity, whose forms restrain
 The young ideas, as they duly rise :—
 Here Nature sits on an unbounded throne ;—
 The soul expands ;—and of the ambient scene
 Imbibes its plan, and feelings scarce her own,
 Boundless and vast, and beautifully serene !
 The mind uncircumscribed, roams o'er the earth ;—
 Asks whence the tyrant's power, the pomp of pride,—
 The law of faction,—the parade of birth,—
 And feels to nature, and to heaven allied.
 Hail, ye green woods ! ye have a lesson given,
 To teach mankind of man, of nature, and of heaven.

Hinckley.

JOSEPH DARE.

TO A DAUGHTER ON THE COMPLETION OF HER 20th YEAR.

My youth—so long extinct her fires,
 No more I wake the sportive lay :
 Yet, as parental love inspires,
 I greet, dear Anne, thy natal day.
 What though no more the sportive strain
 May suit experience, grave and grey ;
 Ne'er shall my pensive verse complain,
 As though no sun had cheer'd my way.
 Rather shall rise, at memory's call,
 Bright scenes of bliss, by time endear'd ;
 Rich boons for ills that life enthrall,
 For all I've felt, and all I've fear'd.
 Then pass, dear Anne, thy road of life,
 Virtue thy aim, content thy treasure ;
 For knowledge urge the generous strife,
 Of pleasing oft indulge the pleasure.
 And, thus, my number'd years survive,
 If such, for good, high Heav'n's decree ;
 Retrace thy varied sixty-five,
 And, haply, spend a thought on me.

J. T. R.

OBITUARY.

1825. Mar. 3, the Rev. JOSEPH COOK, M.A., Fellow of Christ College, Cambridge, between Mount Sinai and Tor, on the Red Sea. After spending some years in the University with the highest credit and honour to himself, he went to the Continent in 1820. Having visited Holland, France, Germany and Switzer-

land, and resided four years in Italy, devoting his time to the public performance of his clerical duties at the English chapel at Rome, and that of the Ambassador at Naples, and to the study and contemplation of the interesting objects with which those classical shores abound; and having qualified himself for a full

and minute examination of those regions, doubly interesting, as being the sources of both sacred and profane history, he set out from Malta in August last, on a tour to Egypt and the Holy Land, accompanied by Dr. Bromhead, of this University, and Mr. Lewis, of the navy. Having penetrated beyond the second cataract of the Nile, the party returned to Cairo, from whence they proceeded to Mount Sinai. The fatigues of this journey, the inclemency of the weather, and the privations inseparable from travelling in those countries, so weakened him, (although he left Cairo apparently in perfect health,) that, after stopping a few days at Mount Sinai, to recruit his strength, he was unable to reach Tor, and, under circumstances fraught with the most deep and awful interest, expired on his camel, in the Pass Wady Hebram, near Mount Serbal, to the inexpressible regret of his family and friends. His remains were deposited by his companions in the burying-ground of a Greek church, near the Wells of Elim, a spot which he had expressed his most anxious wish to visit, and which, to use the words of his friend Dr. Bromhead, "Could he have foreseen his fate, he would probably have selected as his last earthly abode."

June 24, after a very short illness, the Rev. JOHN EVANS, minister of the Unitarian congregation at Carmarthen, aged 43 years. He was educated at the Presbyterian College in that town, which is open to students of all parties, and is the only public institution for the education of *Welsh* ministers, conducted upon liberal principles. When the subject of this notice entered upon his studies, his sentiments were orthodox; but before the conclusion he became a decided Unitarian; and with the ingenuousness that always characterized him, hesitated not to avow the change. His first settlement as a minister was at Ilminster, in Somersetshire, where he remained several years. In 1816, he removed to Carmarthen with the view to improve his health. Pious without gloom, cheerful without levity, and zealous without bigotry, he experienced a welcome reception wherever his worth was known. In simplicity of manners and integrity of heart he was seldom equalled; and few men have been more esteemed by connexions and friends. His correct and exemplary deportment obtained the respect of his neighbours of all religious parties. As a preacher he was distinguished by intimate acquaintance with the Scriptures, by sound sense and liberality, and, on particular occa-

sions, by considerable energy and ability. His funeral was conducted by his congregation in the most respectful though unostentatious manner. On the following Sunday a funeral sermon, at the request of his relations, was preached, in Welsh, from 1 Thess. iv. 14, by the Rev. J. James, of Gelli-onnen; and another in English, at the request of the congregation, from Numb. xxiii. 10, by the Rev. R. Awbrey, of Swansea. The chapel was crowded on both occasions, and the preachers, as well as most of their hearers, were visibly affected at every allusion to their departed friend. The audiences were seriously and almost painfully attentive. The deceased furnished another proof of a truth which he had constantly illustrated and enforced, namely, "that a well-spent life is the best preparation for a happy death." A short time before his dissolution, a brother minister asked him if he was resigned to the will of God. He started at the question, and replied, in a tone of voice, as if slightly offended at the implied doubt, "PERFECTLY." Long be his memory cherished, and his example followed!

T.

[Our correspondent, in a private letter, informs us that Mr. Evans preached, the Sunday evening before his death, a funeral sermon for the late Rev. Dr. A. Rees, from the words, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace!"]

Dr. ELMSLEY. (Pp. 309, 310.)

Of the literary character of Dr. Elmsley, the following just sketch was sometime ago given by the celebrated Professor Herman. And it will be a gratification to the feelings of the present writer to pay a tribute of respect to the memory of this admirable scholar, by exhibiting it in an English dress.

"Peter Elmsley, if any other man, is a man born to promote the accurate knowledge of the Greek language, since his extraordinary and truly singular diligence in investigating subjects of grammatical criticism is directed by an excellent genius, by a mind free from subjection to authority, by a most ardent love of truth, impeded in its operation neither by pride, nor vain glory, nor by the desire of detracting from the merit of another. By these virtues he has effected, that, while his learning is to be valued most highly, he himself is not less to be loved and venerated. But this is the greatest praise, and a praise which will never perish, to be not only a useful, but also a good man."

E. C.

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC.

RELIGIOUS.

Manchester College, York: Annual Examination—and Ordination of Rev. W. S. Brown, at Hull.

ON Monday, June 27, commenced the Annual Examination of the Students in Manchester College, York, and continued till the following Thursday evening, before Abraham Crompton and Daniel Gaskell, Esqrs., and the Rev. John Yates and John Kentish, *Vice-Presidents*; the Rev. William Turner, *Visitor*; the Rev. J. G. Robberds, *Public Examiner*; the Rev. J. J. Tayler, *Secretary*; and Robert Philips, Jun., *Assistant Treasurer*; and Messrs. Bealby, Bell, Brownbill, Dawson, Heavyside, Martineau, Mead, Philips, Pratt, Talbot, Taylor, Tottie, R. V. Yates, and the Rev. Messrs. Gaskell, Lee, Mallison, Smethurst and Tate. On Monday afternoon the three Hebrew Classes were examined together, by written papers, for three hours; and the three Mathematical Classes in the same way, for an equal time. Tuesday morning the Greek Classes were examined in a similar way, from eight to eleven; after which, Orations were delivered by Mr. Paget, on “the Origin and Effects of Chivalry;” Mr. Philipps, on “Ecclesiastical Establishments;” Mr. Dawson, on “the Use of Machinery in Manufactures;” Mr. Darbishire, on “the Tendency of Berkley’s Theory;” Mr. Squire, on “the Institution of the Jesuits;” and Mr. Higginson, on “the Influence of Sects and Parties in Religion, Philosophy and Politics.” Then followed a *vivâ voce* examination of the Ethical Class; Orations, by Mr. P. Crompton, on “Fortitude;” Mr. Rankin, on “the Reformation by Wickliffe;” and Mr. Bayly, on “Penal Laws in Matters of Religion;” and the business of the day concluded by an examination, in writing, of the Belles Lettres, and Senior History Classes. Wednesday commenced with an examination, in writing, for three hours, of the Theology and Evidence Classes; which was followed by Orations by Mr. Freeman, on “the Comparative Advantages of Public and Private Education;” by Mr. Busk, on “Innovation;” and a Sermon by Mr. Worthington, on Phil. iv. 6, 7. After a short interval, Mr. Martineau delivered an Oration on “the Necessity of Cultivating the Imagination as a Regulator of the Devotional Feelings;” Mr. Crompton, on “the Imagination considered in

reference to the Works of Nature;” and Mr. Tagart, a Sermon on Acts xvi. 31. The Junior Latin Class was then publicly examined for nearly two hours; and the business of this day concluded with Orations by Mr. Talbot, on “the Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus;” and by Mr. Ketley, on “the Comparative Evidences and Nature of Christianity and Mohammedism;” and with a Sermon by Mr. Wreford, on Isa. xl. 6, 7. On Thursday, the Senior Latin Class was publicly examined for nearly two hours; Orations were delivered by Mr. Lee, on “the supposed Unfavourableness of the Roman Catholic Religion to Civil Liberty;” and by Mr. R. Brook Aspland, on “the Pulpit Oratory of France;” and a Sermon by Mr. Brown on Deut. iv. 9. The Junior History and the Logic Classes were then examined *vivâ voce*, and the examination concluded with an Oration by Mr. Howorth, on “the Charge against Christianity, that it does not inculcate Patriotism and Friendship;” and Sermons, by Mr. Beard, on Matt. xi. 5, and Mr. Mitchelson on Eph. ii. 12.

After a short interval, for determining the prizes for the best Oration and the best delivery, (it having been previously notified that the fifth year’s Students did not wish to be included, as not considering Sermons proper subjects for a prize,) the Visitor delivered the following Address:

“Gentlemen,—I am now called to the office, which I discharge with annually-increasing pleasure, of closing this long and highly satisfactory examination with our best thanks for the patience with which you have submitted to it, and the many evidences which you have given us in the course of it of the improvement you have made of the advantages here afforded you. I feel particular satisfaction in the highly creditable appearance which has throughout the week been made from the desk, as to both the composition and the delivery of your Orations and more elaborate discourses. It has been particularly gratifying to us all to observe, that you have, nearly without an exception, made choice of subjects which shew your regard for the propagation and spread of truth, virtue and religion, and this upon the firm basis of Christian principles; these principles, I trust, you will carry with you, from this place, and make the rule of your conduct through life.

“With regard to the Lay-Students of this year, let me be permitted to say,

that I feel a peculiar interest in their improvement and future welfare. With one of them I hope I may be allowed to claim a personal connexion, through a succession of interchangeable good offices, and consequent obligations, continued now for three generations; and I trust my young friend will recollect that he will be expected by the public, as well as by his near connexions, to make a worthy use of the station in society in which he has been placed by 'energy of talent.' Others there are, who can never look round this hall without meeting with the countenance of a venerable ancestor, calling upon them, I trust they always feel, in silent, indeed, but mild and expressive language, to keep up the credit of a long race of his successors, who have hitherto maintained the family-character for promoting, as he most eminently did, the interests of learning, truth and liberty. Others, I observe, the descendants or sons of those who have adorned, or are adorning, another liberal profession; and who, at the same time, have shewn, or are shewing, the sincerity of their attachment to the free profession of religion, according to the dictates of individual judgment. All these, and the rest of our young lay friends, are the objects of our most affectionate good wishes; and our hope, we trust not ill founded, that they will be the ornaments of a rising generation.

"I desire to congratulate you, my young friends, who are students for the ministry, on the ready and prompt support with which the public have met your laudable endeavours to render yourselves useful to the best interests of men, by enabling you to complete your chapel and school at Welburn. I am happy to hear that you have attended to the suggestion which I offered last year; and that, whether you are present or absent, public worship is always celebrated there on the Lord's-day. I understand it is likely that you are in future years to meet with some opposition* from a class of Christians, the merits of whose original founders we have just heard so promptly and candidly acknowledged,† and who have been eminently useful in the promotion of practical religion, though in connexion with the zealous maintenance of a scheme of doctrines which we are apt to deem erroneous. But I trust that I may be permitted to entertain on good grounds the full confidence, that this circumstance will not excite in your minds any feeling of jealousy or ill-will; but only that of a laudable emulation.

* The foundation of a Methodist chapel has lately been laid at Welburn.

† By Mr. Beard.

I entertain this confidence with the fuller security since I heard yesterday the excellent Oration of one of you, who, having already stooped to the office of instructing infantine minds in the Sunday-school, and thus imitating the Master to whom he is devoting himself by 'gathering the lambs with his arm, and carrying them in his bosom,' is in future to be one of those who succeed you, my friends who leave us, in instructing more advanced Christians. I persuade myself that he, and with him all of you, my young friends, will carry the principles of that essay into practice; and that, while you are aware of the great advantage which religion has derived from the opposition of sects and parties, you will be careful to keep the pure gold of Christian earnestness undebased with the alloy of animosity; while you inculcate what you deem to be the truth as it is in Jesus, and study to impress the minds of those who hear you with a deep sense of its practical results, and while, in so doing, you may find it necessary to refute what you conceive to be erroneous, you will never revile or scorn, or even ridicule them, still less the persons who may hold them. In short, that, in this your higher office also, you will imitate your Master, and 'never strive nor cry, or cause your voice to be heard aloud in the streets:' that you will also cultivate the spirit of his apostle, under a feeling of opposition, 'What, then, every way, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.'

"In the exercise of your Missionary labours I understand you have taken much pains to acquire the talent, or gift, (as it is often called, and as it is right to call it, for all our talents, whether natural or acquired, ought to be received, acknowledged and exercised, as gifts from God,) of speaking *extempore*. It would ill become me, who have almost daily occasion to lament the want of it, to throw any obstacle in the way of its cultivation or practice. I am aware that what is often acquiesced in, is also often mistaken for, a natural inability; and I greatly regret that I did not, in early life, make more vigorous efforts for its acquirement. Since I came among you on this occasion I have read Mr. Henry Ware's ingenious, and, on the whole, very excellent 'Hints for the Attainment of the Talent of *Extempore* Preaching;' and I have no doubt that, under his restrictions, and by a close attention to his rules, it is an accomplishment which may be applied to the noblest purposes, and be productive of the most beneficial effects. Still, however, it has its peculiar temptations; and if it should lead the Christian teacher to trust too much to

his fluency of speech, and so to neglect to store his mind by previous study (not only general study, but) of the particular subject on which he is called upon to speak, it may be productive of ill consequences which may fully counterbalance its benefits.

“I am happy that herein I am supported by the authority of unquestionably the most distinguished *extempore* speaker of the present day, who, in his late ‘Inaugural Discourse on being installed Lord Rector of Glasgow,’ has thus expressed himself: (the excellent orator has been laying down rules, which it is the interest of every student to consult and follow, for the attainment of a pure English diction; and then proceeds thus:) ‘But it must not be imagined that all the labour of the orator is ended, or that he may then dauntless and fluent enter upon his office in the public assembly. Much preparation is still required before each exertion, if rhetorical excellence is aimed at. I should lay it down as a rule, admitting of no exception, that a man will speak well in proportion as he has written much; and that, with equal talents, he will be the finest extempore speaker, when no time for preparing is allowed, who has prepared himself the most sedulously when he had an opportunity of delivering a premeditated speech. All the exceptions I have ever heard cited to this principle, are apparent ones only; proving nothing more than that some few men, of rare genius, have become great speakers without preparation; in nowise shewing, that, with preparation, they would not have reached a much higher pitch of excellence. The admitted superiority of the ancients, in all oratorical accomplishments, is the best proof of my position, for their careful preparation is undeniable; nay, in Demosthenes (of whom Quintilian says that his style indicates more premeditation,—*plus curæ*—than Cicero’s) we can trace by the recurrence of the same passage with progressive improvements in different speeches, how nicely he polished the more exquisite parts of his composition.

“‘I am now requiring, not merely great preparation while the speaker is learning his art, but after he has accomplished his education. The most splendid effort of the most mature orator will be always finer for being previously elaborated with much care. There is, no doubt, a charm in extemporaneous elocution, derived from the appearance of artless unpremeditated effusion, called forth by the occasion, and so adapting itself to its exigencies, which may compensate the manifold defects incident to this kind of composition: that which is inspired by the unforeseen circumstances of the moment,

will be of necessity suited to those circumstances in the choice of the topics, and pitched in the tone of the execution to the feelings upon which it is to operate. These are great virtues; it is another to avoid the besetting vice of modern oratory—the over doing every thing—the exhaustive method, which an off-hand speaker has no time to fall into, and he accordingly will take only the grand and effective view; nevertheless, in oratorical merit, such effusions must needs be very inferior; much of the pleasure they produce depends upon the hearer’s surprise, that in such circumstances any thing can be delivered at all, rather than upon his deliberate judgment, that he has heard any thing very excellent in itself. We may rest assured that the highest reaches of the art, and without any sacrifice of natural effect, can only be attained by him who well considers, and maturely prepares, and oftentimes sedulously corrects and refines his oration.’—Pp. 38—41.

“It now becomes my pleasing task to distribute the prizes, which either the College or the public spirit of individuals has offered for the encouragement of merit.

“It is with the highest pleasure that I can this year personally deliver the first prize for diligence, regularity, and proficiency to Mr. James Martineau, the second to Mr. Francis Darbishire, and the third to Mr. Edward Higginson. That these three young friends have fully maintained the rank assigned to them on a former occasion, will be readily allowed by the most regular of their fellow-students. The prizes given by Robert Phillips, Esq., to students in their first and second years, for improvement during the session in classical literature, are adjudged to Mr. Thomas Davies, in the first year, and Mr. Francis Rankin, in the second. Those for proficiency in mathematical studies, by a Friend to the College, are awarded to Mr. H. W. Busk, of the third class, and Mr. Darbishire, of the second. The prize for the best translation from English into Greek, given by Euelpis, is adjudged to Mr. Higginson. The prize for the best Oration delivered at this examination, to Mr. Martineau, and that for the best-delivered oration, to Mr. R. Brook Aspland. Mr. Bell offers a prize for the best Latin Essay, to be delivered in, with mottoes and a sealed letter, on or before the 1st of December this year. The subject is the maxim of Cicero, ‘*Opifex dicendi stylus*,’ in which I am happy to observe an undesigned coincidence with what has been already observed and quoted, that the assiduous practice of composition is the best means of acquiring the habit of correct speaking.

"To those of our young friends who are leaving us to fill important stations in our churches, I should feel desirous to offer a variety of observations, if it were consistent with the time prescribed for this Address. In the mean time, I feel a gratification in learning, that it is their general intention to solicit the advice of their elders respecting their conduct as ministers of the gospel. By whatever name this sort of service may be called is a matter of inferior consequence; in itself I cannot but feel that it is a highly seasonable and proper service. I shall not anticipate what you may any of you respectively hear on such occasions; but I may, perhaps, presume to recommend to your careful perusal a letter of my own, and the correspondence occasioned by it, in the Monthly Repository for 1811. Some practical hints may be gathered from thence, which may probably be found useful; as I believe they have been found by the friend to whom they were first addressed."

The Visitor's Address was followed by some important extemporary remarks by Mr. Yates, the Chairman, as the Senior Vice-President, which gave great delight to all that were present. He particularly insisted on the talent of an easy and ready utterance as necessary to a particular species of eloquence, which he would call conversational eloquence; the possessor of which was enabled to avail himself of many opportunities of inculcating important truths and instilling useful sentiments, which did not come within the province of the public orator. He also cautioned his young hearers against two errors into which the student is very apt to fall. When he is acquiring knowledge, it is very natural that, considering it as the foundation of virtue and piety, and these as the only solid foundation of present peace and comfort and hope, and of immortal felicity and glory, he should be led to undervalue every thing but pure knowledge; whereas it is in itself of little value, unless he who possesses it have also the power of communicating it: the best means of doing this is therefore of great importance. But another error was also dangerous, the imagination that it is a talent of easy attainment. After what they had heard in the Visitor's Address, and in the quotation from Mr. Brougham, it was unnecessary for him to add any thing to shew, that he who speaks best will write most: but he entreated his young friends never to go to the humblest of the meetings, they encouraged, without making a previous preparation; without serious thought, intense study and consideration what was the end they were going to promote. It was very natural for young men, educated with so

much science, to talk about enlightening the mind, banishing prejudice, overcoming obstacles to the propagation of truth; "but unless you have also at heart the grand object of saving from error, vice and misery, and preparing your hearers for immortal felicity, you fall short of the great end of your ministry."

The Assembly then separated, after a short devotional exercise, highly gratified with the proceedings of the week.

[The next Session will commence on Friday, the 23rd of September, on or before the evening of which day it is desirable that all the Students should be present.]

On Friday, July 1, the Trustees held a meeting in the Common Hall for inquiring into the affairs of the College, which were found to be in a very promising state, though standing in continual need of public support. Several applications for admission on the Foundation were accepted, others referred to the Manchester Meeting. And on Saturday a considerable party of his friends accompanied the Rev. W. S. Brown to Hull, on the invitation of the congregation there, who had chosen him to be their minister, to introduce their young friend to his new charge, and to offer their advice to, and prayers for, both minister and people.

On Sunday, July 3, after a short introductory prayer by Mr. Tagart, (who was so far on his way to Norwich, where he succeeds Mr. Madge, and where, we understand, there was to be a somewhat similar service on the 31st July,) the Rev. George Lee, as an old member of the congregation, rose up in the pew in which he sate, and announced to the crowded audience (for there were many strangers of various sects and parties) the election of Mr. Brown to be their minister, their conviction of the utility and suitableness of a religious connexion commencing with a peculiar religious service, and of the benefit which both minister and people might derive from advices to each by their older and more experienced friends. That this has been called an Ordination Service; but that this term is only applicable to it, when it is considered as consequent upon the previous proper ordination of the minister *by the congregation*, who, by their election, have appointed, or *ordained*, him to fill that important office. That the presence of so many of their friends, on so interesting an occasion, could not fail to be highly acceptable; and their advices would be listened to by both minister and people, not as an exercise of their authority, but as an expression of their Christian regard: and he hoped would be productive of much practical benefit.

Mr. Brown, from his own proper place

the pulpit, took the opportunity of expressing his purpose of devoting himself to the service of his people, as a Christian, an Unitarian, a Pastor, and a Friend, concluded by adding his own wish, in accordance with theirs, "that our friends and fathers in the ministry would afford their advice in the commencement of our Christian intercourse. I know their sentiments too well to suppose that they could wish to claim any authority over *your* decision, as an *independent* Christian church, or over *my* faith, as one enjoined by that gospel which I am called upon to teach, 'to stand fast in that liberty wherewith Christ hath made me free.'"

Mr. Brown having retired from the pulpit, Mr. Turner, of Newcastle, whose pupil he had been before his commencement of his academical studies, exhorted him (from Colos. iv. 17) to "take heed to his ministry;" and afterwards earnestly recommended him and his services to the kind notice and attention of his people.

Mr. Robberds then affectionately and fervently recommended both minister and people to the blessing of Almighty God.

Mr. Wellbeloved (Mr. Brown's Theological Tutor) represented to the congregation, in an excellent discourse, the duties which they owe to the minister of their own free choice, and to each other as members of a voluntary religious association; and pointed out a variety of particular circumstances in which it would be in their power, by proper dispositions and behaviour, to render their religious connexion mutually beneficial.

In the evening Mr. Robberds delivered an excellent discourse from Rom. xiv. 19, on the duty of "following after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another."

This account of the services of this day is respectfully submitted to the consideration of the numerous readers of the Repository, and particularly to our excellent friends Messrs. Johns and Rutt, in the hope that none can disapprove of any sentiment uttered, or any circumstance which took place, in the course of them. That they were eminently successful in promoting a spirit of Christian love, not only in the society particularly connected, but in the minds of many who attended from a distance; and that the eyes and hearts of many were opened which had formerly been shut against us, I believe is already well known at Hull. The only objection which I at present perceive against such a religious commencement of the connexion between minister and people is, that it has not hitherto been observed, except when *young* ministers have been first settled; and this seems to continue to it the air of *authority*, which, no doubt, in ages properly ecclesiastical, was

attached to it: and though there may not be *all* the same, yet there would still continue many reasons why it should take place on every change of connexion between minister and people; for ministers, at whatever age, are, or ought to be, conscious of the many imperfections of their former services, and disposed to renew their resolution of discharging their duties better in their new connexion; and there is one reason why it should be observed, peculiar to such occasions, that it would entirely do away with the idea of *ordination* as an instalment, or as giving or confirming any authority. If it were carried to this length, it might be a means of multiplying the opportunities of friendly acquaintance with each other, the great gratification and benefit of which many more than one have experienced during their late excursion; and instead of joining in Mr. Rutt's wish, "that we should hear no more of these things," there is one, at least, who does not despair of gaining him over to join in the hope that no new connexion may in future be formed among Unitarians, between congregations and their ministers, whether old or young, without some such religious observance, some friendly welcome of this kind by the neighbouring societies and their several ministers. Surely such "givings of the right hand of fellowship" would eminently tend to the promotion of truth, of virtue, and of Christian unity and love.

It would have been gratifying to the present writer to have gone through the business of the remaining part of the week, and to have reported the highly satisfactory meeting of the Unitarian Association of this part of Yorkshire and Lincolnshire. But probably this will be undertaken by some one more immediately connected with it. In the meantime, he cannot conclude the sketch already offered for insertion in the pages of the Monthly Repository, without expressing personally the entire satisfaction which he felt in all the proceedings of this annual celebration; and his hope that, on some future occasion, if life and health be spared, he may have the privilege of renewing his attendance.

V. F.

East-York and Lincolnshire Unitarian Association.

ON Tuesday evening, July 5, the Annual Meeting of this Association commenced at Hull, with a sermon by the Rev. J. G. Robberds, of Manchester, from Acts xvii. 19, 20; in which, having first observed that the Lord Chancellor had, on a late occasion, expressed himself in nearly the same words with these Epicu-

reans and Stoics, "I should like to know what an Unitarian is!" the excellent preacher undertook, in the spirit of Christian courtesy, to furnish his Lordship with a reply; we can only wish that it may be as well considered by him as it well deserves to be. It will assuredly reach his Lordship; for its publication was unanimously requested the next day, accompanied by a resolution that he might be supplied with a copy. Whether he will take the pains to satisfy his "liking," we doubt; but the public at least will have the opportunity of judging whether it is a reply that ought to satisfy. Wednesday morning a sermon was delivered by the Rev. W. Turner, of Newcastle, from 2 Tim. ii. 7, on the necessity of careful attention and serious consideration to that understanding of the Christian doctrine which the apostle prays that the Lord may give, but which it cannot be hoped that he will give to those who use not the appointed means; that, therefore, supine indolence and implicit credulity are gross violations of Christian duty. The Association, after having held a meeting for business, sate down, to the number of sixty, at three o'clock, to an economical dinner; and at six, found it necessary to put a stop to much interesting and instructive conversation, in order to attend the evening service, when the Rev. R. Cree, of Preston, delivered an elaborate and very interesting discourse from 2 Cor. v. 18, in which he took an enlarged and comprehensive view of the great scheme of Providence for the government and gradual correction and melioration of the world, shewing that "all things are of God;" that Christianity is a part of this scheme, designed and carrying on under the special direction of the one God, whose messenger, minister, and servant, the Lord Jesus Christ is, and admirably calculated, for its completion; and that the Unitarian form of Christianity is the best calculated for carrying to ultimate perfection its important objects. This sermon also, though not delivered in time for being noticed by the association as a body, received so many individual requests for its publication, that we are happy to learn its ingenious author has consented to send it to the press. May we be allowed to suggest a wish that he would print it in the same form with the Course of Lectures on the Evidences which he has announced, from which a perusal of the Prospectus issued leads us to hope for great benefit, particularly to our rising generation, and to which this discourse would prove an admirable supplement.

The devotional services were conducted by Messrs. Tagart, Ketley, and Martineau, of Manchester College, York.

Associated Ministers of Lancashire and Cheshire.

THE Annual Meeting of the Associated Ministers of Lancashire and Cheshire, took place on the 16th of June last, in the Bank-Street Chapel, Bolton. In the absence of the Rev. W. Tate, of Chorley, the devotional services were conducted by the Rev. J. Yates, of Liverpool, and the Rev. N. Jones, of Todmorden. The sermon was preached by the Rev. W. Hincks, of Liverpool, from 1 Thess. ii. 4, in which, after shewing the nature and source of that influence which Christian ministers should possess, he pointed out some of the circumstances and occasions in which the teachers of religion were most liable to transgress the precept in his text, "not as pleasing men, but God;" and censured, with considerable justness, the practice of preaching panegyric funeral orations, no less than flattering the humours and prejudices of the people. At a meeting of the ministers in the Chapel, after the religious services, the Rev. C. Wallace, of Altringham was appointed the supporter to the preacher for the next Annual Meeting at Mosely-Street Chapel, Manchester. The business of the Missionary Society was then transacted, and a series of resolutions were submitted and passed, which separate the future proceedings of this Society from the Provincial Meeting. It was also agreed to connect the Missionary Society with the London Unitarian Association.

The Meeting was numerously attended both by ministers and their lay friends, and about seventy of them afterwards dined together.

B. R. D., Secretary.

South Wales Unitarian Society.

ON the 23rd of June last, at Gellionnen, Glamorganshire, the Twenty-third Annual Meeting of the Unitarian Society in South Wales was held, where there met together a more than usual number of distant Unitarian friends from the counties of Glamorgan, Carmarthen and Cardigan. There was service at two o'clock in the afternoon of the 22nd, when Mr. Rees Davies, of Capel-y-groes and Ystrad, introduced, and Mr. Humphrey Bromley, Llanrhaiadrym-mochnant, Denbighshire, North Wales, preached on *The Connexion between Christian Truth and Virtue*, from John viii. 31, 32; and Mr. John Thomas, of Pant-y-defaid, Cardiganshire, preached after him on *The Importance of Christian Knowledge*, from Matt. vi. 23. On the 23rd, at ten o'clock, Mr. John Jones, of Bridgend, Glamorganshire, introduced, and the Rev. David Rees, M. D., of Merthyr, Glamorganshire, preached on *The Benefit of Man*

the Object of the Divine Law, from Mark ii. 27. After service there was an open conference, at which the speakers were Messrs. Evans, of Aberdâr; Thomas, of Pant-y-defaid; Davies, of Neath; Jones, of Bridgend; Griffiths, of Llan-y-fân; Bromley, of Llanrhaidr ym-mochnant; and Jones, of Capel Sion. The subject was, *The Divine Agency on the Mind of Man*.

Mr. Belsham's *Calm Inquiry** was printed by the Society, in Welsh, in the years 1820-4, and its debt incurred on account of that work has been reduced to £4. 6s. The next annual meeting is to be holden at Pant-y-defaid, Cardiganshire, Mr. John Jones, of Bridgend, to preach. The next quarterly meeting of Unitarian ministers in South Wales is to be held at Blaengwrach, on the first Thursday after Michaelmas-day; Mr. John Thomas, of Pant-y-defaid, to preach.

July 16, 1825.

The Kent and Sussex Unitarian Christian Association.

THE Kent and Sussex Unitarian Christian Association took place on Wednesday, June 29th, at Chatham. The Rev. James Taplin, of Battle, and the Rev. L. Holden, of Tenterden, conducted the devotional services. The Rev. B. Mardon, late of Glasgow, delivered an excellent sermon from Philippi. ii. 5—11, *Who being in the form of God, &c.*, which he shewed, by a variety of scriptural arguments, cannot bear the usual Trinitarian interpretation. Mr. Mardon likewise argued that the Apostle Paul, by these words, inculcated the doctrine of the Divine Unity and the proper humanity of our Lord. Towards the conclusion of the sermon, the preacher made some practical observations of which the text admits; and took a short view of the great progress of Christian truth. The minister of the Independent chapel being present at the delivery of this discourse, has since publicly made some animadversions upon it; in consequence of which the sermon will be presented to the public.

On the Chair being taken for business, the proceedings of the Committee, since the last annual meeting, were read and confirmed. From the Treasurer's report it appeared that the subscriptions for the support of Mr. HARDING as a missionary through Kent and Sussex, were insufficient, and that it was necessary to adopt some plan by which his valuable services might be retained. A resolution was accordingly passed, making a positive en-

gagement with Mr. H. for three months longer; during which time, it is hoped, every effort will be made for the support of this valuable object. Votes of thanks were passed to the Treasurer and Committee for their services during the last year, and officers appointed for the year ensuing. The ministers and their friends then withdrew to the Mitre Tavern, where one hundred and three sat down to dinner. *Thomas Baldock*, Esq., as chairman, by his good sense and Christian temper, greatly contributed to the pleasure of the company. During the afternoon several sentiments were proposed, and, among others, "May Popish prejudices and errors be subdued by Protestant liberality, candour and charity:" "Equal rights and equal laws; with the speedy repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts:" "The memory of Mrs. *Barbault* and Mrs. *Mary Hughes*, those best of benefactors to the poor, and may their loss be well supplied." "The healths of the Marquis of Lansdown, W. Smith, Esq., and all those members in both Houses who supported the Unitarian Marriage Bill." The Meeting was highly interested by the speeches of the Rev. L. Holden, Rev. B. Mardon, Rev. J. Taplin, Rev. H. Green, Mr. J. Green, Jun., and several others. Most of the company, with the chairman, withdrew early to partake of tea provided for them at the houses of friends.

T. F. THOMAS.

Chatham, July 14, 1825.

Tenterden District Unitarian Association.

ON the 2d instant, the Tenterden District Unitarian Association held their Annual Meeting for the purposes of public worship and social intercourse. The chapel service was introduced by the Rev. B. Mardon, with reading the Scriptures and prayer. The Rev. H. Green then delivered an instructive and animating sermon on the Progressive Nature of the Gospel Kingdom, from our Saviour's beautiful parable of the leaven, "which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal till the whole was leavened." A party of ladies and gentlemen, about ninety in number, then adjourned to the Woolpack Inn to tea, after which Mr. Mardon was called to, and very ably filled the Chair. The evening was employed in addresses from different speakers, and that interchange of sentiments and observations usual on these gratifying occasions.

Tenterden, June 28, 1825.

Devon and Cornwall Unitarian Association.

THE Annual Meeting of this Society was held on the 6th of July, at Exeter.

* The *Calm Inquiry*, in Welsh, is sold by the Society at 7s. in boards.

The service was opened by the Rev. J. C. Wallace, of Totness; the sermon was preached by the Rev. H. Acton, from Romans i. 16, defending the Unitarian doctrine from the charge of flattering the pride and corruption of human nature. It was an admirable discourse, exciting the close attention of the auditory, among whom we were much pleased to observe some leading members of other sects. After the Meeting, the business of the Society was transacted. By the Secretary's report there appeared to have been an increase in the number of tracts distributed in the last year, and at the same time an increase in the funds. Many tracts had been given to the Missionaries of Devon and Cornwall who had stated their distribution to have been of very essential service, that they were sought for with avidity, and lent from one to another, producing the best possible effects. The members and friends then dined together, W. Hornsey, Esq., in the chair, and were favoured with the company of the Rev. James Taylor, of America. On his health being drank, he gave a most pleasing and satisfactory account of the rise and progress of Unitarianism in Philadelphia and its present state. Mr. Wallace in giving an account of the progress of the cause in his district, read a letter from a humble tradesman of his congregation to a gentleman who had dismissed his daughter from his service, because her father, the writer of the letter, attended an Unitarian place of worship. After several able and eloquent speeches from the Chairman, the Rev. H. Acton, T. M. Kingdon, Esq., the Treasurer of the Missionary Society, and others, the company separated. In the evening, the service was opened by the Rev. Mr. Yeates, of Collumpton, and a most interesting sermon was preached by Mr. Taylor, from John xiv. 29, on the Arguments derived from Prophecy for the Truth of Christianity.

Western Unitarian Society.

THE Annual Meeting of this Society was held at Trowbridge, Wilts, on Wednesday the 13th of July. The morning service was introduced by Mr. G. Smallfield, of Hackney, with reading of the Scriptures, and a short, but most appropriate prayer; Mr. Taylor, of Philadelphia, U. S. of N. America, made the general prayer; and the Rev. R. Aspland preached the annual sermon, which was heard by a respectable audience with deep attention, and, it is hoped, will not soon be forgotten; and, if remembered, it cannot fail to produce effects highly beneficial. The discourse was founded

on the words of Paul, 2 Tim. iii. 7; from which the preacher took occasion, in a very full and circumstantial manner, with extraordinary clearness and energy, to point out the causes of the slow progress of truth, or the obstacles which keep men from coming to the knowledge of the truth; and made that practical use of the views stated, which is calculated to stimulate the zeal, and animate the hopes, of the friends of the Unitarian cause. It would be impossible, in a short compass, to do justice to this most excellent sermon; but the reporter hopes that, in compliance with the unanimous request of the society, it will be printed, being fully persuaded that the perusal of it will both highly gratify and much edify the real friends of truth, whether they have previously heard it or not.

At the meeting for business, after the morning service, several new members were added to the society. Sixty-six persons, members and friends of the society, dined together, A. Palmer, Esq., in the chair; and Mr. Aspland, Dr. Carpenter, Mr. Taylor, and several other gentlemen addressed the company, on subjects well calculated to promote the objects of the institution, and the general cause of truth and charity. Throughout, the proceedings were truly edifying.

There was a public service again in the evening, which was introduced by the Rev. H. Clarke; and the Rev. Dr. Carpenter preached on 2 Cor. x. 7. In his discourse the Doctor ably defended Unitarians against some of the false charges which are brought against them by mistaken men and bigots, (who deny them the name of Christians, and regard them as exposed to eternal condemnation,) by shewing that they believe all the essential doctrines taught by Christ and his apostles, and even agree with Christians of other denominations in the most important points; by exposing the injustice of censuring and condemning and unchristianizing those who believe in and worship the one living and true God, refer all the temporal and spiritual blessings they enjoy to him, hold themselves continually accountable to him for the improvement of all their talents, and expect from him, as his gifts, eternal life and happiness; who believe that God sent his Son Jesus Christ into the world to be the Mediator of the New Covenant; that Christ came to seek and save the lost, that in him they have life, and that all who come to God by him shall receive remission of sins; who believe that every thing which Christ taught proceeded directly from God; that God was with him, and manifested by him; and that in his precepts and example we have an infallible rule of faith and prac-

tice; and who also believe and expect that Jesus will finally be their judge; that all must stand before his judgment seat. The candid and solemn appeal which the doctor made to his hearers, as to the right of Unitarians to be acknowledged and treated as Christians, must have been felt by all serious and impartial persons. On the whole, this discourse was well suited to Trowbridge and its neighbourhood; and, it is hoped, will help to remove some of the misconceptions which so generally prevail there respecting Unitarians. There is good reason to think that the holding of this meeting at Trowbridge, together with the valuable services of Mr. Aspland on the following Sunday, which were numerously attended, will contribute to the advancement of the Unitarian cause.

R. W.

Eastern Unitarian Society.

THE Thirteenth Anniversary of the Eastern Unitarian Society was held at Framlingham, in Suffolk, on Wednesday and Thursday, the 13th and 14th of July. On Wednesday evening, Mr. Ryland (who for the last three months had been supplying the congregation at Norwich) introduced the service, and Mr. Worsley, of Plymouth, preached. On Thursday morning, Mr. James Martineau, a student at the York College, commenced the service by prayer and reading the Scriptures: Dr. Philipps, of Sheffield, followed, and Mr. Tagart, of Norwich, preached from Isaiah xxxv. 8, "The way-faring men, though fools, shall not err therein." The object of the sermon was to prove that the prophet's declaration could not be applied to the commonly reputed orthodox notions and schemes of religion, since the Scriptures would be searched in vain for any clear and explicit statement of those doctrines which are usually called the essential parts of Christianity.

After service the business of the Society was transacted, Thomas Robinson, Esq., of Bury St. Edmund's, in the chair. The Report of the Committee was received and adopted by the meeting, and the next Yearly Meeting was appointed to be held at Norwich on the first Wednesday in July, 1826, and following day. In consequence of the resignation of Isaac L. Marsh, Esq., and Mr. Edward Taylor, who had filled the offices of Treasurer and Secretary from the formation of the Society, Mr. Henry Martineau and Mr. William Newson, both of Norwich, were severally appointed to succeed them. Mr. Tagart and Mr. Worsley were requested to print their sermons, but declined ac-

ceding to the wish of the Meeting. The Meeting then proceeded to take into consideration the propriety of forming a District Association, to be called the Eastern District Association, and connected with the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, when it was unanimously resolved that such Association should be formed, and the Treasurer was directed to pay the sum of five pounds to the Treasurer of the British and Foreign Association. Mr. Edward Taylor, and Thomas Robinson, Esq., were appointed Deputies.

The thanks of the Society were voted to William Smith, Esq., for his able and judicious efforts to free the Unitarians from the degradation of being compelled to submit to the marriage service of the Established Church; for his vigilance in watching and securing their civil rights; for his consistent support of Catholic emancipation; and for his numerous and steady exertions in the cause of freedom and humanity during his long political career. Also, to the Marquis of Lansdown and to Lord Holland, for their powerful support of the Unitarian Marriage Bill, and for their steady attachment to the cause of civil and religious liberty.

The thanks of the Meeting were also given to the late Treasurer and Secretary for the discharge of their respective duties during the last fourteen years.

Seventy-three gentlemen afterwards dined together at the Crown Inn, and after dinner about twenty ladies joined the party, as did also several labouring men, some of whom had walked a distance of twenty miles in order to be present at the Meeting. We believe that none went away disappointed. Perhaps it was the most interesting Meeting the Society ever had. To see such a number of individuals, assembled, from various and distant parts of Norfolk and Suffolk, in a small market town, animated by one common feeling, men of all classes and all ranks, and welcomed and headed by the excellent and venerable minister of the Unitarian Chapel—to witness the respect which his character claims and receives from all who come within the sphere of his influence, could not fail to excite the best feelings and affections of the heart, and to lay up a store of reflections which the memory will delight to dwell on. The Chair was ably filled by George Watson, Esq., of Palgrave; and in the course of the afternoon the company were addressed by Mr. Tagart, Mr. Worsley, Mr. James Martineau, and Mr. Edward Taylor.

Address and Presentation of a piece of Plate to the Rev. W. Field, of Warwick, by his Congregation, on the Thirty-fifth Anniversary of his Ministry.

WE have very great pleasure in recording the honourable and highly-deserved compliment and respect paid to the Rev. W. Field, of Warwick, on the above occasion. The private virtues of Mr. Field, his zealous and eminent services in the Unitarian ministry, are too well known to our readers to require any publication in our pages. In 1790, when he first assumed the office of the Unitarian ministry in that town, the congregation was comparatively small, and the political and religious prejudices of the town and neighbourhood were greatly excited against the profession of Unitarian opinions, and the establishment of the Sunday-schools: we only refer to these circumstances as a gratifying contrast to the liberal spirit of the present day. No one is now more universally esteemed than Mr. Field: his evening services are frequently attended by many members of the Establishment and other Dissenting churches; and he is entrusted with the education of many of their sons. Thus truth triumphs over error.

On the evening of the 12th, the *whole* congregation, and many ladies and gentlemen of different religious sentiments, assembled to tea in the large room of the Race Stand, which the proprietors had liberally lent for the occasion. Mr. Field was present by invitation. After tea, Mr. Brookhouse, in the name of the congregation, presented a Silver Salver, with the following Address:—

“ I have much pleasure, Sir, in presenting to you this Salver, in the name of your congregation, who beg that you will accept it, as a slight token of their high regard for your character, both public and private.

“ Our Society has now been favoured with your services, for the long period of thirty-five years. The occasion is one which presents no ordinary claims on our respect and gratitude; and we think that we should be wanting in duty, both to you and to ourselves, if we suffered it to pass, without some more than ordinary expression of our feelings. You will believe, Sir, that it is not the language of flattery, but that of sincerity and of truth, when we say, that in presenting you with this token of our regard, we have been influenced by the deepest sense of the value of those public services on which we are in the habit of attending on the Lord's day. We feel the happiness of

frequenting a place of worship, where the most enlarged views of Christian truth are unfolded before our minds; where the great rules of our duty are illustrated and enforced in the most impressive manner; and where we are made intimately acquainted with those consolations under the troubles of life, which religion alone is able to furnish. We feel that we have ourselves alone to blame, if we do not profit by the services which you so ably conduct; and we are sensible that those services are rendered doubly impressive by the excellence of your private character, by that pure spirit of Christian charity, by that strict integrity, and that unwearied assiduity, in the performance of all the great duties of life, by which your conduct has been uniformly marked. These excellencies have endeared you to us, as they have also deservedly obtained for you the high respect of your neighbours and fellow-townsmen.

“ As a token of the sincere and fervent esteem and affection which we entertain for you, we beg that you will accept this piece of Plate—accompanied, as it is, with our most ardent wishes, that you may long be spared as a blessing to us, and to your family, and that the Great Author of all mercies may bestow upon you every real good, both in the present and the future life.”

This Address was received by the company with the warmest applause. It was truly interesting to observe the feelings of pleasure and interest in every countenance of this general assembly. The presence and intermixture of all classes of the society was consistent with the principles and practice of the first promulgators of Christianity, the great Author of which had “ no respect of persons.” Mr. Field was the patriarch of the family. He then came forward and addressed the company to the following effect:—

He began with saying, that he could hardly find words to express how much he felt obliged and gratified by the favour they had done him, in assembling, so numerous, as a respectful compliment to him; and especially by the great favour they had conferred upon him, in the generous and the splendid gift which, by the hands of one of his earliest and one of his best friends, they had, in so handsome a manner, and with so many kind and encouraging expressions, presented to him. Such a public testimony of respectful and affectionate regard was, indeed, a flattering distinction: and, he hoped, they would believe that he received it with a high and glowing satisfaction at his heart: and that he should never cease to remember it with gratitude

and with delight, so long as the powers of memory lasted.

He then proceeded to mention that, on that day thirty-five years ago, he first took upon himself the duties of that office, which gave him a fixed residence in their town; and brought him into near connexion with many, then present, as fellow-worshippers in the same temple, and with all of them as fellow-townsmen:—and “your presence here,” said he, “encourages me to add, not as fellow-townsmen only, but also as kind friends and well-wishers.” Noticing the long course of his services—though he could not flatter himself that they were valuable or important, in proportion to the length of their continuance; yet some part of the praise they had so kindly bestowed upon him in the address of his excellent friend, and in the inscription, just read, he did venture to take to himself—the praise of his fidelity to his trust—the praise of sincere intention and earnest exertion, in the discharge of his official duties. “Yes!” said he, “looking back through the course of the thirty-five departed years, I hope I may venture to say, that if I have not laboured so effectually as I could wish, yet that my labours have been sincerely and earnestly directed to the great object of promoting the sacred cause of religious and moral truth!”

Speaking next of the changes which had taken place in the state of his own religious society, he remarked, that of all who belonged to it when he first took the charge of it, there were not more than three or four individuals now remaining! Of the rest, he said, some had been removed from this place by the changes of life, and many had been removed from this world by the great change of death. After pathetically lamenting the loss of almost all those who first invited him to Warwick, he went on to say, that though he had lost many kind and affectionate friends, many steady and zealous supporters, who, if they had been living, would have rejoiced to witness the honours, and to share with him in the happiness of that day—yet that he had abundant cause for gratitude in finding so many other friends rising up in their place, no less kind and affectionate than they; no less steady and zealous in their support than they. “Of this,” said the speaker, “could I desire a greater or a more decisive proof, than this large assembly, crowding round me, or that noble present lying before me?”

One of the most pleasing circumstances, he next observed, of their present meeting, was, that so many persons, not members of his congregation, had united with them, in promoting the ob-

ject of it; some by handsomely granting the use of the large and commodious room in which they were assembled; others by generously contributing their pecuniary aid; others by their declared good wishes; and many, he was proud to see, by their actual presence. This he dwelt upon, as a testimony to what little merit he might have, most of all gratifying to him, because it could only proceed from some strong feeling in his favour. He then expressed, very fervently, his thanks to those friends, not of his congregation, for the great favour they had done him, by their presence in that assembly, and by their concurrence in that gift, which would for ever signalize this day, said he, as one of the happiest days in the “short and simple annals of his life.” Such kind support, he should ever remember as an indulgent act of respectful regard to him; and whilst, most honourable to his own character, he considered it as no less honourable to the candour of theirs.

The times we now live in, the speaker next, with much animation, exclaimed, are glorious times! times of increasing knowledge, improving morals, and more enlarged, more enlightened, if not more ardent and active, benevolence! But in no respect did he consider the times as more glorious than in this—that the spirit of religious bigotry was every where either dying fast, or quite dead and gone; and instead of it, is springing up, every where, into full life and active vigour, a noble spirit of religious candour and charity. All men, in almost every country, of almost every religious sect, are learning, and learning very fast too, this important lesson—not merely to endure those who are honestly of a different opinion, but to love and respect them, just as much as if they held the same opinions with themselves. This, said he, is a grand improvement in human character. It tears up, by the root, some of the most painful feelings, some of the most pitiful prejudices, that have ever planted themselves in the human mind. It must increase greatly the pleasures of social intercourse, and contribute much to promote the order, the harmony, the happiness of social life.

Alluding to one of his own publications, the speaker observed, he had already said it in print, and he would say it there again, that in the liberal spirit of the times, few places have more largely participated than the town in which he had lived so long. This he ascribed, in no small degree, to the happy influence of known liberality of sentiment, and known benevolence of spirit, which a great divine, (Dr. Parr,) whom they had lately

lost, exerted and diffused in a wide circle all around him. "And here," said he, "I cannot help indulging for a moment in the melancholy pleasure of thinking, had he been now living, how cordially would he have rejoiced to meet us in this place, and to join with us in all the transactions of this day! How pleased would he have been to witness the honour you have conferred upon one whom he himself delighted, on all occasions, to honour; and whom he distinguished by his kind and affectionate regard, continued through many years to the last moments of his existence. Well!" said the speaker, mournfully, "he is gone! By his death, one great happiness of my life is struck down, and the chief glory of our neighbourhood is for ever eclipsed! If that venerated person, to whom I am alluding," continued the speaker, "were capable of hearing what I am now going to say, I am sure he would approve it: I am sure he would applaud it. It is this: that we cannot do greater honour to his memory than by cherishing in our own minds, and promoting in the minds of all around us, the same candour and charity which shone out so brilliantly in his character."

Mr. Field concluded by repeating his thanks for the honour and happiness the company had conferred upon him that day, by their kind attendance, and by their most generous and splendid gift; adding his best wishes for their health and happiness, and his humble hopes of having with them a far more joyful meeting, under far more favourable circumstances than they could now conceive of—hereafter!

We need make no comments on the excellent sentiments of the Address and Answer, alike honourable to all parties.

The Plate was of the value of Fifty Guineas, and bears the following inscription:—"Presented to the Rev. WM. FIELD, by the Congregation assembling in the High-Street Chapel, Warwick, in testimony of the high respect which they entertain for his private character, and in grateful acknowledgment of the exemplary fidelity; the animated zeal, and the unwearied diligence with which, during the period of thirty-five years, he has discharged among them the office of a Christian Minister. July 12th, 1825."

The health of Mr. Brookhouse was drank, who returned thanks. Several gentlemen addressed the Meeting, and proposed other toasts. The Rev. Mr. Wood, of Kenilworth, and Mr. Wallace, of Altringham, were present; and other Dissenting Ministers, of different denominations, expressed their intention of attending, had not previous engagements prevented them.

Address of the Catholic Association to the People of Ireland.

(Concluded from p. 380.)

Fellow-Countrymen,

ATTEND to our advice—we advise you to abstain from all such secret combinations; if you engage in them, you not only meet our decided disapprobation, in conjunction with that of your revered clergy, but you gratify and delight the basest and bloodiest faction that ever polluted a country—the Orange faction. The Orangemen anxiously desire that you should form Whiteboy, and Ribbon, and other secret societies; they not only desire it, but they take an active part in promoting the formation of such societies; they send amongst you spies and informers; first to instigate you to crime, and then to betray you to punishment. They supply their emissaries with money, and they send them to different parts of the country, holding out to the people the pretence of being friends and fellow-sufferers. The instances are not few nor remote of such instigation, and it is quite natural that the Orangemen should adopt such measures. When the country is disturbed, it is the Orangeman's harvest; he is then employed in the constabulary force and in the police, and he obtains permanent pay in the yeomanry corps. He shares the rewards with the informer, and often helps him to mark out his victim. He is also able to traduce the people and the religion of the land. The absence of constitutional law enables the Orangeman to exert ruffian violence with impunity; and thus, by means of secret and Whiteboy societies and outrages, the fell Orangeman is able to gratify his predominant passions of avarice, oppression and cruelty.

You could not please the Orangemen more than in embarking in secret societies, Whiteboyism and outrage.

On the other hand, you cannot do any thing that could more afflict your sincere friends. You could do nothing that could give greater grief to the Catholic Association, that now affectionately and anxiously address you. We are striving to obtain your rights by constitutional and legal means. We are endeavouring to procure redress, through the proper and legal channel, for the oppressions which aggrieve you. We are anxiously desirous to obtain from Parliament a great diminution of tithes—a total abolition of the Church rates—a great reduction of the grand jury cess—the abolition of the odious oppressions and heavy tolls, raised by bigoted and narrow-minded corporators—a more pure administration of justice, more especially as it affects the lower and poorer classes of the commu-

nity; and, above all, the extension of equal laws and equal rights to all classes of his Majesty's subjects.

Engaged in these sacred duties, our success for the people is highly probable, unless we are thwarted by the people themselves. We have no idea of acting for persons who would be so foolish as to put themselves in the power of their enemies; and we now, and for ever, disclaim any kind of alliance with persons who could be so wicked as to commit crimes—besides, our power to do good is necessarily weakened by any disturbance on the part of the people, whilst the strength of their enemies is thereby augmented and reinforced.

Thus, fellow-countrymen, we have submitted to your judgment and reason these topics—

1st. That no good has ever been the result of Whiteboy disturbances and secret societies.

2d. That the persons engaged therein are liable to the severest punishment—to imprisonment, whipping, transportation and death.

3d. We have shewn you that your religion distinctly and loudly prohibits and condemns all the outrages and crimes which are produced by Whiteboyism and secret societies.

4th. That it would be quite foolish and absurd to expect any kind of success from Whiteboyism or secret societies.

5th. That such disturbances give great pleasure and many advantages to the Orange faction, and are, in general, secretly instigated by that foul faction.

6th. That these disturbances and secret societies are reprobated and condemned by your excellent and matchless clergy—a clergy whom you ought not only to esteem and to love, but whose advice you are bound to respect and obey.

7th. That these disturbances and secret societies are most distinctly and emphatically condemned by your most sincere friends, the Catholic Association of Ireland.

8th. That the necessary consequences of such disturbances and Whiteboy societies, is to impede our legal and constitutional exertions in our progress to put down the Orange faction, to obtain redress for many of the oppressions and grievances under which you labour, and, in fine, to achieve Catholic Emancipation.

There remains one topic more, and that is peculiar to the present times. We have, at length, an Attorney-General who exposes faction, and is anxious to do his duty impartially to all the King's subjects. We have, for Lord Lieutenant, an Irish Nobleman, who loves the land of his birth, of which he is a bright ornament, and who is sincerely solicitous to give her

peace, quiet, liberty and happiness; but, above all, and greatest of all, we have now upon the throne a Monarch, to whom the people of Ireland ought to look with affectionate hope; a Monarch who had the good sense and the manliness to commence his reign by that noble declaration, "That power was a trust for the good of the people;" the first British Monarch who ever reached the shores of Ireland in the sweet garb of peace, and for the purposes of benevolence and kindness; a Monarch who has often declared his warm affection for his Irish subjects, and of whom we have every reason to believe that the leading wish of his patriotic and cultivated mind is to see dissension cease, and cordial unanimity of sentiment prevail in Ireland.

In the name, then, of common sense, which forbids you to seek foolish courses; by the hate you bear the Orangemen, who are your natural enemies; by the confidence you repose in the Catholic Association, who are your natural and zealous friends; by the respect and affection you entertain for your clergy, who alone visit with comfort your beds of sickness and desolation; by all these powerful motives, and still more by the affectionate reverence you bear for the gracious Monarch who deigns to think of your sufferings with a view to your relief; and, above all, and infinitely beyond all, in the name of religion, and of the living God, we conjure you to abstain from all secret and illegal societies and Whiteboy disturbances and outrages.

So shall you permit us to seek, by peaceful, legal and constitutional means, for redress of your grievances and oppressions; and so shall you enable us to obtain for our beloved country those constitutional privileges and blessings which can alone make her what she ought to be—

“ ———Great, glorious and free,
First flower of the earth, and first
gem of the sea.”

NOTICES.

THERE will be a religious service on the settlement of Mr. EDWARD TAGART, as Minister of the *Octagon Chapel*, at *Norwich*, on Wednesday, August 10th. Mr. William Turner, Jun., of York, will deliver the Charge to the Minister, and Mr. W. J. Fox, of London, will address the congregation. E. T.

The Rev. JOHN HOWARD RYLAND, of Birmingham, has accepted the unanimous invitation of the members of the Unitarian Chapel at Diss, in Norfolk, to succeed their late pastor, the Rev. Charles P. Valentine.

PARLIAMENTARY.
HOUSE OF LORDS.
APRIL 25, 1825.

The Duke of York's Speech on presenting a Petition from the Dean and Chapter of the Collegiate Church of St. George, Windsor, against the Catholic Claims.

His Royal Highness stated, that he had been requested to present to their Lordships the petition of the Dean and Canons of Windsor, praying that no further concessions should be made to the Roman Catholics.

He considered it unnecessary, in bringing before their Lordships the petition of so learned and respectable a body, to assure them that it was worded so as to ensure its reception; but, before he moved that it should be read, he must be permitted to say a few words.

Sensible as his Royal Highness was of his want of habit and ability, to take a part in their Lordships' debates, it was not without the greatest reluctance that he ventured to trespass upon their time and attention; but he felt that there were occasions when every man owed it to his country and to his station, to declare his sentiments; and no opportunity could, in his opinion, offer, which required more imperiously the frank avowal of them than the present, when their Lordships were called upon to make a total change in the fundamental principle of the Constitution, and, in his Royal Highness's view of the question, to strike at the very root of its existence.

His Royal Highness observed, that 28 years had elapsed since this question had been first agitated, under the most awful circumstances, while this country was engaged in a most arduous and expensive, though just and glorious war; that the agitation of it had been the cause of a most serious and alarming illness to an illustrious Personage, now no more, whose exalted character and virtues, and whose parental affection for his people, would render his memory ever dear to this country; that it had also produced the temporary retirement from his late Majesty's Councils of one of the most able, enlightened, and most honest Statesmen of whom this country could boast.

Upon this question they were now called to decide; and from the first moment of its agitation to the present, his Royal Highness had not for one instant hesitated, or felt a doubt as to the propriety of the line of conduct he had adopted in reference to it.

That he must also call their Lordships'

attention to the great change of language and sentiments which had taken place since the subject was first introduced, among the advocates for Catholic Emancipation.

That at first the most zealous of these had cautiously and yet strenuously endeavoured to impress upon the minds of the people that Catholic Emancipation ought not to be granted without establishing strong and effectual barriers against any encroachment on the Protestant ascendancy. But how changed was now their language! Their Lordships were now required to surrender every principle of the Constitution, and to deliver us up, bound hand and foot, to the mercy and generosity of the Roman Catholics, without any assurance even that they would be satisfied with such fearful concessions.

His Royal Highness had, upon a former occasion, taken the liberty of stating his sentiments fully upon the subject, and had endeavoured to convey to their Lordships that no person was more decidedly inclined to toleration than his late Majesty, but that it must be admitted there is a great difference between toleration, participation, and emancipation. He would not now enter into this discussion, convinced as he was that if the bill should again be brought under their consideration, its merits would be much more ably discussed by others of their Lordships. There were, however, one or two points which appeared to him to have been kept out of view in the different debates that had occurred in various places, and which seemed to him of such vital importance that he could not help touching upon them.

The first was, the situation in which the Church of England would be placed should Catholic Emancipation pass. If his Royal Highness were mistaken he would doubtless be set right; but he had always understood that the Established Church of England stands in a very different situation from any other religious persuasion in the world, different even from that of the sectarians in this country. The Established Church was subject to its own government, and did not admit the interference of the civil authorities. It was placed under the authority of the King as the Head of it, and under the controul of Parliament, so much so, that the Church was not only not represented as a body in the Lower House of Parliament, but that no clergyman was admitted to a seat in it.

Surely, their Lordships could not wish to place the Established Church of England upon a worse footing than any other church within these realms; nor allow the Roman Catholics, who not only

refuse to submit to our rules, but who deny any authority of the civil power over their Church, to legislate for the Established Church, which must be the case if they should be admitted to seats in either House of Parliament.

The other point to which his Royal Highness had to advert was one he felt to be of a more delicate nature. He must, therefore, begin by stating to their Lordships, that he spoke only his own individual sentiments; as he must not be supposed to utter in that House the sentiments of any other person. He was sensible that, by what he was about to say, he should subject himself to the scoffs and jeers of some, and to the animadversions of others; but from speaking conscientiously his own feelings and sentiments, he would by no apprehension whatever be appalled or deterred.

That he wished to ask whether their Lordships had considered the situation in which they might place the King, or whether they recollected the oath which his Majesty had taken at the altar, to his people, upon his Coronation. He begged to read the words of that oath:—

“I will, to the utmost of my power, maintain the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant Reformed Religion established by law—and I will preserve unto the Bishops and Clergy of this realm, and to the Churches committed to their charge, all such rights and privileges as by law do or shall appertain to them, or any of them; and I will maintain and preserve inviolably the settlement of the Church of England, and the doctrine, worship, discipline and government thereof as by law established, within the kingdoms of England and Ireland, the dominion of Wales, and town of Berwick-upon-Tweed, and the territories thereunto belonging.”

Their Lordships must remember that ours is a *Protestant* King, who knows no *mental reservation*, and whose situation is different from that of any other person in this country. That his Royal Highness and every other individual in this country could be released from his oath by the authority of Parliament; but the King could not. The oath, as he had always understood, is a solemn obligation entered into by the person who took it, from which no act of his own could release him; but the King was the third part of the State, without whose *voluntary* consent no Act of the Legislature could be valid, and he could not relieve himself from the obligation of an oath.

His Royal Highness feared that he had already trespassed too long upon their Lordships, and he thanked them for the patience with which they had heard him.

If he had expressed himself too warmly, especially in the latter part of what he had said, he must appeal to their liberality. That he felt the subject most forcibly, and that it affected him yet more deeply when he remembered that to its agitation must be ascribed that severe illness, and ten years of misery, which had clouded the existence of his illustrious and beloved father. That he should therefore conclude with assuring their Lordships that he had uttered his honest and conscientious sentiments, founded upon principles which he had imbibed from his earliest youth; to the justice of which he had subscribed, after serious consideration, when he attained more mature years; and that these were the principles to which he would adhere, and which he would maintain and act up to to the latest moment of his existence, whatever might be his situation of life—So help him God!

JUNE 3, 1824.

Unitarian Marriage Bill.

The Marquis of LANSDOWN rose to move the second reading of this bill. He reminded their Lordships, that last year he had the honour to propose to them a bill to the same effect as the present, which had this session been brought up from the Commons. That bill had been thrown out on the second reading; but now a bill for the same object had not only been agreed to by the other House of Parliament, but had passed that House without a division on any of its stages. The present bill differed in some respects from that which he had introduced last session. Much pains had been taken to improve it. Ministers of the Established Church had given their advice, and lent their assistance in framing it. He did not state this fact with the view of thereby obtaining any improper influence over the minds of their Lordships, but to induce those who were disposed to object to it to consider the subject well before they opposed a measure which came before them under such a sanction, and which was fortified by the approbation of the House of Commons. The bill related to a grievance not very difficult of remedy, but not the less felt by those whom it affected. The object of the measure was to remove the difficulties which stood in the way of the performance of the marriage ceremony with regard to certain individuals. That ceremony should be open to persons of all opinions; but from the manner in which it had been hitherto treated, it would appear that giving the means of marriage was regarded as a boon. Every individual, however, whatever his opinions might be, was entitled to have

all obstacles removed which tended to prevent him from celebrating, in what he considered the most solemn manner, that ceremony which formed the most sacred of all ties. Every unnecessary restriction and regulation which affected particular classes of persons in regard to such an object as marriage, ought surely to be done away without delay; and on this subject it was their Lordships' duty to give every relief which was consistent with the safety of the state. Only those regulations which appeared to be called for by necessity ought to be maintained. The different regulations adopted in this and other countries resolved themselves into two kinds—namely, civil and religious. With regard to the former, in as far as related to matters of police, the object of the bill was to maintain every civil right. The persons for whose benefit it was introduced were ready to submit to any civil regulation on the subject of marriage which their Lordships might think fit to impose. The religious part of the question, their Lordships would perceive, was totally distinct from the civil; and all that the bill proposed to do, was to provide against the depreciation of the sacred ceremony of marriage by regulations to which Unitarians could not conscientiously submit. To make the legality of so solemn a tie as marriage depend upon declaring what the parties did not believe to be the truth, was to invite them to do that which their Lordships, who were sensible of the sacredness of the obligation entered into, must regard as highly improper. According to the former bill, the marriage ceremony was to be celebrated by the clergy of the Established Church. That mode had, however, been thought objectionable, and it was therefore provided by the present bill that the ceremony should be carried into effect by the Unitarian ministers in their own congregations. When it was considered that the ceremony of marriage was intended for the benefit of the whole community, it would be proper to perform it, as far as possible, in the same manner for all classes; but as conscientious scruples about performing the ceremony to Unitarians were known to exist in the minds of many ministers of the Church, this mode had been abandoned. In the same way some of the ministers of the Established Church had objected to registering the marriages of persons who were united by a ceremony inconsistent with the principles of the Church; and to obviate this difficulty, the Unitarians also took upon themselves the trouble of registering their own marriages. In fact, the bill professed to do, and did nothing more than afford relief from regulations inconsistent with the

conscientious scruples of individuals. None of their Lordships would say that the opinions of the persons whom the bill proposed to relieve were not tolerated by law; and being so, the law ought to protect them, and facilitate to them the means of duly forming the most sacred of all the relations of society. It would, perhaps, be asked, why were the persons for whose benefit the bill was framed so scrupulous? Some, he was aware, might make a compromise with conscience, and be able to satisfy themselves of the propriety of every opinion that was consistent with their temporal interests; but their Lordships surely would not encourage a species of reasoning which led to a disregard of the truth of the most solemn declarations. Their Lordships ought not to discountenance or despise scruples which were opposed to a practice inconsistent with morality and religion. Persons ought not to be forced to enter the temple of God with equivocation on their tongues, nor made to subscribe to what they did not believe to be true. Wherever sincere and conscientious scruples existed, they ought to be met half way. On these grounds, he proposed to their Lordships the second reading of this bill.

The Archbishop of CANTERBURY had voted for the bill of last session, and intended to give his support to the present, because its tendency was equally to relieve Unitarians and ministers of the Established Church. The scruples of the Unitarians he believed to be sincere; but he was chiefly anxious to remove, by this bill or some other, the difficulties in which ministers of the Church were involved by Unitarian marriages. The bill, he thought, might be amended; and for that purpose he would propose some clauses in the committee. By this or some other measure, he wished to do away with that unhallowed equivocation which, sanctioned by law, now took place at the altar.

The Bishop of BATH and WELLS, having stated his sentiments at some length upon this subject when it was before the House last year, would trouble their Lordships with very few observations upon it at present. He felt himself bound, however, to state as briefly as possible the reasons which impelled him to oppose this bill. His objection lay to the principle of the measure. He did not see on what grounds marriage, according to the rites of the Church of England, was to be considered a grievance to the Unitarians. First, what were they called upon to subscribe? Merely the parties' names. He admitted, however, that they were obliged to make a declaration "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:" but these very words were used in their own printed

form of prayer. The words used by the Unitarians in their ceremony of baptism were these—"I baptize thee in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." They, therefore, could not justly object to their own form of prayer. He also admitted that the clergyman who performed the ceremony of marriage gave to the parties benediction, by praying to God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, to bless them. Now, if they did not think they were the better for this, surely they could not feel themselves the worse for it. He defended the ministers of the Church of England from the charge of equivocation in the performance of this ceremony for the Unitarians. There was no ground whatever for such a charge, for the word equivocation implied saying one thing and meaning another, for the purpose of deception. Now there was no deception here, because the minister knew beforehand the opinions of the Unitarian, and the Unitarian knew those of the minister, so that neither party was deceiving or deceived. He therefore repelled with indignation the charge brought against the ministers of the Church; they were neither guilty of equivocation nor pious fraud. He denied that the Unitarians had any just grounds for saying that their consciences were violated. Occasions were continually occurring when points of doctrine laid down by ministers of the Church, were disapproved of by some individuals, who said that they would not again go to Church to hear them; but that was no reason why the Church of England should not lay down the pure doctrines of Christianity. If the minister of the gospel did not propound the true principles of faith in Christ Jesus, how else was the gainsayer to be converted? He contended that if this privilege were ceded to the Unitarians, it must also be granted to every other sect and community, however erroneous their opinions might be. The doctrine of the Unitarians gave them no right to be looked upon as a favoured sect; yet this concession would be calculated to give a spread to the opinions of that sect; although, by denying the divinity of Christ, they laid the axe to the root of the tree of Christianity itself. For these reasons he moved, as an amendment, that the bill be read a second time that day three months.

The Bishop of LICHFIELD and COVENTRY considered the opinions of the Unitarians as utterly destitute of any foundation; and grossly erroneous as they were, he must believe them to affect their conduct; but still he looked upon their present complaint as founded on fair grounds, and he conceived the bill entitled to their Lordships' support, as being

calculated to deliver the Church of England from the scandalous profanation of a compromise at the altar. He was a general friend to toleration; although he did not wish to give any encouragement to those sectaries; but he did not conceive that the present bill would operate as any encouragement to them. His Lordship concluded by supporting the original motion.

The LORD CHANCELLOR would be very glad if any noble Lord would inform him what he meant by the word "Unitarian:" for if a Unitarian were a person who denied the divinity of Christ, their Lordships, before they could pass this bill, must first pass an act rendering it lawful for him so to do. His Lordship then referred to the Act of William to shew that the denial of the divinity of our Saviour was declared to be a heinous crime, which subjected the party guilty of it to a severe punishment. The Act of Toleration did not repeal the law as it had stood before; it only excepted the parties in some cases from the consequences of those crimes which were crimes at common law before the passing of that act. No man who should propose to repeal that law, could feel as an Englishman or a Christian: but if it was a crime at common law to deny the divinity of Christ, their Lordships must begin with repealing the common law, and not with an Act of Parliament in the teeth of it. The Jews and the Quakers had marriage ceremonies of their own, and he should not be sorry to see a bill introduced, declaring their marriages to be valid; for although they were excepted in Lord Hardwicke's Act, yet in a case which had lately come before him, considerable doubts had been raised as to the validity of the Quakers' marriages. He considered the doctrines of the Unitarians as calculated to work an essential mischief in this country, and he called upon the House not to sanction that which the Judges of Westminster Hall must deny in judgment.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL felt great pain in differing from his Noble and Learned Friend on the Woolsack, particularly on such a question as this: but, entertaining a strong opinion upon the subject, he should not be discharging his duty if he did not state the grounds of that opinion. His Noble and Learned Friend had stated at some length the principles of the common law as respected this subject, and said, that notwithstanding the Act of Toleration, the common law was still in force. But the Noble and Learned Lord, towards the conclusion of his speech, furnished an argument against himself; for what did he admit? An understanding that Jews and Quakers might lawfully

marry according to the rites of their own communions; for they were excepted in Lord Hardwicke's Act. Now could any man assert that the doctrines of the Unitarians were more at variance with the principles of Christianity than those of the Jews were? The Unitarians denied the divinity of Christ; but the Jews denied the truth of Christianity altogether—they blasphemed and crucified him whom we adored. The same argument would apply to Mahometans and various other persuasions, if the members of them were sufficiently numerous in this country. But how did the law stand at present? In some cases marriage, according to the rites of the Church of England, was not necessary even amongst members of the Church of England itself; for they might go to France and be married by a Roman Catholic, or to Scotland and be married by a Presbyterian, and in both cases the marriage was good and binding. He believed that if, in a country where a priest could not be had, a marriage was performed by a civil person, that marriage was also valid by law: and the reason was, that every possible facility might be given to marriage, in order to prevent immorality. He would now advert to the ground of expediency. The strongest argument which he had heard against the bill, was that which had been urged by a Right Reverend Prelate, who said if the concession were to be made to the Unitarians, why not extend it to every other sect? The answer was, because it was impracticable. When a bill had been brought in for that purpose by a Noble Lord, he (Lord Liverpool) voted for it; but he afterwards stated, that he could not give it his support in the committee, having been convinced, by the speech of a Noble Friend of his, that it would be impossible to frame a general act to meet the object in view. They had an example for the present measure in the case of the Quakers. He thought, that where there was a sincere and conscientious objection entertained, it ought to be respected. A Jew could not, a Quaker could not, a Unitarian could not, submit to have the ceremony performed by the Church of England, or, if he could, it was only by casting a slur on that Church; for their Lordships constantly saw in the papers statements of protests, which must have filled them with disgust. The Church had a right, and it was her duty, to compel marriage according to her own rites, amongst her own members; but as she did not assume to be an infallible church, he did not see why she should look with any jealousy on the doctrines of those who were of a different communion. He therefore saw no objection to the

present bill, and on these grounds he would give it his support.

The Bishop of CHESTER would trouble the House with a very few observations. There could be no question as to the importance of this subject to the Unitarians. If they were sincere in their belief (as he had no doubt they were) against the divinity of the Trinity, and if they really considered that by submitting to the ceremony of marriage in the Church of England, they were brought to worship the Trinity, he certainly thought them entitled to relief. While the Noble Marquis opposite defended the sincerity of the Unitarians, he had thought proper to cast an unmerited imputation on the body of the English clergy. ("No," from Lord Lansdown.) He certainly understood his Lordship to allude to them.

The Marquis of LANSDOWN said, he had not made any such allusion.

The Bishop of CHESTER was ready to admit the sincerity of the Unitarians, but they were spurred on to their present complaint by the sneers of a sect who called themselves Free-thinking Christians. Here his Lordship read an extract from the *Free-thinking Christians' Magazine*, in which the writer animadverted upon the marriages of the Unitarians by ministers of the Established Church. As, however, there was no very great grievance imposed upon the consciences of the Unitarians, he thought that, after having submitted so long, they might submit for one year longer to the privation of what he considered a right. He agreed with the Right Reverend Prelate (the Bishop of Lichfield) that the present measure would afford not only relief to the Unitarians, but also to the clergy of the Church of England; and he would, therefore, put the former on the same footing with the Quakers, and all the other Dissenters, before the passing of the Marriage Act. He was not for imposing the doctrine or the discipline of the Church of England upon those who could not conscientiously entertain them; but the Unitarians were not prepared at present to give the necessary securities against clandestineness, and, consequently, he was impelled to oppose this bill. He had no objection to give the Unitarians the same privilege which was enjoyed by Jews and Quakers, but nothing further; at the same time, that he would provide effectual barriers against clandestine marriages.

Lord REDESDALE opposed the bill.

Lord CALTHORPE supported the bill, on the ground that it was a measure of relief to the Church rather than to the Unitarians. He also contended, that it was unfair to place the Unitarians on the

same footing as any other Dissenters, because, to other Dissenters, who did not, like the Unitarians, deny the doctrine of the Trinity, the marriage ceremony was no hardship, but it was to Unitarians a very great one. He would not attempt to impugn the legal argument of the Noble and Learned Lord on the Woolsack, but the present law, admitting it to be correctly stated by the Noble and Learned Lord, afforded, in his mind, a strong reason for passing the bill. The Church could not better promote her true interests than by conforming herself to the increasing knowledge and genius of the age. Nothing could be more injurious to her than to place her in opposition to liberal ideas. The Church was able to rely on her own strength, and might, without fear, appeal to the augmented learning and assiduity of her clergy, to the increased number of her churches, and to the two great Universities, which year after year sent forth distinguished champions to uphold her rank and maintain her security. In conclusion, he supported the measure, because he believed that it would add to the dignity and character of the Church of England.

After a few words from the Marquis of LANSDOWN, in which his Lordship denied that the sect of Free-thinking Christians had had any part in bringing forward the present bill, the House divided. The numbers appeared—for the second reading—

Content.....	32	
Proxies	20	52
Not Content.	31	
Proxies	25	56
Majority against the Bill	4	

JULY 5.

Petition from Unitarians.

The Marquis of LANSDOWN rose to present a petition to their Lordships from a body of men with whom he did not agree, and with whose opinions their Lordships, he knew, did not agree—a petition from the Unitarian Dissenters, praying for inquiry into the state of the law as it was applicable to them. He knew (the Noble Marquis said) that it was not possible for their Lordships to enter then into the inquiry, but he must say that he was surprised that any body of men, against whom whatever errors might be imputed to their belief, no crime could be alleged, and who professed those religious opinions which held society together; he was surprised that a body of men of this description, who were not charged with any crimes as bad

subjects, should be deemed or suspected to be liable at common law to be treated as if they had committed, in professing a peculiar religious opinion, a detestable crime. He did not believe that Lord Mansfield could have been in error when he declared that the law protected nothing which that law deemed a crime. The petitioners, whatever might have been their former opinions of security under the Toleration Act, could not conceal from their Lordships, that doubts had been entertained in high quarters, such as were described in the petition, whether the petitioners did not commit a crime at common law by the opinions they held. They approached their Lordships with a prayer, to which he was sure their Lordships were disposed to lend an indulgent ear; a prayer that they might know what the law is under which they stand. It was just, that as they had committed no crimes, they should be amenable to no laws. Their Lordships would see the propriety of having the law settled on this point, as all their public charities and institutions would fall to the ground if the opinions they professed were to be regarded at common law as a detestable crime. The prayer of their petition interested all other Protestant Dissenters. He would take that opportunity of stating, that the time must come, and he hoped it was not far off, when these Dissenters must be relieved from a grievance as to the celebration of marriage, and when the Church of England would have removed from it the necessity of discharging an equivocal and painful duty, and he looked forward to the passing of that measure as the proper opportunity for recognizing the principle he had brought under their Lordships' notice, and perhaps better than doing it by any direct proceeding. It was fit that the obscure cloud should be removed which now hung over the Dissenters, and that they should not be left in any doubt as to the state of the law on a point so important to them. The Noble Marquis concluded by moving that the petition should be read at length. [*For the Petition, see p. 380.*]

On the petition being read, the LORD CHANCELLOR agreed with the petitioners, and with the Noble Marquis, that the exact state of the law should be ascertained, though he did not say whether it should be by a new act or otherwise. If it were found that doubts did exist with regard to the law, and a new act was necessary, he should be ready to give the petitioners the benefit of this act, and not make it to their prejudice. He was not then called on to enter on the question, but whenever he was, he should

be ready to state the grounds of his opinion. The Noble Lord was much mistaken if he supposed, that when the state of the law was ascertained, it was his (the Lord Chancellor's) wish to introduce any measure to the prejudice of the sect in question.

Lord HOLLAND said, the Noble and Learned Lord seemed to have forgotten that he not very long ago addressed their Lordships on this subject, and though he did not state what the law was, he stated there were doubts concerning it, and these doubts were sufficient to raise doubts in the minds of others. To have them set at rest, the petitioners had taken, he thought, the only straight-forward, manly course. If the Noble and Learned Lord had these doubts as to the state of the law, it would have been more fair, more honourable, and more generous, to have come forward and stated them openly, and more worthy of him to have applied his powerful mind to rectify and amend the law. It was impossible, as his Noble Friend had stated, to propose any proceedings on the petition during this session. There was some difficulty also in taking any direct step. The petitioners were not to be blamed for not having petitioned earlier; the existence of the doubts on which the petition was founded had not been long known, and till those doubts were expressed they did not suppose they were liable to any punishment at common law. The opinion that they were, coming from so high an authority—an authority also which had described as uncharitable the preamble to that old law which stigmatized the opinions of the Dissenters as a detestable crime—had raised doubts and fears which must be set at rest. He approved of the petition, not only on account of the Dissenters, but on account of the community at large. All the Dissenters of England and Ireland were deeply interested on this question, and the petitioners deserved, he thought, the thanks of their countrymen. The doctrines laid down as to the law did not affect their interest alone, but the interest of all the Dissenters of the kingdom. It was, he knew, the opinion of Mr. Justice Foster—an opinion espoused and enforced by Lord Chief-Justice Mansfield, by Mr. Justice Willis, and half embraced by Mr. Justice Blackstone—that all the Dissenters of England existed only by sufferance, and that the whole of their charitable institutions rested on a sandy foundation, and might all be destroyed by a process at law. Their Lordships had seen during the session, particularly when the measure for releasing the Catholics from their disabilities, and for knocking off the fetters of this part of our population,

was under consideration, that then every sort of kind expression had been used to the Protestant Dissenters. "They were our Protestant brethren"—reminding him of the words, "Gentle Harry Percy, kind cousin." He would not, however, go on with the quotation and say, "The devil take such cousins;" but according to that sentiment were the Dissenters treated. A few days after that measure was thrown out, one body of the Dissenters came to ask for a measure of relief, in which they were supported by some of the most enlightened members and greatest ornaments of the Church, who, with a proper regard to their own dignity, supported it, because it would be not only a boon to the Dissenters, but remove a burden from the Church; then, however, up jumps, said his Lordship, our cousin yonder in all his panoply of state, and asks, "Who are you? I know nothing of you; you have no existence;" and he finds out some Act of Parliament, in which persons holding the opinions of our Protestant brethren are described as guilty of a detestable crime. The Noble and Learned Lord held this opinion, he believed, on the ground that Christianity was part and parcel of the common law, and that those who denied the Trinity, denied Christianity, and thus became amenable to the common law. With respect to Christianity being part of the common law, he did not mean to say much; it was no part of the case of the petitioners, and the state of his own health would not allow him to enter into it at length. [His Lordship came into the House on crutches, and looked unwell; he was suffering, we understood, from an attack of the gout.] He must, however, say, that he had lately had his attention much drawn to the subject, and he was surprised to find on what slender foundations this assumption of Christianity being part and parcel of the law of the land rested. He did not mean to oppose this principle, but he was surprised, and he believed their Lordships would be surprised, at the fearful rapidity with which laws had been made or revived out of Parliament when this subject came under discussion. If Justice Raymond and Lord Chief-Justice Holt had declared it to be part and parcel of the law—if the former had been careful to say the general principles of Christianity—if Lord Mansfield, using more correct language, had stated that the principles of revealed religion were a part of the law, and that to revile it was punishable, then Christianity was part of the law, and it must have a legal meaning. But what, he would ask, was that legal meaning? If by it was meant a belief in the Scriptures only, then every person who believed in them

could not, constitutionally and legally, be held to deny Christianity. If they were to adopt the old common law, and say, that was Christianity which was then recognised, in that case to deny Transubstantiation would be as great an offence as denying the Trinity. The Noble and Learned Lord, in his zeal to prop up the Church, was thus calling on their Lordships, before they took their seats in that House, to do that which was an offence at common law. The Christianity, however, he believed, which was to be made a part and parcel of the law, was the Established Church—that was the doctrine the Noble and Learned Lord meant to enforce, though he did not shew it in all its hideous features. Against the consequences of this doctrine he wished to warn the country. He knew that this was the doctrine held by Mr. Justice Willis in the case of Evans. No decision had ever done Lord Mansfield more honour than the one in that case. It ought to be read at least once a year by every man. The case was referred to in the petition, and it was this—Mr. Evans had refused to pay a fine for not taking on himself an office in the city. He pleaded as an exemption that he was a Dissenter; but it was replied that he could not plead that as an exemption, which was held by the law to be a crime; but it was finally decided that the Toleration Act not only protected but established Protestant Dissenters. The petition was to obtain for the Protestant Dissenters of England, the full benefit of the Toleration Act. While those doubts existed which had been attempted to be thrown on the state of the Unitarians, they could not be secure in leaving their property for the benefit of their own charitable institutions, or for the instruction of children whose parents believed as they believed. The petition called on the House to put this question at rest for ever, and place the petitioners on the same footing as the rest of their fellow-subjects.

The LORD CHANCELLOR reminded the Noble Lord, that the doubts he had stated were not his own opinion, but what had actually occurred in the Courts at Westminster Hall.—The petition was then laid on the Table.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, JUNE 21.

Petition from Unitarians.

(See p. 380.)

Mr. W. SMITH rose to present a petition signed by a small number of individuals, who were, however, well known and of great respectability, complaining of the situation in which they were placed

by the present state of the existing laws affecting the profession of certain religious opinions. He had heard that it had been stated from a very high quarter in another house, in respect to the laws affecting the Unitarians, that before any act could be passed for relieving them from the operation of particular statutes, it would be well that some bill should be passed previously, to protect them from the penalties to which they were still subject at common law. (Hear.) At the same moment, and from the same high and learned quarter, there proceeded an appeal which it was impossible not to perceive to be directed and addressed to him (Mr. Smith) personally, and which went to remind him, that at the time a bill which he had been instrumental in carrying through Parliament was passed, such bill having for its object to protect Unitarians in certain cases from the legal consequences that might attach to the impugning of the doctrine of the Trinity,—he (Mr. Smith) had made a declaration to the noble and eminent person in question, whereby he agreed, as to all cases not provided for by such statutes, to leave the Unitarians liable to all the visitations that they might be still exposed to from the common law. Now, most unquestionably, he had never made such a declaration. On a former occasion, when he was preparing a measure for the further relief of the Unitarians from the obligation of taking certain oaths, he had had an interview with that most Rev. and distinguished Prelate, the Archbishop of Canterbury, for the purpose of explaining to his grace the principle of the bill he was then about to bring into the House. The Archbishop of Canterbury, at that time, told him, that if his object was only to remove such penal liabilities as operated to prevent, perhaps, the fair and friendly and candid discussion of the doctrinal points to which the Unitarians excepted, he, the Archbishop of Canterbury, was willing to consent to the repeal of those statutes that might be thought to stand in the way of such a discussion; but, of course, not extending this understanding to any denial of Christianity in general, or to blasphemy; both of which he (Mr. Smith) himself proposed to except out of the operation of his bill. The object of his bill, the Act of 3d Geo. IV., was simply this—to put Unitarian Dissenters on the same footing, as to the consequences of professing certain peculiar tenets, as all other Protestant Dissenters had been placed by the Act of Toleration. Now it had been clearly stated by Lord Mansfield, that unconformity, simply and as such, was no offence at common law. Why then it was very desirable that these

parties should feel assured that the common law would not visit them as if their unconformity was an offence. The act of the 53rd Geo. III. c. 160, which recited the act 19th Geo. III., exempted Protestant Dissenters from all penalties to which they were previously liable at law for non-subscription to certain doctrinal articles and oaths. So that he inferred that nothing could be clearer than this fact—that it was only the denial of Christianity in general, or blasphemy, which was an offence made penal at common law, and not mere nonconformity to particular points of doctrine. By introducing the 53rd Geo. III., he (Mr. Smith) had flattered himself at one time that he had done some service by amending and explaining the law in the respects he had mentioned. The penalties denounced against the profession of these tenets by the common law were of the most severe and heavy kind,—fine and imprisonment, at the pleasure of the judge, who was authorized, therefore, if he should see fit, to take from a man the half of his fortune and years of his liberty for dissenting from the received doctrine of the Established Church. With the knowledge of facts like these, how was it possible, let him be allowed to ask, that he (Mr. Smith) should have made any such agreement as that imputed to him? (Hear, hear.) Really a statement of so serious and so mischievous a nature ought not to have been lightly made in the quarter to which he was alluding. The Honourable Gentleman, adverting to the other bill he had brought in for the relief of Unitarians from the obligation of going through certain forms prescribed by the marriage ritual, observed, that after it had received, with one exception only, the sanction and support of all the most efficient and responsible of his Majesty's ministers, it was thrown out in the other House. The petition he had now the honour to present, entered so fully into the object of the petitioners, that he could not do better than refer the House to the object of their prayer, premising only, that if the House should feel hereafter disposed to accede to its prayer, the denial of Christianity as such, and blasphemy, would of course remain, as they at present were, offences at common law.

Mr. ROBERTSON expressed himself decidedly adverse to the prayer of the petitioners, and cautioned the House to be aware how they encouraged too much the prevailing spirit of innovation. The petition was then brought up and read, and ordered to be printed.

Conduct of Dissenters with regard to Catholic Claims.

APRIL 18.

MR. BROUGHAM presented a petition from Great and Little Bolton, in favour of the Catholic Claims. This Petition had attached to it more than 9000 signatures, and the petitioners, without reference to the peculiar merits of the Roman Catholic question, went to point out the injustice, as well as the impolicy, of subjecting any set of men to disabilities upon the ground of their religious faith, and prayed the abolition of all tests. He was glad to find that the petitioners adopted this mode of reasoning, because their opinions were entirely in unison with his own, and he had frequently so expressed them both in that House and elsewhere. He was glad that they advocated principles of universal tolerance, because he held a man was as little answerable for his religious belief as he was for the physical conformation of his body or the construction of his mind, over neither one or the other of which had he any controul. If this were so, then to bind men down by tests, was nothing more than to make them hypocrites; for who would venture to tell him that to conform to a particular form was to entertain a belief in that form? (Hear, hear!) Entertaining such a feeling, he had listened with much of pain and sorrow, and bitter disappointment, to the few observations which had been made within a few minutes, and but a few minutes only had they occupied. It was not to be wondered at that persons out of doors entertaining, and, perhaps, conscientiously entertaining, the hostile opinions expressed towards the emancipation of the Roman Catholics, should confide their petitions to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and the Honourable Member for Somersetshire, (Sir T. Lethbridge,) as men who entertained a similarity of feeling with themselves upon that question. It was right that the petitions should be so entrusted; but he saw with sorrow, not unmixed with a portion of shame, the quarters from which those petitions came. That petitions such as those presented from the county of Kent should darken their doors was not to be wondered at. It was no matter of surprise to him to find that the dean and chapter of one district, or the rector and clergy of another, or the clergy and select vestry of a third, should aid and abet in getting up such petitions; all this was in the natural order of things, and could surprise no man, at least no man who knew the church. But that a

different class of men—a class of men always respectable, always liberal—that the Dissenters of England should be found taking a similar course, was to him matter of equal surprise and regret. No man entertained a higher respect for the Protestant Dissenters of this country than he did, and here he wished to vindicate that body, amounting to, he believed, more than 6,000,000, from any thing like a general charge. The petitions to which he alluded came from a small, very small part, of the Dissenters of the United Kingdom; but however small the part, it was still by far too large. (Hear, hear!) If any one class of his Majesty's subjects ought to be less forward than another in opposing the claims of the Roman Catholics, it was the class called Protestant Dissenters. He trusted that as that body always sought calm and rational discussion—as they had always the word toleration on their lips, they would extend to him and to those who thought with him, a small portion of that toleration which they themselves found it necessary to claim, and which was extended to them at a former period. (Hear, hear!) He trusted that they would, at least, agree to enter into that cool and dispassionate inquiry which, in his opinion, would convince them they were in the wrong. Did they (the Dissenters) forget that they were members of that House? But it was not so; there were no Dissenters there. (*So reported.*) Did they forget that every public office which they held was by connivance? Did they forget that they were continually liable to be proceeded against, and were only protected from such proceeding by an annual Indemnity Bill? (Hear, hear!) All offices were open to Protestant Dissenters in this way; but they were equally open to the Roman Catholic, and he was prevented only by a conscientious feeling from availing himself of them. Why then should the Dissenter turn round to the Roman Catholic, and say, True it is that I hold office by connivance—true it is, that I am only protected from punishment by the annual Indemnity Bill, yet I am determined that you shall not have extended to you either equal emolument or equal protection? He remembered that in the reign of a king of this country, in the reign of King James the Second, the Quakers of that period presented an address to his Majesty, in which they said, and said justly,—“We hear that thou dost not agree in the church of this land any more than ourselves; we expect, therefore, that thou wilt hold out that toleration to us, of which thou thyself standest so much in need.” Such was the language of the

Quakers of that day; and were he a Roman Catholic, he should feel inclined to say to the Dissenters, “Friends, Dissenters, you have presented several petitions to Parliament against our claims, through the medium of those who differ from you upon almost every other point; you have selected as your organs the Right Honourable the Secretary for the Home Department, and the Honourable Baronet who represents the county of Somerset; but, friends, Dissenters, if their religion be one in which neither you any more than I can agree, then I pray you to grant us a little tolerance while we seek that which is our right, and at the same time advance your claim to that which it is your proper business to seek.” (Hear, hear!) Again, there had been petitions presented from the Scotch Dissenters against the Catholic Claims; upon this he should take leave to say a word or two. It was true that a Scotch Dissenter was entitled to sit in that House, but there were some good things which the Scotch Dissenters, zealous and patriotic as they were, would not wish to lose. How, for instance, would they like to have the doors to all great offices closed against them? How would they like that no Dissenter should be Lord Chancellor—that no Dissenter should be Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench, (offices which, with many others of rank and emolument, had frequently been filled by Scotch Dissenters,) yet such was the fact; for, by an existing law—a savage one he admitted it to be—persons holding these offices were obliged to receive the sacrament annually, according to the ritual of the Church of England—a form which Dissenters of that country abhorred; yet Scotch Dissenters did hold these offices, because they were protected by an annual Indemnity Bill. No man respected Dissenters more than he did; he had uniformly found them the advocates of civil liberty and the promoters of education and enlightenment, except, perhaps, where a temporary delusion prevailed, and he hoped they would now be found advocates equally zealous in the cause of religious liberty. Had he not highly respected that great community, he would not have taken up so much of the time of the House in animadverting on the conduct of a small number of their body, and he hoped they would take what had fallen from him on that occasion as a kindly-intended admonition.

On the question that the petition be brought up,

Mr. Secretary PEEL observed, that the temperate manner in which the Hon. and

Learned Gentleman had alluded to him, did not call for a single observation on his part; but he felt it necessary to state that he had, on a former occasion, presented a petition from 10,000 Dissenters of Great and Little Bolton against the Catholic claims. And for himself, he could not see why Dissenters should be prevented from petitioning the Legislature any more than any other class of his Majesty's subjects. It was true, that the Indemnity Act protected the Dissenters in holding some offices, but there were many which they could hold without it; why, then, should they be debarred from praying against a measure, the effect of which would be to endanger the established religion of the country? The Dissenters always approached that House in respectful terms, and surely there could be no inconsistency in their wishing not to entrust power into the hands of those of its abuse by whom our history furnished such ample proofs. It had been said, that all tests ought to be repealed, and if this Bill had that for its object, then he felt sure that he might count upon the votes of many honourable members, who, as Englishmen, and members of the Church of England, could never consent to such a step, however favourable to the claims of the Roman Catholics. With respect to the Test Act, the Bill now pending did not touch it; so that, even if the Bill passed, it would operate equally upon Catholic and Dissenter.

Mr. BROUGHAM, in order to prevent any misapprehension, was anxious to explain, that the opinion thrown out by him, as to the removal of tests, was entirely his own, and had nothing whatever to do with the framers or supporters of the Bill. That Bill would not go one step beyond the objects specified in it, so that any member supporting it would not be pledged to a single point further. "Oh, but," said the Right Honourable Secretary, "the Bill does not touch the Test Act." Certainly not, and the Right Honourable Gentleman, in saying so, was arguing with him. For had not the Roman Catholic a right to complain when he found the Dissenter turn upon him and say, "True, we take office, and are protected by the Indemnity Act, but we are determined that no measure shall pass which will place you in a similar situation?"

Mr. W. SMITH was glad that this conversation had arisen, as it would tend to remove a mistake originating in the House, and thence spread through the country, that the Dissenters labour under no disabilities, disqualification or reproach. At the proper time he should be able to prove satisfactorily, that they

labour under all three, and that they ought to be relieved from the unjust burthen.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE contended that no petitioners had ever come before the House with a worse grace, or with less consistency, than those Dissenters who petitioned against the claims of the Catholics. The Dissenters generally, were an enlightened and liberal body; but he could not view with any feelings of respect the conduct of those who now obtruded themselves on the notice of the House for such a purpose. They were fanning the flame against the Roman Catholics, and yet at the same moment they had a Bill before the House for relieving themselves from disabilities; that which they would not allow others they eagerly claimed for themselves. (Hear!) Looking at the public press, he found that the papers which most favoured the object of the Dissenters opposed the Catholic Bill, on the ground that it was exclusive, and did not embrace the Dissenters. When the Dissenters found, therefore, that this argument was of no avail, and that they would not be benefited by an alteration of the law, they turned round and opposed any concession. He had never yet given any vote on the subject of the Test Act, but if he were governed by his feelings and not by his reason, he should certainly support that disabling statute as a punishment to those who were now so anxious to resist concession to their Roman Catholic brethren. However, upon principle he was opposed to the Test Act, and would vote for its repeal, that the better class of Dissenters might not suffer for the worse.

The petition was then read, and the question put that it lie upon the table.

Mr. BROUGHAM. I have to return my thanks to my Honourable Friend who spoke last, for the light he has thrown upon this subject, and for what he has said regarding the views and conduct of that body of Dissenters which has been so forward in petitioning against concession to the Roman Catholics. No doubt that very prudent class thinks that if it shews itself ready to aid the Church at a moment when the Church is in such need, when it cannot raise even a feeble cry of "No Popery!" the Church, in return, will help the poor lame Dissenters over the stile, after the many yelps for assistance. Give me leave to say, that I know the Church better (hear, hear, hear!)—I mean the High Church, not the great and, I believe, liberal body of the Church. The High Church may hold out a delusive hope, in order to induce these Dissenters to volunteer their petitions, but it will never make the slightest

return for the favour. Let the Dissenters hereafter claim the repeal of the Test Act, and they will find these amiable and conciliatory gentlemen of the High Church assume a very different port and tone. (Hear, hear, hear!) The Dissenters may say, indeed, "We supported you in 1825—we did what we could for you when you were in the utmost despair, in the very 'depths of blank despair'—when even the Solicitor-General was hopeless (hear!)—when the Honourable Member for Somerset (Sir T. Lethbridge) was in the lowest despondency at what he termed the 'apathy of his native land.' (Laughter.) Then we, the Dissenters, stepped forward to your relief and assistance, with a few drops of consolation, a few crumbs of comfort." All this will be true; but what will the High Church party say in reply? "What should we help you for? You petitioned indeed, but it was according to your conscientious belief (hear, hear, hear!)—because you were really alarmed.—You wished to help yourselves, not to help us, because you wanted to enjoy a monopoly of toleration. You are covered by the annual Indemnity Act, and you wanted to keep out the Papists—you had got into a snug birth yourselves, and you were anxious to keep it to yourselves. (Hear!) It was very consistent in us to resist the progress of Popery, but it was very inconsistent and very ridiculous in you at the time when you yourselves were asking relief. We pity and despise you for it. We hate the Catholics indeed, but we hate the Dissenters ten thousand times more; so get along about your business—we will have nothing to say to you." Such, I warn these Dissenters, will be the result; they will experience no slight degree of the *odium theologicum*, the intensity of which is always in an inverse *ratio* to the distance. (Hear!) There is no position in the *principia* better established than this: the Christian Protestant, for instance, no doubt dislikes the Mahometan; but let the Mahometan become Catholic, and dislike is immediately converted into absolute hatred; let the Catholic again become a Protestant Dissenter, and there is no limit to the abhorrence of the High Churchman; he hates him in the purest bitterness of spirit. (Hear! and laughter.) The more minute the difference, the more unbounded and unconquerable the rancour. Do we not all know into what furious animosity one little letter threw the whole Romish Church; the dispute was a mere *iota*, and yet what an unquenchable flame did it create! The question merely was, whether a particular word should be written *ὁμοεσιον* or *ὁμοισιον*. In fact, the more insignificant the matter

in dispute, the more virulent the malignity. (Hear, hear!) The nearer men are to the Church of England in their doctrine, the further from the hearts of the members of that Church; the alarm they feel is in exact proportion to the proximity of religious opinion. I hope that my honourable friend, the member for Norwich, (Mr. W. Smith,) will communicate to the Dissenters this most important truth—if they indulge any hopes that the High Church party will favour them by the repeal of the Test Act, nothing can be more futile and fallacious than such expectations. I should vote for that repeal whenever the question is brought forward, if the Dissenters (I mean, of course, such as now petition) were fifty times worse than they are: I should do it on principle—in justice to their claims, and not in gratitude for their conduct. (Hear, hear!)

—
APRIL 19.

Mr. PEEL having presented a number of petitions from Dissenting Congregations against the Catholic Bill,

Mr. W. SMITH said he would take that opportunity to observe, that he did not object to the exercise of the right of petition on the part of any of those individuals who had thought proper to address the House on this occasion, whether Dissenters or others, whatever their opinions might be. Neither did he object to any thing they had done, in order to shew their feelings, with reference to the Catholic Question. It certainly did, however, happen yesterday, that his learned friend (Mr. Brougham) was so far mistaken as to attribute to the Protestant Dissenters (in consequence of some petitions having been presented from Dissenters) a strong feeling against the bill for the relief of the Roman Catholics. Now, he believed, that up to yesterday not more than nine or ten petitions from Protestant Dissenters had been presented. He had this morning looked over an alphabetical list of 2,000 congregations in England; and he declared, that amongst those he could find but five or six congregations that had appeared before the House. Gentlemen might easily calculate how small a proportion this number bore to the general mass of Protestant Dissenters. He held in his hand a list (comprising the whole period from the year 1732 down to the present time) of [London] Protestant Dissenters properly so called. These were divided into three classes—Presbyterians, Independents and Baptists. When they agreed on any public act, that act was performed by a number deputed from the general body. In that list he found ninety-seven congregations. He had dissected the list of petitions as well

as the time would allow him, and he could discover no more than five which came from persons who could by any possibility be said to belong to the sects he had mentioned. There were a great number of persons (he doubted not, very worthy and respectable persons) who belonged to the class of Methodists, (which was chiefly divided into the Whitfieldite and Wesleyan connexion,) who were sometimes confounded with the Protestant Dissenters, but did not in reality belong to them. He meant to cast no reflection on those parties. He merely wished to put every gentleman who heard him on his guard, lest he should be led to suppose that, because twenty petitions, emanating from this heterogeneous mixture, had been presented against the Catholic Claims, that, therefore, the great body of Protestant Dissenters were opposed to them. They had, in fact, expressed no opinion about it. He would maintain, that not one in one hundred of the Protestant Dissenting congregations in England had given any opinion at all on this question. He believed the feeling of the Protestant Dissenters throughout the country, was, to leave the subject to be dealt with as Parliament in its wisdom should think fit. Speaking of them as a body, he believed they were perfectly desirous that justice should be done to the Roman Catholics; but they left it to the wisdom of the Legislature to act as to them might appear most safe and prudent. He should be sorry if the suspicion which appeared to have entered the minds of some gentlemen near him, as to the feelings of the Protestant Dissenters, was in any degree well-founded. It would give him much pain, if the body of which he was speaking stood forward as the foes of—he would not say religious toleration, but—religious liberty in its widest extent. (Hear.) He begged to repeat his words deliberately. He should regret very much if the Protestant Dissenters opposed religious liberty in its widest extent. If they came forward and called on the Legislature to put its seal on this question—if they demanded that the claims of the Roman Catholics should be refused, he should be both surprised and grieved. He would repeat what he had before stated, that the Protestant Dissenters were not so bound together as to have amongst them but one opinion. They, of course, had their own opinions on political matters. They were tied up to no one common opinion, except that which was connected with the religion they professed. They maintained most liberal opinions in politics; and he knew no shorter or better mode of expressing their feelings than by quoting the rule of their

conduct—a rule which ought to be adopted by all religious societies—namely, that of doing unto others as they wished others to do unto them. This, the best of all possible maxims, was their motto, and he believed they were most anxious to act up to it. As a body, he deemed it right to say thus much in their behalf, lest a false opinion might be entertained of the conduct of the Protestant Dissenters. (Hear.)

An Honourable Member, under the gallery, bore testimony to the correctness of the statement made by the preceding speaker.

Mr. S. RICE said he held in his hand a declaration in favour of the Catholic Claims, which had emanated from a most respectable body of the Protestant Dissenters in Ireland. The Presbyterians of the North of Ireland were as ready as any set of men to admit the claims which the Roman Catholics had on the justice of that House. This ought to be stated, to prevent them from being removed from their proper level, since they were as liberal a body of men as any in the empire. He said this, because an idea had gone forth, and was, indeed, embodied in the evidence given relative to the state of Ireland, that the Presbyterians of the north of Ireland had become more than ever adverse to the claims of the Roman Catholics. He had this day, in contradiction to that assertion, to lay before the House a statement (for the parties had not time to put it in the shape of a petition) from the Ministers and Elders of the Presbyterian profession in the county of Down and Belfast, to which they requested him to call the attention of Parliament. Those individuals said, that so far from becoming adverse to the Catholic Claims, if the Presbyterians declared themselves hostile to civil and religious liberty, they would belie the principles of the Church to which they belonged. On all occasions they had declared their opinions in favour of that liberality which became them as followers of the Christian faith. In 1812, no less than 139 members of the Synod of Ulster had called on the House to do away with all civil disabilities on account of religious opinions. The individuals whose sentiments he was now speaking, begged of him to state, that any person acting as Moderator could express nothing more than his own opinion. If he did otherwise—if he assumed a representative capacity—he passed the line and boundary of his office, since he had a right only to act in his individual capacity. The parties stated that, as the cause of Catholic Emancipation gained ground in the North, and must continue to do so, they wished, both in justice to the Dissenters and to

the Catholics, to record these their opinions. (Hear.) If a general declaration on the subject had been necessary, they could have procured thousands of respectable signatures to it; and they stated that they never felt greater chagrin—and the same remark would apply to the great body of Protestant Dissenters—than they did on the publication of the evidence in which the Protestant Dissenters were described as entertaining hostility against the Roman Catholics. The first name signed to this paper was that of an individual well known to several gentlemen opposite.

It was that of the High Sheriff of the county of Down. Here was a Presbyterian, not acting in the spirit of monopoly, but coming forward to state his own liberal feelings, and at the same time to bear his testimony to the growing principles of liberality amongst his fellow-countrymen. This was worthy of a Presbyterian of the north; and he certainly would think very ill of any of that class who, having a monopoly of toleration, endeavoured to prevent others from enjoying those benefits which they themselves possessed.—Laid on the Table.

NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

Memoirs of the Rev. Benjamin Goodier. 12mo. 5s.

The Vision of Las Casas, and other Poems. By Emily Taylor. Foolscap 8vo. 8s.

The Doctrine of the Trinity Indefensible. A Letter to the Rev. Thomas Sworde, A.M., Minister of St. Mary's, Bungay, occasioned by his Recent Visitation Sermon, preached at Beccles. By Edward Taylor. 12mo. 6d.

Sacred Poetry; consisting of Hymns and other Devotional Compositions. By W. Lamport (of Lancaster). 8vo. 5s.

A Scripture Catechism for the Use of Schools. (Norwich.) 12mo. 1s. 11s. per dozen, or 18s. per score.

The Poetical Works, the Correspondence and other Prose Pieces of Anna Lætitia Barbauld. With a Memoir. By Lucy Aikin. 2 vols. 8vo. 17. 4s.

Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ. The Book of the Church Vindicated and Amplified. By Robert Southey, LL.D. 8vo.

Domestic Duties, or Instructions to Young Married Ladies on the Management of their Household, and the Regulation of their Conduct in the various Relations and Duties of Married Life. By Mrs. William Parkes. Post 8vo. 12s.

A Defence of Religious Liberty, in a Series of Letters: with Notes and Illustrations, from a Lover of Truth. By the Author of Sermons on Christian Responsibility. 3s.

Formularies of Faith in the Reign of Henry VIII. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

The Doctrines of our Saviour in Harmony with those of St. Paul: the Hulsean Prize Dissertation for 1824. By J. A. Jeremie, B. A.

Proofs that the Holy Communion in both Kinds was administered to the Laity, within the Parish of Nortram and Diocese of Durham, before the Reformation.

A Letter to the Hon. and the Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of Durham. By James Raine, Rector of Meldon.

Inaugural Discourse of H. Brougham, Esq., M. P., on being installed Lord Rector of the University of Glasgow, April 6, 1825. 2s. 6d.

Harry and Lucy concluded. By Maria Edgeworth. 4 vols. 12mo. 16s.

A Critical Dissertation on the Nature, Measures, and Causes of Value, chiefly in Reference to the Writings of Mr. Ricardo and his Followers. By the Author of "Essays on the Formation and Publication of Opinions." Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Origines; or Remarks on the Origin of several Empires, States and Cities. By the Right Hon. Sir W. Drummond. 2 vols. 8vo. 17. 3s.

The Historical Works of Sir J. Balfour, of Kiunnaird. Portrait. 4 vols. 8vo. 37.

Analysis of the Statistical Account of Scotland: with a General View of the History of that Country and Discussions on some Important Branches of Political Economy. By the Rt. Hon. Sir John Sinclair, Bart. Part I. (To be completed in II.) 12s.

Lord Sackville author of the Letters of Junius. By George Coventry. 8vo. 14s.

The History of Paris from the Earliest Period to the Present Day. With an Appendix, containing a Notice of the Church of St. Denis, &c. 3 vols. 8vo. 27. 2s.

Researches into the Laws and Phenomena of Pestilence: being the Subject of the Anniversary Oration delivered before the Medical Society of London, 1820. By Thomas Hancock, M. D. Demmy 8vo. 8s.

Memoirs of Mr. William Veitch and George Bryssen. Written by Themselves. With other Narratives illustrative of the

History of Scotland, from the Restoration to the Revolution. To which are added Biographical Sketches and Notes. By Thomas M'Crie, D. D. 8vo.

Remarks on the Propriety of applying the Funds of the British and Foreign Bible Society to the Circulation of such Foreign Versions as contain the Apocrypha. 3d.

A Letter to the Rt. Hon. Lord Teignmouth in Vindication of the Proceedings of the Bible Society against the Statement of the Edinburgh Bible Society relative to the Circulation of the Apocrypha. 3d.

Memoirs of Samuel Pepys, Esq., F. R. S., Secretary to the Admiralty in the Reigns of Charles II. and James II., comprising his Diary from 1659 to 1667. Decyphered from the Original Short-Hand MSS. in the Pepysian Library, and a Selection from his Private Correspondence. Edited by Richard Lord Braybrooke. 2 vols. Royal 4to. Portraits and other Engravings. 6l. 6s.

Memorials of the Public Life and Character of the Rt. Hon. James Oswald, of Dunnikier, M. P., &c. &c., contained in the Correspondence with some of the Most Eminent Men of the last Century. 8vo. Portrait. 16s.

Narrative of a Second Visit to Greece, including Facts and Anecdotes connected with the Last Days of Lord Byron, &c. By Edward Blaquiére, Esq. 8vo. (View of Athens.) 12s.

A Brief Treatise of Bona Notabilia; together with an account of the Archiepiscopal Courts of Probate at York. By George Lawton, Notary Public. 8vo. 5s.

A Catechetical Exposition of the Apostles' Creed. By J. T. Law, A. M., Chancellor of Litchfield and Coventry. 8vo. 9s.

The Origin, Progress and Existing Circumstances of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews. An Historical Inquiry. By H. H. Norris, A. M., Perpetual Curate of St. John's Chapel, Hackney. 8vo. 12s.

Two Essays. By the late Rev. Richard Raikes, of Gloucester. 8vo. 5s.

An Essay on the Practicability of uniting Conformity to the Standards of the Established Church with complete Liberty of Conscience. 8vo. 2s.

Aids to Reflection in the Formation of a Manly Character: illustrated by Passages from our Elder Divines, especially Archbishop Leighton. By S. T. Coleridge. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Facts and Correspondence relative to the recent Conduct of the Managers of the Congregation of Protestant Dissenters assembling in Carter Lane, Doctors' Commons. By John Hoppus, A. M. 1s.

Joint-Stock Companies.

A List of Three Hundred and Two Joint Stock Companies, &c. (From the *Monthly Repository*.) 3d.

Treatise on Joint-Stock Companies, with an Appendix of Cases and Judicial Determinations. By George Farren, Resident Director of the Economical Life Assurance Society. 7s.

Letter on the Speculative Schemes of the Present Times and the Projected Bank. By Anthony Romney. 1s.

Remarks on Joint-Stock Companies. By an Old Merchant.

Considerations on the Expedience of Sinking Capital in Railways. By John Vallance. 2s. 6d.

The Case of the London Dock Company. By S. Cook, Secretary to the Company.

An Inquiry into the Plans, Progress and Policy of the American Mining Companies. Third Edition. 4s.

Roman Catholics.

Practical and Internal Evidence against Catholicism. By Joseph Blanco White, M. A. and B. D. 8vo. 9s. 6d.

The Claims of the Church of Rome to Universal Supremacy and Infallibility Examined—in Two Sermons. By T. Raven, B. A., Minister of Trinity Church, Preston. 2s.

Supplement to the Protestant's Companion. By C. Daubeny, LL.D. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

A Collection of Passages from the Bible against the Errors of the Church of Rome. 1s.

The Bible prohibited, a Dialogue between a Roman Catholic Priest and a Roman Catholic Layman. 4d.

The Revival of Popery; its Intolerant Character, Political Tendency, &c., in a Series of Letters to William Wilberforce, Esq. By William Blair, Esq., M. A. 7s. 6d.

Serious Thoughts on Catholic Emancipation; or Popery demonstrated to be the Same in Every Age. By a Member of the Inner Temple. 8vo. 2s.

The Hind and Panther; or, the Catholic Confuted. An Allegory. By a Protestant. 1s.

The Northumberland Miracle, as related in a Conference between the Duke of Buckingham and a Jesuit, sent by King James to convert his Grace to the Catholic Religion. 8vo. 4d.

Sermons.

On Various Subjects. By William Paley, D. D. Edited by Edmund Paley, A. M., Vicar of Easingwold. 2 vols. 8vo. 18s.

On Various Subjects. By Thomas Rennell, B. D., F. R. S., late Vicar of Kensington. 8vo. 12s.

Six, preached in the Church of the Holy Trinity, Cheltenham, during the Season of Easter. By J. W. Cunningham, Vicar of Harrow. 3s. 6d.

By J. E. N. Molesworth. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

On the Lord's Prayer, in a Series of Lectures. By Samuel Saunders. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Single.

The Reunion of the Wise and Good in a Future State. A Sermon, preached in the Old Jewry Chapel, in Jewin Street, Aldersgate Street, on Sunday, June 19, 1825, on occasion of the lamented Death of the Rev. Abraham Rees, D.D., F.R.S., F.L.S., &c., who departed this Life on the 9th of June, in the 82nd Year of his Age. By Robert Aspland. To which is added, The Address delivered at the Chapel, over the Body, on Saturday, June 18, 1825, previously to its Interment in Bunhill-Fields. By Thomas Rees, LL.D. F.S.A. Printed by Request of the Congregation and of the Family of the Deceased. 8vo. 2s.

A Discourse on Matt. v. 11, in which some of the Principal Charges brought against the Professors of the Unitarian Doctrine are Noticed and Refuted. By W. Worsley, A.B. 12mo. 6d.

Preached at the Unitarian Chapel, Whitchurch, Salop, March 13, 1825, on the Death of Mr. John Edwards, Jun. Also a Letter to the Rev. H. Morrall, one of the Curates of Whitchurch, in consequence of his Illiberality. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Preached at Castle-Hill Meeting-House, Northampton, May 15, 1825, on occasion of the Death of Mrs. Horsey, Wife of the Rev. J. Horsey, Pastor of the Congregation assembling there. By B. L. Edwards. 8vo.

Sources of Consolation on the Death of Pious Friends. Preached at the Unitarian Chapel in Stockton-upon-Tees, April 10, 1825, on occasion of the Death of James Crowe, Esq. By C. Wellbeloved. 8vo.

The Nature and Influence of Faith: Preached at George's Meeting, Exeter, Dec. 19, 1824, and at Lewin's Mead, Bristol, Jan. 2, 1825. By Henry Acton, one of the Ministers of George's Meeting. 12mo. 1s.

A Sermon preached by Dr. Samuel Wright at the Opening of the New Meeting-House in Carter Lane, Dec. 5, 1734; to which is prefixed some Account of the Author and of the Origin of the Congregation. By John Hoppus, A.M.

An Address to Young People, delivered at Carter Lane, Jan. 1, 1825. By the Same.

The Doctrine of the Holy Trinity Stated, and some Objections of the Unitarians Examined, in a Sermon preached at the Visitation held at Beccles, April 19, 1825. By T. Sworde, A.M., Minister of St. Mary's, Bungay. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Systematic Preaching recommended: preached June 4, 1825, at Oxford. By E. Hawkins, M.A. 1s. 6d.

Preached in St Paul's at the Anniversary of the Sons of the Clergy, May 21, 1825. By J. B. Jenkinson, D.D., Dean of Worcester. 4to. 1s. 6d.

The Preparation of the Righteous: preached at St. James's, Westminster, June 12, 1825, on the Death of the Very Rev. G. Andrewes, D.D., Dean of Canterbury. By Edward Smedley, Jun., A.M. 8vo. 1s.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from Mr. R. Aubrey, Jun.; A. B.; and Investigator.

The Letter to the Bishop of Chester, in many respects excellent, is rather too plain in its language.

The list of the Buxton preachers, which came unpaid, was received too late last month to be acknowledged: it is an advertisement.

The post-paid obituary was charged to us by weight two shillings and threepence. The length of it has prevented our preparing it (for it must be abridged) for the present Number.

A great quantity of temporary matter has obliged us to put aside several articles designed for the present Number, and we are still behind with our Intelligence. The Protestant Society, &c. hereafter.

We observe that in the Report of Mr. W. Smith's Speech on presenting the Unitarian petition (p. 440, col. 2) we have copied from the newspapers an erratum, corrected by himself in one of them, of "the Act of 3d Geo. IV." for *the 53 Geo. III.*

The advertisement from Biddenden came too late for insertion.

ERRATUM.

P. 373, col. 2, lines 7 and 12 from the bottom, for "Allcock," read *Allecock*.