

THE
Monthly Repository.

No. CCXXXIX.]

NOVEMBER, 1825.

[Vol. XX.

Mr. Bakewell on the Doctrine of "the Final Perseverance of the Elect," as held by the Modern Swiss Calvinists.

SIR,

Downshire Hill, Hampstead, Oct. 12, 1825.

HAVING been publicly challenged in the Monthly Repository (XIX. 673) to prove by fair citations from the writings of M. Malan, or Calvin, or any Calvinistic author of credit, their assent to the doctrine, that "*when a man is become one of the elect, he cannot afterwards fall from salvation, whatever crimes he may commit,*" I shall beg permission to introduce to the notice of your readers a small publication, entitled *Conventicule de Rolle par un Témoin digne de Foi*. This publication contains an undisguised avowal of the above doctrine, and is one of the greatest curiosities of modern religious literature: it comes from the pen of no less a personage than M. Cæsar Malan, of Geneva, at which place I purchased it soon after its appearance. Rolle is a small town in the Canton de Vaud, where, in the year 1821, a few persons, among whom were three pastors of the canton, assembled in a private house to receive religious instruction from M. Malan. Conversations intermixed with prayers and discourses were continued two days. To this meeting the people of the canton gave the name of Conventicule, and the novelty of the thing excited much attention in a country where there are but few objects of public interest to attract notice. No friend to religious freedom can deny that all men have the right to assemble peaceably for religious instruction *in what manner they best approve*, nor could any just ground of offence be taken against M. Malan and his friends for assembling in a private house. A considerable time afterwards, M. Malan published a narrative of the proceedings, which he entitled *The Conventicle of Rolle, by a Witness worthy of Belief*—at the end of it his own signature is given at full length. Who would expect, from such a title, that the witness worthy of

VOL. XX.

belief was himself, the hero of the story, in which is related in the third person how condescendingly he spoke to one, how graciously he smiled upon a second, how kindly he advised a third, and how fervently he prayed for all? It surely requires no small degree of religious vanity to write in this manner. Christ has said, "*If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true.*" M. Malan would have done well to have recollected these words. In an early part of the conversation at Rolle, M. Malan endeavours to instil into the minds of the new converts, clear ideas of Calvinistic charity, by describing an allegorical picture which he drew when in England; for his knowledge of the language being imperfect, he was compelled to employ his pencil. In this picture he represented the Church of Christ built upon a rock, and the dome which covered it was called the communion of saints. To depict the state of those whose faith differed from his own, "he drew in the shade beyond the rock a high and shining pillar, without any base, on which he wrote *salvation by works*. This pillar he surrounded with broken columns, of which the Devil wished to form a church, of dust and ashes: these columns were called Socinians, Arians, Pelagians, Rationalists, &c.; their shafts were joined by a cement* of pride and ignorance, and their approaching ruin was preparing by a river called Truth, which was washing away the sand from under them. When the good man for whom the drawing was made, sighed as he looked upon these broken columns of the Devil's church, M. Malan comprehended his meaning, and wrote on one side, *God is all powerful*" (mind, not to

* M. Malan does not inform us in what manner he represented the composition of this cement.

save them as Socinians, &c., but) "to change their names, and make these wretched ruins pillars in his own church." How edifying is M. Malan's charity! We shall soon see that his modesty is not less extraordinary.

I now proceed to the parts of the publication which relate to the doctrine of Final Perseverance. I shall occasionally subjoin the original French, to avoid the charge of misrepresentation: indeed, some of the expressions are so extravagant, that it is scarcely possible to convey their precise import in a literal translation.

The good sense of M. Malan has been much extolled, and Dr. Smith, who quotes from the *Conventicule de Rolle*, exultingly appeals to the discretion of its author, as a sufficient guarantee that he would not publish or utter any extravagant opinions; we may therefore take the following exposition of the doctrine of final perseverance, contained in the extracts from M. Malan's book, as the orthodox faith of his Calvinistic brethren in England, and also of the Scotch Seceders, among whom he has been recently and triumphantly admitted a member.

"The soul," says M. Malan, "should most ardently desire to say with full assurance it is saved, and at whatever moment it shall pass from this life to eternity, it will go there to be glorified in the bosom of its God. Those who have not saving faith, try to render themselves worthy of the pardon of their sins by their virtues, and others, not comprehending the sacrifice of Christ, do not believe that the soul can be certain of its salvation, and call those proud who say that their salvation has been freely gained for them, and that they are certain of it for ever, because in God there is no variation or shadow of change. Some labour and groan and torment themselves, and instead of saying, 'Jesus has saved me on the cross—it is done—every thing is finished;' they cry out, 'When shall I have a faith sufficiently strong and holy, that Jesus may deign to receive me, and grant me his grace?' It is eighteen hundred years since Jesus purchased our salvation, and nothing is left for us to do but to accept it, and to sing and leap for joy; Jesus did not wait till we had merited his love;

he received us into favour when we existed only in the decrees of God. If you wish to glorify yourselves, you ought to do it; but glorify yourselves in your Saviour, in his grace which has extended to your unworthiness: do not fear to believe it; it is the order of God: be not afraid to say boldly, 'Christ has saved me when I was lost:' it is a fact, and do not hesitate to relate a fact that God himself certifies: imitate the criminal who has received a pardon—rejoice, sing, leap with gladness. It is surely something to make us bound with joy, for it is no slight solace to have a hell less to fear; it is no trifle (*bagatelle*) gained to obtain an inheritance in heaven of which we are sure:* it is a blessing, eternal as God, who is the source, and has alone the power and the merit of it." No one can deny that M. Malan here earnestly recommends the new converts at Rolle to boast and glory in their salvation, without fear or shame, and he has himself followed the advice he gives to others. (See *Mon. Repos.* XIX. p. 519.) Yet an English Calvinist divine in high repute, at the very time that he is quoting from the *Conventicule de Rolle*, and extolling its author, with singular inconsistency says, "He who boasts of this heavenly blessing, supplies the most painful reasons for apprehending that he is a total stranger to it." *Ib.* 674.

It is truly remarkable that Dr. Smith, with the *Conventicule de Rolle* in his hand, could challenge me to produce any citations from M. Malan

* This expression is so purely French, that justice cannot be done to its epigrammatic point in a translation, and the whole passage is worthy of notice. The writer exhorts the converts to boast of their salvation by demonstrations of joy as public and almost extraordinary as the saltations of David before the ark: "N'appréhendez pas de dire hardiment 'Christ m'a sauvé quand j'étois perdu:' c'est un fait; et il ne faut pas hésiter à répéter un fait que Dieu même assure. Faites comme le criminel absous par grâce: réjouissez vous, chantez et sautez d'allégresse. Certes il y a de quoi tressaillir de bonheur. Ce n'est pas un léger soulagement qu'un enfer de moins à craindre. Ce n'est pas une bagatelle acquise, que l'héritage de ciel dont on est sûr." P. 26.

to justify my statement of his doctrine: but let us hear M. Malan further on this subject: "The blood of Christ has not flowed for a soul, that it should only be washed for a few hours. The sacrifice offered is eternal and perfect; whoever has had a part in it, can never lose this good part; it will never be taken from him. How consoling is this doctrine, yet how few believe it! Some regard it as dangerous. Take care (say they) how you sow such a doctrine; it would soon be productive of crimes. Good God, pardon their blasphemy!" In the following page he adds, "*But perhaps some one of you, my dear friends, may make this natural objection to himself: WILL IT NEVER HAPPEN THAT A CHRISTIAN SHALL FALL SO HEAVILY AS TO BREAK THE TIE OF LOVE WHICH UNITES HIM TO GOD, AND THUS THE SINNER SHALL LOSE GRACE?*"* This question (he replies) has been already answered by the Holy Spirit: "Neither death nor life, (and it is in the life of a Christian that the sin of which we are speaking will be found,) neither angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, (but the sin will be among present things,) neither height, nor depth, nor any other creature, can separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." Lest, however, the doctrine that no crimes can separate the elect from God, should not be announced with sufficient strength, M. Malan delivers it in an allegory. A benighted traveller on a desert heath, overcome with dread and fatigue, lies down and attempts to sleep: suddenly a flaming sword, held by a mysterious hand, approaches to pierce him: he

flees away with all his remaining force, until he falls down exhausted and nearly senseless: the same sword still menaces him: at length he cries out, "Lord, have mercy upon me!" Suddenly his eyes are opened, and he sees before him a vast and splendid edifice, from which he hears a voice cry, "*Knock, and it shall be opened.*" The traveller believes it; he stretches forth his arm and knocks—"the gate is immediately opened, and an irresistible force draws him within the edifice: then the brazen gate closes, and against this gate he supports himself to breathe in peace, to say with certainty, that he is safe for ever from the dreadful sword; the brazen gate rises between himself and the world, and all the united efforts of the world shall never force it." Then M. Malan describes a concert of angels, which for brevity I omit. The sword is changed into a lamp, and moves before the traveller up a flight of steps; on the top is a cross, to which he is directed to look steadfastly: but, alas! who can know all the inconstancy of the human heart, all its levity, all its ingratitude? Seduced by some other object or fantasy, he turns away his eyes, his feet trip up, and he rolls down, bruising himself, to the very bottom of the steps; he is even thrown against the brazen gate. What would become of the wretched soul if this gate were not that, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail? "But fear not; thy fall has happened within the house; thy fall cannot in any way affect the surety of thy asylum; thou hast dashed thyself against the rock, but it is this rock itself which supports thee," &c.* The traveller, strengthened by these gentle words, which descend from the cross, is raised up, and feels some one at his side who supports and consoles him, and says, "It is thy friend, thy faithful friend; repose upon me; do not fear; thou canst not tire me; I am almighty." The traveller recognizes the voice of the Friend of Sin-

* Mais peut-être, quelqu'un de vous, mes chers amis, fait-il en lui-même cette objection si naturelle, Ne pourra-t-il point arriver que le Chrétien fasse une chute si lourde, que le lien d'amour qui l'unit à Dieu se rompe et qu'ainsi le pécheur perde la grace? Le saint esprit a déjà répondu—Que ni la mort, &c." P. 46. I am aware that the translation does not give sufficient force to the meaning of the French epithet *lourde*, but had I departed from a literal version I should probably have been accused of misrepresentation.

* "Mais ne craigns point; c'est dans la maison que ta chute s'est faite; ta chute ne change rien à la sûreté de ton asyle. Tu t'es heurtée contre le rocher, mais ce rocher même, c'est celui sur lequel tu t'appuies." P. 49.

ners, and, full of confidence, but ashamed of his first fall, he presses on," &c. Now, as Dr. Smith has asserted, "that though some wicked or ignorant Antinomian may have held the doctrine *that the elect cannot fall from salvation, whatever crimes they may commit*, the Calvinists never did hold it," I should be glad to be informed whether "*that good man*," "*that excellent man*," who wrote the *Conventicule de Rolle*, is to be numbered among wicked Antinomians; or are we to understand, that what is pure Calvinism on the other side of the Jura, becomes wicked Antinomianism in England?

When Dr. S. defied me to prove from the writings of M. Malan, that he ever held the above doctrine, he must have felt assured that I should not read the *Conventicule de Rolle*, with the contents of which he was himself well acquainted. M. Malan has certainly the merit of plainly and openly avowing the undisguised doctrine of final perseverance, and does not adopt the cautious conduct of his Calvinistic friends in England, who, like night-walking Nicodemus, seem ashamed of acknowledging before the world what they secretly believe. That the doctrine, as explained by M. Malan, has a tendency to engender presumption and spiritual pride, can scarcely be denied by any one who is acquainted with human nature. Suppose one of the young men who heard him at Rolle, should soon after be assailed, like Joseph, by a strong temptation—might he not remember the words of the preacher, and say (not with Joseph, "How shall I do this evil and sin against God?" but) with M. Malan, "My fall will take place within the house of safety; it cannot endanger my salvation; I am already chosen; my salvation is for ever sure; to doubt it is to doubt the promise of God himself; the Friend of Sinners is at hand to console me; then why should I abstain?" I am willing to admit, that both Calvinists and Antinomians would be grieved that such an application should be made of the doctrine; the empiric who distributes a dangerous medicine would much rather it should cure than kill the patient who swallows it; but the good wishes of the vender

will not take away the noxious quality of the dose.

M. Malan has himself given most extraordinary evidence that the doctrine he maintains is too apt to engender spiritual pride. What Christian preacher, from the time when St. Peter pronounced the doom of Ananias to the present day, ever laid claim to the power of crushing his enemies to dust with the breath of his nostrils? Yet this dangerous power M. Malan appears, from his own testimony, to possess, though he good-naturedly declines calling it forth. Towards the conclusion of the meeting at Rolle, one of the three ministers of the Canton de Vaud bitterly laments the ridicule and misrepresentation to which the new converts are exposed from their irreligious neighbours, and concludes with, "It is truly vexatious." To which M. Malan replies, "Do not let us be vexed at them; God, who reigns in heaven, and whose name is the Lord of Hosts, sees and hears them; and since he supports the vaulted roof of heaven, which hangs over the heads of these poor benighted wretches, do not let us utterly crush them with our censure and indignation."* Now if M. Malan had not supposed that he and his friends could thus annihilate their opponents, the caution he gives not to do it, were worse than unnecessary. This language cannot be regarded as the incautious expressions of an extemporaneous discourse, which had escaped in the fervour of delivery; the passage was written, as he informs us, long after the discourse was delivered, and afterwards published. Who can wonder, after this, that the Genevese should regard M. Malan as a man who is so lifted up in his own conceit by religious vanity, and the adulation and rich presents of his English

* En vérité cela nous donne du dépit. Min. Gen. N'en ayons point: Le Seigneur qui regne au ciel, et dont le nom est l'éternel des armées, les voit et les entend; et puisqu'il soutient au-dessus de ces pauvres aveugles le plafond qui couvre leurs têtes, ne les écrasons pas de notre censure et de notre indignation. P. 65. The verb écraser is the most powerful term in the language, implying to utterly ruin and extinguish.

supporters, that he is in danger of losing his judgment altogether? An Englishman who should write in this manner, would be thought by his family a fit object for medical advice.

In the same pamphlet, M. Malan relates the manner in which he was converted to the orthodox faith by Mr. Robert Haldane, or rather by a wonderful Bible, which, when laid upon a table, opened of itself at the passages that were wanted to confirm his belief in the doctrines of Calvin. Like the ships of the Phæacians, the leaves of this Bible were instinct with unerring motion to guide the theological wanderer to his desired port. M. Malan, at that time, was, according to his own account, a very shallow theologian, and little acquainted with the Scriptures, and hence, unable to cope with his more learned friend, who heaped text upon text, until he was compelled to yield. "But during the whole of their discussions, Mr. Haldane said only a few words; it was his fore-finger which spoke (*c'étoit son index qui parloit*); for as his Bible, which was literally worn out with reading, opened here or there, his finger placed itself upon the passage, and whilst I read, he kept his eye fixed steadily upon me, as if he wished to search into the impression which the sword of the Spirit made upon my soul." Your readers have doubtless anticipated the natural cause which acted on this self-opening Bible, nor is any miracle pretended to have been wrought; but the fact is highly instructive, as it shews in what manner certain religionists read their Bibles, for ever dwelling on those isolated passages which tend to confirm their own peculiar views or prejudices. In this manner, the Catholic, who lays so much stress on the efficacy of works, might drive the Calvinist fairly out of the field, who preaches salvation by faith alone, as there are in the Scriptures at least ten texts which declare that men shall be judged by their works, for every text which says, that they shall be judged by their faith. If we neglect the general tenour and spirit of the sacred writers, and attend only to detached passages, there is scarcely any extravagant opinion which may not be defended by scripture: the effect of this mode of reading the Bible, practised by too

many zealots, was well described by Dryden—

"The fly-blown text creates a crawling brood,
And turns to maggots what was meant for food.

Before I conclude, I wish it to be understood, that the above strictures are intended to apply to the publication of M. Malan only, and not to the private religious meetings in the Canton de Vaud, which I have before said cannot be regarded as any violation of Christian practice, though they may be viewed with fear and distrust by an Established clergy. It is to be regretted, that M. Malan should by his indiscreet zeal, as evinced in the publication of the *Conventicule de Rolle*, have given his opponents in the Canton de Vaud specious reason to say, that he was promulgating doctrines in these meetings which were contrary to sound morality.

Your readers will, however, please to bear in mind, that the Government and Church Establishment of the Canton de Vaud are entirely distinct from those of Geneva; neither is the religious faith of the two cantons the same. I mention this, because an attempt is making to deceive the people of this country, and to confound both the governments together in a general charge of intolerance.

ROBERT BAKEWELL.

SIR,
IN the first volume of *Archæologia Americana*, recently published by the American Antiquarian Society, is an interesting Tract, by William Sheldon, Esq., of Jamaica, on the Caribs, the original inhabitants of a portion of the West-India islands. Speaking of the beads made by those natives out of the beans of the *cerobia*, the writer subjoins the following note, which I thought might be appropriately transcribed for the pages of the Repository.

AN AMERICAN.

"Of this kind of *cerobia* are the locust-trees on the northern continent of America. They are like the Syrian locust-tree, bearing a crop of beans annually. In America are two kinds, one bearing long straight pods, resembling kidney beans; the other broad,

crooked, speckled pods, which appear like snakes. It was the beans, and not the husks of the cerobia, (St. Luke xv. 16,) which the Prodigal Son lived on; our translators not having been aware that Κεράτιον, siliqua, means both the fruit and the husk of the cerobia."

SIR,
NONE ought to feel so strongly as the Dissenters the importance of the establishment of an institution where their children may receive the benefits of a liberal education without the sacrifice of principle. I am one of those who are not sorry that circumstances prevented the Unitarians from having a prominent share in the first formation of the proposed University, because I feel convinced that more prejudice might have been brought to bear against a design so set on foot, than it has been possible to enlist against the present undertaking in the hands of men of all classes of society. But I do feel the urgent call that the friends of a liberal and extended system of education have a right to make upon a body of persons who are so competent to render assistance in the most essential way, and who have so strong an interest in the success of the undertaking, a call which may be answered in a quiet way, though most efficiently, as appears by the difficulty found in completing the appropriation of the requisite number of shares.

It will be obvious to the wealthy members of our body, that they can efficiently come forward with very little trouble or risk to ensure success to a noble work; but the principal object of the present letter is to inquire whether any of our public institutions have funds which they could to any extent embark (*temporarily* at any rate) in the furtherance of so important an object to the Dissenting community.

In particular, I have understood that a considerable sum of money remains from the funds of the Academy formerly existing at Hackney, and which it was intended should be hereafter employed either as the basis of some new institution of the same sort, or in some purpose kindred to the original design of promoting the liberal education of Dissenters.

If this be the case, I would suggest that the cause could not be more materially served than by the investment of at least some portion of this money in the purchase of shares of the University. The gentlemen, whoever they are, who hold this fund, can as well (even probably with a view to pecuniary income of their fund) have it, or a part of it, invested in these shares as in the public funds, and with probably no great risk of deterioration.

They would have the benefit meantime of recommending students—a purpose identical with that of the original fund, and I am not aware that, until the establishment of a new Academy (no very probable thing) should render it necessary to withdraw the fund so employed, it could be disposed of in a manner more truly useful, and more consistent with the original intention of the subscribers.

I should, perhaps, myself be inclined to go further, in the event of the proposed institution really answering the expectations of the founder, and should think the interests of truth and learning better served by the permanent establishment to which all sects and parties would resort for education and instruction, than by institutions in their nature contracted, and confined to the inculcation of the peculiar systems of any particular sect, however liberally conducted; but at all events *some* assistance might be rendered, without in any way permanently affecting the disposeableness of the fund.

E. T.

SIR,
IN the haste with which I made my remark on the verb γιγνεσθαι, in my last, (p. 605,) I omitted to observe that, in the passage quoted from Herodotus, γινεαι can neither be rendered by *fit* nor by *factus es*, the sense excluding the former, and the tense of the verb the latter of these renderings. I also neglected to submit to the consideration of your ingenious correspondent, an example or two of γινεσθαι, used as the aorist of ειναι. The following instances will shew that a transition or change of state is *not always* implied by this word. Thucydides, Lib. iv. c. xciv. Ψιλοι—ουτε τότε παρησαν, ουτε εγενοντο εν τη πολει. Lib. ii. c. xcvi. Εγενετο η αρχη η Οδρυ-

των, μεγεθος, επι την θαλασσαν καθη-
 κθσα, κ. τ. λ. Herodotus, Lib. ii. c.
 cxxxiv. Ουτω και Αισωπος Ιαδμονος εγε-
 νετο. Thus it appears that *Æsop* also
 was the slave of *Jadmon*. Pausanias,
 Lib. i. c. xvi. Σελευκον δε βασιλεων εν
 τοις μαλιστα πειθομαι και αλλως γενεσθαι
 δικαιον και προς το θειον ευσεβη. The
 Scholiast on the *Vespæ* of *Aristo-*
phanes, v. 581. Αισωπος τραγωδίας
 εγενετο υποκριτης γελοιωδης. On this
 instance I need make no remark. I
 may now, I think, compare και ο λογος
 σαρχ εγενετο, (as interpreted by *Soci-*
nus,) with the following passage of the
Septuagint. Proverbs iv. 3, υιος γαρ
 εγενομεν καγω πατρι υπηκουος, και αγα-
 πωμενος εν προσωπω μητρος.

The fact seems to be this: The
 verb *γενεσθαι* is used of a state com-
 mencing, and *ειναι* of a state which
 exists. But this distinction was some-
 times overlooked even in the present
 tense, as particularly by *Herodotus*; and
 as things *are* what they *have be-*
come, the primary meaning of *γενεσ-*
θαι was often dropt in the aorist, and
 the want of a proper form of an aorist
 to the verb *ειναι*, was supplied by
γενεσθαι, as in Latin, *fui* (from the
 Greek, *φυω*, *gigno*) was used as the
 aorist of *sum*. If any one contends
 that the primitive signification of the
 verb ought to be taken into account
 in these instances, he seems to me to
 overlook the analogy of language, and
 to embrace in his conception what
 never suggests itself to the mind of
 the reader. I will only add, that I
 now distrust the example produced in
 my last from *Aristophanes*.

E. COGAN.

SIR,
 YOUR correspondent *Ben David*
 (pp. 533, 534) has in a manner
 almost called me out to take the
 place of my late friend *Porson*, whom,
 according to his own account, he has
 laid prostrate on the ground. But
 surely he cannot think me so incon-
 siderate, as to enter the lists with so
 redoubtable a champion; where the
 only chance of success that I could
 have, would be, that the sling, which
 was successful against the great *Go-*
liath, might miss the mark when di-
 rected to a smaller object. Waiving,
 however, comparisons of this kind, I
 do not feel that interest in the con-

troversy which should induce me to
 take an active part in it. The passage
 in question is, in my opinion, of no
 consequence in the discussion between
 Unitarians and Trinitarians; for al-
 lowing it to the latter, it conveys no
 idea of the relationship between the
 terms spoken of, except as to testi-
 mony.

A more important subject has been
 started in the same number of your
Repository (pp. 536—538); and *Ben*
David will recollect, that when he did
 me the favour of a call, and presented
 me with his work on the *Three Wit-*
nesses, I called his attention to it by
 putting the same question to him
 which I have done to *Porson* and se-
 veral of the first class of Greek scholars
 in this country, What is the differ-
 ence between *ην* and *εγενετο*? And this
 question I beg leave now to repeat to
 him, being assured, that whether he
 agrees or disagrees with your corre-
 spondent *T. F. B.* on this subject, he
 cannot fail from his extensive learn-
 ing to throw great light upon it.

In the mean time, it may not be
 without its use to shew in what man-
 ner I endeavoured to satisfy myself.
 The two words occur frequently in
 the first chapter of *John*. The word
ην is translated uniformly *was*, the
 word *εγενετο* has different renderings.
 I took my Greek and Latin Concor-
 dance, and examined every passage in
 the Greek Testament where these
 two words occur. In these passages
 I exchanged the one for the other,
 and the palpable absurdity that fre-
 quently occurred, led me by degrees
 to the true distinction between them.
 Thus, if you place *εγενετο* for *ην*, in
 the first verse of *John*, Θεος εγενετο ο
 λογος, the passage becomes, I might
 almost say, blasphemous; and if you
 read και ο λογος σαρχ ην, the connexion
 between this passage and the first
 verse is destroyed.

Having satisfied my own mind on
 the real distinction between the two
 words, I examined every passage in
 the English established translation
 where they occur, which brought me
 soon to this conclusion, that the trans-
 lators had never duly considered this
 question, that they were led astray by
 the Latin translation, and consequent-
 ly gave to the word *εγενετο* a variety
 of renderings which would never have

occurred to a scholar who was acquainted with only the English and Greek languages.

The English reader will not be surprised at this, when he considers a fact of frequent occurrence in our own language. Our verb has not a future tense, and the want of it we supply by the two auxiliary verbs *shall* and *will*. Our northern writers find no small difficulty in managing these verbs to their own satisfaction, and not unfrequently afford occasions for mirth at their expense to those who, born in the south, are supposed to possess a purer style. A similar thing takes place with the English who have learned French only in this country, and who seldom acquire the true use of the tenses of the verb *être, étois et fus*. In the Hebrew, which has only two tenses, the future and the past, the Greeks and the Latins found no small difficulty in accommodating these tenses to their idiom, and the later Hebrew writers have not unfrequently made their verb conform to the usage of the country in which they lived. And I fear, that if Ben David were to write a composition in Greek, his use of the words *ἦν* and *ἐγενετο* would not exactly accord with their application in Justin Martyr. He will not be at a loss at my selecting this author on the present occasion.

I cannot conclude without expressing the very great pleasure and satisfaction I received from the paper of T. F. B. on the *Crux Theologorum*. The difficulties are acknowledged by all. I am persuaded that they are not insuperable. Being firmly convinced myself, that *Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος*, and also that *ὁ λόγος σαρχὶ ἐγενετο*, I may not perhaps find much countenance to my next position, that this *λόγος* is at present in the world, is at present *σαρξ*, and that it abides in all true Christians. We have the treasure in earthen vessels. May it be widely diffused over all the earth, and produce fruits correspondent to its divine original!

W. FRIEND.

SIR,

I AM glad that the proem of John is brought under discussion in the Repository. The letter of your correspondent (p. 536) displays sound sense

and skill in the Greek language; and I subscribe to the justness of his strictures as far as they go. But, in truth, no scheme of interpreting the introduction of this Gospel was ever suggested which is not liable to serious objections, not excepting that of Lardner, which comes nearest to the truth. I will first state one or two of these objections.

“This” (the Logos) “was with God.” If this *Word* meant God himself, “Then,” says Dr. Clarke, “the Word was that same person whom he was with. And that is both a contradiction in terms, and also the ancient heresy of Sabellius.” Lardner, on the *Logos*, quotes this, and adds, “I am of opinion that God here is the same God that was mentioned before. St. John useth a gradation. First, he says the Word was always, before all time. Then he adds, *and was with God*, and lastly, that he was God himself.” P. 96. This wise and learned man felt the difficulty, but yet persisted in his opinion as the least of two difficulties: and in this he evinces that solidity of judgement which characterises all his decisions, even where, through misconception or the want of some additional evidence, he happens to be wrong. But suppose him here to be right, where lies the propriety of the assertion made by the Evangelist?

Was it necessary so formally and solemnly to assert that the Word, the Wisdom or Reason of God, was God himself? Did any man or body of men deny this? Is such an assertion at all natural; and if so, does it form a rational and appropriate introduction to the Gospel? This exordium is remarkable for the plainness and simplicity of its language; why should not the sentiments, the drift of the writer, be not equally clear, distinct and determined? Only one reason can be given for this, and it is the following: There were circumstances known to the Evangelist, and to all the world at the time, which rendered his language necessary. Time has withdrawn these circumstances from the knowledge of mankind, and with them the purport of the historian. Bring these again to view, and you restore the proem to a sense that is at once clear, pertinent and momentous. To do this is the object of my

present letter: and I hope the reader will excuse me, if I occupy an unusual share of his attention. As I wish to develop those circumstances with the utmost brevity, I shall state what I purpose saying in a series of remarks.

1. The larger Epistle of John furnishes the true clue for discovering the main object which he had in publishing his Gospel. This Epistle is properly *controversial*, called forth by the prevalence of a certain *heresy* which threatened to undermine Christianity, and addressed to that church or churches where that heresy prevailed. John, therefore, meets its base authors, opposes his own language with the utmost precision to the opinions they advanced, and directly notices them as *liars*, *false prophets* and *antichrist*. This Epistle, therefore, was intended to be of a local nature, chiefly useful for the persons to whom it was addressed, though comprehending sentiments interesting to all Christians, especially where the same or similar errors had taken root. In the Gospel the Evangelist has the same end in view, but he comes to his end by less direct and obvious means. Here his Divine Master is the only speaker and agent; and as what he said and did, though bearing immediately on the errors of the times, were of high moment to mankind in all ages and countries of the world, the sacred writer took care to keep his words as free as possible from all local and temporary disputes. With this intention he selects such discourses or works in the ministry of Jesus as were immediately calculated to set aside the doctrines of the impostors without specifically noticing them, contenting himself with stating facts, without apprizing the reader of his design, but leaving him to draw the proper inference from the bearings of those facts and the notoriety of the falsehoods to which they were opposed. Yet we see that the Evangelist states his design in direct terms at the close of the Gospel: "These things are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." Now, look into the Epistle, and you will there perceive that the object of the writer was to enforce the proposition that "Jesus is the Christ," or "that Jesus is the Son of God;" and that in reference to the men whom he notices,

and who endeavoured to set aside this proposition by saying that Jesus was *not* the Christ; but that the Christ was a God, an empty phantom in the appearance of the man Jesus, or a God dwelling for a season in the man Jesus. Here, then, we have foundation for saying, that the Gospel of John is throughout levelled against the Gnostics. We have, therefore, reason to infer that the proper way to interpret his exordium is to bring it in contact with the sentiments of those deceivers.

2. The Greek and Latin Fathers have given a full account of the Gnostics and their heresies. The crimes imputed to them are revolting to human nature. They reduced immorality to a system; and, as Paul says of them, gloried in their shame. The opinions they held were too ridiculous and absurd to have been seriously believed, and must have been affected to answer a sinister end. The object of the heresiarchs, without exception, was to burlesque Christianity, and to establish in disguise a system of Atheism. Unable to destroy the gospel by open violence, they endeavoured to undermine it. With this view they taught two principles which struck at the root of natural and revealed religion. They maintained that the Christ was a supernatural being, not the man Jesus, but a God in his shape, or dwelling in him. Being a God, he did his miracles by means of his own underived power, and appeared after death by virtue of his own nature. On this principle the resurrection of the dead, the very foundation of the Christian religion, is erased; as the resurrection of a being who by nature is superior to death, cannot be a proof and a pledge of the resurrection of beings who by nature are subject to death.

The other fundamental principle on which they insisted was, that the Creator of the world was an evil, imperfect being; while they pretended to have revealed an all-perfect Deity, hitherto unknown. This proves at once that, whatever they might affect, they were at heart real Atheists. For it is not to be supposed, that if, against all evidence from reason and revelation, they rejected an Almighty Author of nature, they could seriously believe in a God who, according to

their own account, had no evidence from either, as living in eternal solitude, unconcerned in the creation and government of the universe.

3. The authors of this base system were the Scribes and Pharisees, who caused our Lord to be put to death, joined by a portion of the disciples of John, among whom was Simon, the famous impostor of Samaria. Jesus pointed out the foundation of their heresies in the tares sown by the agents of Antichrist or the evil principle, guarded his virtuous followers against their insidious admission into the Christian church, under the emphatic figure of wolves in sheep's clothing, and stigmatized them as children of the serpent, that is, advocates of that divinity which, under the symbol of the serpent for ages immemorial, had in Egypt and other Heathen countries been opposed to the God of Israel.

4. Actuated by deep-rooted malice against the Gospel and its first teachers, and finding open violence ineffectual to suppress it, they planned this artful scheme to sink it in the dregs of Jewish and Heathen superstitions, by enforcing a necessity on the part of the Heathen converts of conforming to the rites of the Mosaic law, and insisting on the divinity of Christ, as such to be ranked with the Pagan gods. With this view, by means of emissaries, they sent the scheme to every place where churches had been planted by the apostles, with such modifications as the prepossessions of each peculiar church required. Its admission into the several churches was the cause, under Providence, of calling forth the apostolic writings. So artfully was Gnosticism adapted to the corrupt views and bad passions of mankind, that, in defiance of the apostles, it gradually prevailed, so as ultimately to threaten the very existence of pure Christianity, its teachers being joined and supported by the reputed wise, by magicians and imposters, in heathen countries, especially in Egypt and in Rome.

5. Irenæus, who has given the most authentic and detailed account of their tenets and actions, has not told us, what he ought to have done, that he derived his information from the false gospels which they published and caused to be circulated as soon as

Christianity began to be disseminated in the world.

To these Gospels Luke alludes in his introduction: and the apostle thus notices that which had been received in the church at Galatia: "I wonder that so soon ye have transferred yourselves to another gospel, which is not another, but *an artifice which some, throwing you into confusion, have adopted, wishing thereby to overthrow the Gospel of Christ.*"

6. The Pagan philosophers personified the *deep* or *chaotic mass* mentioned in the Mosaic history of the creation. This was the Supreme God of the Gnostics; and one of the names which they gave him was, *Βυθος*, the *deep*. Now they taught that with this divinity, *σιγη* (*silence*) coexisted from all eternity. This is expressly asserted by Irenæus, whose words are, *Συνυπαρχειν αὐτῷ καὶ σιγῇ*. From which we might conjecture, that the gospel of the impostors, which lay open before this father, thus began: *Εν ἀρχῇ ἦν ἡ σιγῇ, καὶ ἡ σιγῇ ἦν πρὸς τὸν Βυθόν, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Βυθος*. *In the beginning was silence, (or solitude,) and silence was with the Abyss, and the Abyss was God:* which, reduced to simple language, inculcates that the great Abyss, existing a dark and lonely mass from all eternity, alone comprehended the elements of creation, without any rational Cause or supreme Intelligence presiding at the head of the universe.

7. Philo has the merit of explaining the primary sense of *Logos*, as applied to God: and he professes to speak with philosophical accuracy when he says, that it means *the principle of reason* or *the Divine Intelligence*, and expresses God himself, not indeed as to his *being*, but as the intelligent and designing cause of all things, as a rational or spiritual agent, independent of the works of his hand. The Pagan philosophers applied the word *God* to nature, to physical causes, to the heavenly bodies, to abstract ideas personified, and the Stoics, even to that concatenation of causes and effects which they called *fate* or *necessity*. This vague use of the word *God* was but an artifice to preclude rational evidence for the existence of a spiritual principle, as the cause of creation, distinct from creation itself.

8. Now, the defeating of this artifice is the object of John in the beginning of his Gospel. Evidently alluding to the account of the creation given by Moses, he says, "In the beginning was the Logos," meaning, that He who existed as the cause of all things, was not that vague thing, animate or inanimate, which the philosophers called *God*, but a conscious, wise Being, first *designing* the things which he caused, and next executing the things which he had designed—that a rational, intelligent principle, under the name of Logos, was the author of nature, or, according to Philo, when the foundation of the universe was laid, an intelligent *planner* or designer preceded its formation.

9. The reference which this Evangelist has to Antichrist, both in his Gospel and in his Epistles, places this doctrine in a clear, simple and unequivocal light. The Antichristian teachers were *Atheists*; and they sought to level the whole edifice of Christianity, by withdrawing from under it the existence and agency of one God. The dispute between them and the Apostle was, whether *Sige* (*silence*) or *Logos* (*reason*) was from the beginning with God. If the former, the Supreme Being led a life of eternal darkness and lonely inaction: if the latter, he lived in the eternal fruition of light and life, communicating these to unnumbered myriads of beings through the boundless extent of creation. The one cut up all hope of a future state, by erasing the very foundations of natural and revealed religion: the other prepares the way for it by pointing to an all-powerful, wise and beneficent Being at the head of the universe.

10. The Gnostics rejected the Creator as an evil, imperfect Being, because they thus had a plea for denying that Christ came with authority from him to save the world—to save sinners, or to save men from the penal consequences of sin by repentance and reformation. As the Creator was evil, he did not wish the happiness of his creatures: and as Christ was God, he acted independently of God the Father. Thus, as John says of them, they "denied the Father and the Son." Now mark how this pernicious tenet is set aside by the Evangelist. The Logos, which

in the beginning was with God, "became flesh." What does this much-disputed language imply—what does it assert? In direct and forcible terms it asserts the very thing which the impostors denied. It asserts that the Christ, instead of being a man in appearance, was flesh and blood—a real human being; that instead of being a God acting independently of the Creator, he was a man acting with the authority of the Creator. It implies that the miracles which Jesus performed, the wisdom and benevolence which he displayed, the doctrine which he taught, the power by which he rose from the grave—were but *emanations* of those Supreme perfections which originally framed and still govern the universe. In a word, it implies that Jesus had received a commission from God, and was even invested with the attributes of God, in order to carry into effect a benevolent scheme which God himself had formed for the salvation of mankind.

J. JONES.

SIR,
IN Mr. Turner's Address to the Students of Manchester College, York, at the conclusion of their last annual examination, he advises them to endeavour to acquire the habit of "speaking extempore," (p. 421,) by which, I presume, he means extempore preaching. But, as he guards this advice with so much care and caution respecting the preparation it necessarily requires, to be done in a decent and becoming manner, and also fences it round with Mr. Brougham's advice and directions to those who wish to acquire the habit of extempore speaking, it appears as if he was not thoroughly convinced of the propriety of the advice he gives. Nor is it clear whether Mr. Turner intended his advice to apply to their regular services as settled ministers, or only to their occasional services as missionary preachers. If he meant the former of these, then I beg leave to make some remarks on it, because I conceive it to be a mode of preaching which, if generally adopted, will not be acceptable to a majority of the members of most of our regular congregations, and, therefore, it ought not to have been thus recommended to young men just commencing their

ministerial career, as they may hence infer, that this mode of preaching will be the most likely to ensure their popularity and usefulness. But if Mr. Turner only meant the latter, then my remarks will not apply to these, because, as so much depends on extraneous circumstances, I do not pretend to give an opinion on the best mode of performing them. In order, however, to understand this subject clearly, it will be necessary to define the terms we use, or we shall only wage a war of words. By extempore preaching, I mean a discourse delivered without premeditation, or with premeditation, as it respects the matter it contains, but the language in which it is expressed is suggested to the mind of the speaker at the moment of delivery. Any other mode than this I do not call extempore preaching, and, of course, should not object to it. I have said that I believe this mode of preaching will not be acceptable to the majority of members of most of our regular congregations; for, although our congregations may not be so numerous as some of the other classes of Dissenters, yet, I think, it will be generally admitted, they contain, according to their numbers, a greater proportion of intelligent hearers; and I cannot conceive that these will be as well satisfied with extempore preaching, as with the present mode, unless it can be supposed that extempore sermons will, in general, be equally as good, in matter and arrangement, as written ones; but this, I believe, the most sanguine advocate of extempore preaching will not undertake to prove. If ministers were only required to address their congregations some few times in the course of a year, some of them, probably, might, by previous preparation, according to Mr. Brougham's recommendations, become as finished orators in the pulpit as any of those who have signalized themselves in the Senate, at the bar, or on the stage. But can there be any comparison instituted between the ministerial profession and any other respecting the frequency of its public addresses? Are not the great majority of ministers, especially among the Dissenters, obliged to address their hearers twice on every Sunday throughout the year? From what other profession is an

equal exertion required? If the other professions have their busy times, in which great exertions may be required of them, they have longer intervals of leisure to prepare for them. But, in any other profession which requires much public speaking, how few is the number of those who attain any high degree of eminence as public speakers, compared with those who scarcely reach the point of mediocrity! But to be able to form some idea what extempore preaching would generally be, we have only to ascertain how this kind of preaching is performed among the other classes of Dissenters, whose preachers generally adopt this mode of preaching; and then we may, probably, be able to determine whether, setting aside their peculiar doctrines, the members of our different congregations would be satisfied with a similar strain and style of preaching; for something similar it undoubtedly would be. I willingly acknowledge there are some excellent preachers among those to whom I refer, men of considerable talents and attainments in this mode of preaching; but, it must also be admitted, they are thinly scattered; the great majority cannot be quoted as examples of the excellence of this kind of preaching; and though it may give satisfaction to the members of their different congregations, would it satisfy the majority of ours? Do not they, also, overlook or excuse many imperfections in their preachers, if they do not discover any lack in soundness of faith? But would similar imperfections be thus easily passed over among the Unitarians? Do they not, likewise, generally believe that, both in praying and preaching, the preacher receives certain aids and assistances from heaven, and, therefore, to give utterance to these, he must necessarily speak extempore, or these could not be granted him? They, therefore, readily overlook many delinquencies against logic and sound sense, too glaring to escape detection; and, if compelled to notice them, it is generally done with this kind of an apology for them, that the preacher depended too much on human aid, and not sufficiently on divine. But is this belief prevalent among the Unitarians, and would they thus readily excuse the blunderings of their preachers?

It may, perhaps, be said that I take it for granted, that extempore preaching must necessarily be imperfectly done, and that written sermons, of course, are excellent. But this is not the case. I acknowledge, that extempore preaching may, occasionally, be well done, and thus produce a considerable effect on those who hear it; all that I contend for is, that if it were generally adopted, it would not be as well done, or give that satisfaction to the great majority of Unitarians, as the present mode of preaching now does: why, therefore, should it be changed? Nor do I pretend to say that all written sermons are excellent. Some of these, it is well known, cannot be highly extolled. And much, perhaps, cannot be said in favour of those that are hastily put together; especially, if done after tea-time, on a Saturday evening, which is about all the time that some sermon-writers pretend to take for the composition of a sermon: some of these will not be much superior to a common extempore sermon. But, if our young ministers were advised to adhere to the writing of sermons, rather than to attempt extempore preaching, the probability is, we should have better sermons, and such as would give more general satisfaction. Indeed, facts, as far as they can be collected; are in favour of written sermons; for, where the experiment of extempore preaching has been tried among the Unitarians, it has not been generally approved. Seriously, therefore, would I advise those young men who have been induced to attempt this mode of preaching, to return to the other, in which they have merited the approbation of those that heard them, while their extempore effusions have not given equal satisfaction. I know there are some among us who think from the great success which the Methodists in particular have obtained in making proselytes, which success has generally been attributed to their popular mode of preaching, that if Unitarians would adopt the same style of preaching, they would be equally as successful in making converts to their peculiar opinions. But the cases are very dissimilar. When a Methodist goes forth to preach, he does not carry to his hearers what they con-

ceive to be new or strange doctrines. They do not hear from him any doctrine contrary to what they have been taught to believe to be true, if they have received any religious instruction. They may have heard the same general doctrines from their fathers, and the same they know are believed and avowed by the Established Church, to which by profession they belong. There is not, therefore, any opposition of sentiment between them on doctrinal subjects. But how changed is the case respecting the Unitarian! What opposition from ignorance and prejudice has he not to encounter and remove, before he can plant a single grain of Unitarianism, or excite any attention to it! But we are not now discussing the best mode of propagating our peculiar sentiments where they are not known, or the best mode of preaching for a missionary preacher, but that which will be the best for the instruction, edification, and prosperity of our regular congregations; and this, I believe, will not be extempore preaching.

PLAIN TRUTH.

Critical Synopsis of the Monthly Repository for November, 1824.

HISTORY OF THE IRISH PRESBYTERIANS. An instructive and pleasing abridgement,—affording, in its manner and matter, a good illustration of some of the merits of the Monthly Repository.

What a beautiful instance of liberality is exhibited in the mutual concessions of Mr. Blair and the Bishop who ordained him! Too happy, if we could but witness frequent examples of the same kind in the Christian church of the present day.

One could have wished that more description and reflection had been mixed up with this purely narrative account. I desiderate a statement of the particular character, influences, and effects of the Irish Presbyterian Establishment. What good has it done in that afflicted land? What mistakes may it have committed? What has been and still is the tone of its piety and its toleration? Has it retained a similar character to other establishments of the same denomination?—and so on.

Mr. Cogan on the Greek Article. There are several points of sound and interesting criticism in this communication, but the thread is rather obscurely conducted through them.

I am struck by the following rule: "It is worthy of observation, that the epistolary writers of the New Testament do not commonly use the article with an attributive standing *before* the name of Jesus Christ, when such an attributive is introduced by a conjunction, the word Θεός having preceded." The peculiar influence of the circumstance stated in this last clause is certainly very curious. Would no other word but Θεός have the same effect? Unitarian critics are bound to investigate the nature and *rationale* of this rule, if it can possibly be done.

Essay on the incidental Communication of Religious Knowledge to the Young, contains much good sense.

Mr. Worsley on Unitarian Missionary Preaching. Some of this advice I should think excellent. I regret to see some too contemptuous expressions coming from such a quarter. "Reports well enough got up." What a fine bone for the enemies of Unitarianism to pick! The custom of sending out desultory missionaries might be injudicious if continued indefinitely. But under certain circumstances, I can conceive of nothing more useful to the cause at large than these explorers and pioneers. Even if they get pelted with mud, it is a fact worth knowing. And if any where they are respectfully listened to by considerable numbers, it is better still.

American Roman Catholics. Years ago have I often heard the excellent Catholic Bishop Cheverus, formerly of Boston, read one of the regular prayers of his Church, in which the President of the United States, by name, with all others in authority, were commended to the especial blessing of God.

Dr. J. Jones on Mark and Luke, exhibits, in many things, the usual acuteness of his penetration. But has he not deceived himself in his argument for the "internal evidence" that Luke was one of those who went to Emmaus? Although Luke "in three places uses the first for the

third person," yet does not the context sufficiently shew that he is relating the conversation of other persons besides himself?

The remarks on the identity of Mark and Cleopas are to me somewhat confused.

Dr. Jones has poured more valuable light on St. Paul's precepts respecting anger.

Persecution of Elias Hickes. The readers of the Repository will be glad to learn that Elias Hickes and his cause are making triumphant progress among his sect at New York. At their General Meeting the last spring, Unitarian preaching and liberal measures overwhelmingly prevailed. The Unitarians of this denomination, however, stand decidedly aloof from those of all others. Indeed, Elias Hickes, though he now extensively reads our publications, arrived at his present views solely by his own unassisted reflections and perusal of the Scriptures. Probably not a hundredth part of his followers know any thing of the great controversy that is prevailing in the Christian world at large. John Griscom, one of the sect, a Professor in the Columbia College, at New York, and author of a very intelligent book of Travels in Great Britain, still retains the faith of Trinitarians. In the towns of New Bedford and Lynn, in Massachusetts, two flourishing Unitarian congregations possess a generous proportion of regular worshipers, who but a short time since were the highly-respected followers of Penn.

Rammohun Roy. An edition of his writings is now going through the press in New York.

Mr. Bakewell in Reply to Dr. Smith. The lovers of light and pleasant reading must feel an obligation to these two gentlemen for the entertainment and instruction which has been furnished by them during the past year. They have very much enlarged our knowledge of the state of things in Geneva; and they have taught both us and themselves the lesson, how differently may the same object appear to different minds, when seen from different points of view, and coloured by different prejudices and habits of thought.

When Dr. Smith reproached the

Genevese pastors for preaching moral sermons, did he forget the sermons of Barrow on Industry? I do think it shews the excessive barrenness of what the orthodox have to say against us, when they resort, as they so frequently do, to the wretchedly futile charge of our preaching and listening to moral discourses and sermons, in which Jesus Christ is not expressly named, &c.

One cause, I suspect, of the animosity of Calvinists against modern Geneva, is, the admirable system of catechetical instruction which is in such active operation there. It must somewhat excite their jealousy to see their own instruments and apparatus of defence so successfully employed by their opponents.

The systematic efforts which are at this moment making for the instruction of the young by so called "orthodox" Christians in America are prodigious. Each little Sunday-School Committee is not contented with labouring in its own private sphere; but there is a great rage among them to generalize and nationalize the business, and make it present an imposing front by enlisting numbers in the cause, and uniting distant communities and different sects in the pursuit of one object. Our peculiar federative constitution of government, leads us perhaps into these ambitious whimsies. They parade thousands and thousands of youths through the streets, with badges and banners, on anniversary days, and assume the dangerous title of *National Sunday-School*, &c. Verily these children of light are growing wise in their generation. Yet I see not much to fear ultimately in their mighty operations. The Assembly's Catechism is no longer the text-book among a majority of the schools. Lessons of scripture are committed to memory, and books, I believe, are generally used, which, though in many points exceptionable, are not quite so injurious in their tendency as the old Westminster farrago of incomprehensible metaphysics and absurd theology. To the eye of philosophy and experience, many a Calvinist Sunday-School is now a sweet and gentle and pliable little nursery of future sturdy, independent, thinking Unitarians.

Dr. Smith in Reply to Mr. Bake-

well. What a pity that these gentlemen should so widely differ as to the "chief object" of Dr. Smith's argument! Diverging thus at the very central point, it is no wonder that the farther they have proceeded, the farther they have seemed to depart from each other.

Feeble, oh, feeble, art thou, Dr. Smith, in thy argument, (numbered 1,) to shew that M. Malan did not violate the Consistory's Regulation! Silence would have been a better way of backing thy friends than this.

Where is the mighty inspiration and superior unction in the extract from that preacher's writings on p. 669? Passages, equally eloquent, pious, and sound, might be found in many an Unitarian's sermons. I do not think the passage is in perfectly good taste. It possesses that strained aim after merely rhetorical effect, so common among the French divines.

Dr. Smith's next argument (2) is strong.

In Arg. 3 is an unhandsome insinuation, as if the present Genevese clergy did not "adorn their Christian profession by the *fidelity* of their preaching, and the *purity* of their conduct. Whatever may be their speculative errors on metaphysical and critical subjects, it seems cruelly uncandid thus to impeach the very spring of their internal motives, and to throw a stigma on their moral characters.

The distinctions run between religious toleration and religious approval are very well. But Dr. Smith should recollect, that toleration may be violated by the *manner* in which those doctrines are condemned which cannot be approved.

After all, this Monsieur Malan, I fear, is acquiring an importance by the present controversy, which scarcely belongs to him. Dr. Smith and all of us will ere long probably be ashamed that we ever took any concern about the yearly receipts and expenditures of a noisy sectary and boarding-house-keeper. We shall wonder how we could ever have pondered on his "outfit of beds and furniture," or felt perplexed to know whether he employed two, or three domestic servants. The lovers of theological scandal and domestic investigation will, no doubt, be glad if Dr. Griscom, of New York,

and some English traveller in the United States will treat them next year with a Correspondence in the Repository respecting Elias Hickes, and his persecutions, and household style of living.

Dr. Smith asks if Mr. Bakewell "is ignorant that the very word salvation means *deliverance from sin*." This is coming round sweepingly to Arminianism and liberal interpretation, and lowering the old terrific images with which Calvinism has so long and often essayed to move the world.

And how the doctrine of Final Perseverance is frittered away by this accommodating writer! It amounts then to a mere truism. Unitarians, and all other men of good sense, I should presume, must admit in the main the representations of it here made.

There is a poor catch in the reasoning on p. 674, beginning with "He that believeth on me," &c. These expressions contain not a promise of perseverance to those who believe, but a promise of everlasting life to those who *perseveringly* believe. The doctrine of final perseverance, I imagine, has nothing to do with them.

All that about "the salt of the land" in Edinburgh and other Calvinistic cities, is still purely a begging of the question. It takes for granted the very fact that Mr. Bakewell disputes. But Calvinists are so fond of applying to themselves the scriptural expression "Salt of the earth," that, I dare say, Mr. Smith's argument with himself, instead of being pointless, passes for self-evident.

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

I am not disposed to defend the entire breadth of Dr. Channing's remarks on Dr. Priestley; but the present writer's generous jealousy causes him, I think, to magnify the wound inflicted on the reputation of his departed friend.

Although *Dr. Priestley* might have regarded innovation as improvement, yet so do all innovators, and this is a weak defence against the charge of Dr. Channing. As to the French theory of chemistry, it was opposite to his own; and may not this have been the cause of his reluctance to adopt

it? The next charge is not very heavy, and is a mere matter of critical opinion; and the next is very feebly replied to.

As regards the allegation of a deficiency in moral enthusiasm in Priestley, I apprehend Dr. Channing will be well borne out. Undoubtedly, Dr. Priestley had a certain kind of enthusiasm, which prompted him to pursue the truth fearlessly, and to suffer for it manfully. But, surely, his best friends must allow, that in the capacity of *religious teacher, or leader of a party*, he possessed no vivid enthusiasm. He was rigidly didactic and demonstrative in all his writing and preaching, but there was little, if any, warmth in his exhortations, and no high tone of sensibility in his reflections. This was probably all that Dr. Channing could mean. American Unitarians can easily inform Mr. Belsham, that if Dr. Priestley, in his first sermons at Philadelphia, had displayed more "moral enthusiasm," and less of the mere uncompromising ardour of the controversialist, there would have been an earlier, broader, and more central basis laid for Unitarianism in America.

In closely examining Dr. C.'s remarks on Priestley's anti-supernaturalism, I find no positive charge, but every thing tenderly, sparingly and dubiously said. The amount of it only is, that Priestley was liable to be "*swayed*" in his speculations by the scrupulous spirit of his age, and knowing that there is something infinitely valuable in Christianity, he was inclined to hope that it would be rendered "*more credible*;" not by sweeping away its miraculous character, surely, but by excluding from it the supernatural "*as much as possible*;" that is, as much as the truth could bear.

I think it not worth while to touch upon several other points in the body of this communication, since they rather involve some matters of metaphysical theology and biblical criticism, than a direct impeachment of Dr. Priestley's Christian and moral temperament, or any misapprehension of Dr. C.'s terms on the part of his critic.

Mr. Belsham does not appear to me to have considered with proper

care the qualifications which Dr. C. himself introduces into his strictures. For instance, the latter says, "The Unitarians of England may be considered as forming a political, *as well as* religious party." The latter says, "Dr. Channing is pleased to represent the Unitarians of England as a *political sect*." But this is not an exact report. The most that Dr. Channing's representation can fairly be made to convey, is, that the Unitarians of England are swayed in some degree by political motives, in consequence of their peculiar relation to the state. Now, such a charge, I humbly maintain, is neither "unfounded" nor "contemptible." Not "contemptible." For, supposing you are, in some respects, a political sect, yet how can you be blamed for it? Indeed, you would scarcely deserve the respect of mankind, if you did not possess that quality. If the Unitarians of America were to be oppressed by their government, Dr. Channing would be the first to write and talk and act against the oppression; but at the same time, he would candidly allow that this new relation to the state rendered us a political as well as a religious sect, and especially, that it would endanger and injure the purity of our religious susceptibilities. Nor is the charge "unfounded," if we may believe the testimony of almost every traveller, both American and English, both Unitarian and Orthodox, who comes to our shores. Would Dr. Belsham please to state what proportion of English Unitarians he coolly thinks are Whigs, and what are Tories?

Letter from Rammohun Roy to Dr. Rees. Let liberal members of the Church of England for one moment consider the weighty and unprejudiced testimony here offered by this great man, as to the light in which the Establishment appears to the most cultivated foreign subjects of the realm.

We Americans were astonished at the sagacity with which Rammohun Roy had seized upon the true theory of our complicated political institution, as shewn in his short letter to Dr. Ware. How guarded and precisely correct also is he while animadverting in the letter before us upon the influence which the King of England possesses in his Church! He

seems to ascribe to him no absolute, oriental power to make alterations therein, but at the same time is fully aware of the paramount force of that patronage and influence which belong to him as Head of the Church.

Friendly Correspondence between an Unitarian and a Calvinist.

There is no writing so eloquent and beautiful as purely religious writing. The second paragraph of this letter enters into and fills the soul.

There is something to my mind awfully oracular in these short responses and notes of N. at the bottom of the page. They seem to come up from some gloomy shade below, where Calvin is dwelling, and obstinately holding fast his favourite dogmas. Yet it must be allowed that in some of them our Calvinist is softened a little. He admits that a discriminative recommendation of vice and virtue by preaching is better than vociferous denunciations of eternal damnation. He grants that some distinction of character will be made in the punishments of a future world. Dr. Griffin, one of our great orthodox leaders in America, denies this. He says that a line is drawn amid the inhabitants of this world. All on one side are irretrievably and indiscriminately damned. All on the other are received into unspeakable glory. And he urges on his hearers with all the force of voice and limb the intelligible and practicable direction to "step over the line," or they are lost.

I am glad that I. at length makes use of the proper distinctive term in this controversy, in speaking of Calvinists and *Universalists*.

On the following remark of I.—"Upon the whole, I am pleased with the complexion of the times as respects tolerance and Christian charity"—N. observes, "All this is the refinement of unconverted man." Now this looks like a fictitious sarcasm put into his mouth by I., and whispers somewhat of the identity of the two opponents.

REVIEW. *On the Bible Society's Turkish Testament.* Learned and instructive.

On Mrs. Jevons's Funeral Sermon. A picture of Christian gentleness gently drawn.

Obituary. Funeral sermons appear to attract unusually large audi-

ences in England. I think it not so in America, unless the character of the deceased have occupied an extraordinary space in the public eye.

Intelligence. Few cases are so interesting as the "proposed new Chapel at Sheerness." I can have no doubts of its success with that magnanimous and never-weary Unitarian public in England. Would that we in America had more of the spirit of communicating to our own household of faith! But there is scarcely a more hopeless expedition under the sun than a begging one here in behalf of an Unitarian church. The Unitarian Chapel in Baltimore is the most beautiful edifice in the United States. Its proprietors have already paid 60,000 dollars for the building. Twenty thousand more will purchase the ground on which it stands, and which must either be bought, or the whole establishment be sold out of the hands of the present proprietors. They can raise, though with difficulty, 7000 dollars. They have, in their private capacities, been peculiar sufferers by unavoidable commercial embarrassments. They now offer to their countrymen to invest the remaining 13,000 dollars in 3 per cent stock, to be secured by a mortgage on the whole ground and edifice, and to be redeemed in fifteen years. I have my doubts whether this accommodating project will possibly succeed; although in the single city of Boston, there are five hundred Unitarians whose purses are ever open to applications for other charitable objects, and each of whom could make an outright present to the Baltimore Church of 10,000 dollars, without the necessity of abridging a spoonful of sauce from their daily elegant and hospitable tables. Already the Trinitarians, with an ominous and vulture-like eagerness, are flapping their wings and muttering their triumphs over the impending dissolution of that devoted church. May their predictions and mine be alike blasted!

Comparison of French Protestants with English Catholics. How affecting is this picture! And how prominent and cutting is the truth of the conclusion! I tremble every day lest the intolerance of the French Government will wipe out every line of this contrast.

Is not the following remark rather overcharged—"It is a principle in England, that all religions which differ from the religion of the state, ought to be destroyed"?

SIR,

Oct. 17, 1825.

I BEG to assure your correspondent W., (page 538,) that it was very far from being my design to "bespatter" him "with obloquy" on account of his scepticism; and though I charged him with *inconsistent* scepticism, I did not consider the charge of so grave a nature as to merit any thing of petulance in the reply. My only object is the discovery of truth, and truth is best discovered by calm and amicable discussion.

After reading, with considerable interest and attention, his last communication, (p. 538,) I am under the necessity of saying, that so far from having returned a satisfactory answer to my inquiry, he has altogether evaded it. As the remarks contained in his first letter in your number for June, (p. 335,) appeared to represent Judaism as a system merely of human policy, established without miraculous agency, and, therefore, not entitled to be considered as a revelation from Heaven, I wished to know how these sentiments, which, I was well aware, are not peculiar to your correspondent, could be reconciled with the belief, which I did not doubt he entertained, of the divine origin and authority of the Christian religion. I stated my conviction, that the Jewish and the Christian systems are inseparably connected, not only because the divine authority of the former is acknowledged in almost every page of the New Testament, but because, also, the very nature of that office or character which is ascribed to Jesus, and his title to which it appears to have been the main object of his miracles and resurrection to establish, implies a previous revelation. I expected, therefore, that he would have informed me on what grounds he conceived the divine origin of Christianity might be established independently of that of Judaism; instead of which, he has merely attempted to support his sentiments by the authority of some great names. His language, indeed, is such as leaves me still in doubt what his sentiments respecting Judaism really are; for

though he disavows the design of explaining away all that appears miraculous in the Old Testament, yet he has not informed us where he draws the line between the natural and the supernatural, nor what distinction he makes between "*giving an air of probability* to these ancient writings" and explaining away the miracles which they relate. He acknowledges, if I rightly understand him, an important relation between these ancient writings and the books of the New Testament; but adds, that the latter "might stand their ground, although the writings of Moses and the prophets had been trampled in the dust." Here is the very sentiment which he was expressly called upon to defend; but I look in vain for the arguments which I expected to be advanced in its support. Your correspondent cannot require to be told that miracle is necessary to establish the claim of any religion to the character of a divine revelation. If, then, Moses is only to be considered as an "admirable general," who led his army dry-shod over the Red Sea by means of his knowledge of the tides; if the thunders and lightnings of Mount Sinai were nothing more, as he insinuates, than a natural tempest, which "might well frighten the Hebrews, who had passed their days in a land where rain and storms were unknown;" if the pillar of smoke and fire which guided the Israelites, was merely an artificial signal like that employed by Alexander the Great to conduct his army; if the story of the walls of Jericho falling down at the sound of the rams' horns be merely "a figure of speech to signify the ease with which the Hebrews made themselves masters of that city;" if the phrase, so often occurring in the Old Testament, of "*Thus saith the Lord*," be merely "an idiom of office, a form of speech chosen to head the new law—some-what like, *And be it enacted, &c.*,"—if all those tokens of Divine interposition be thus converted into tricks of state or events of ordinary occurrence, what ground, I ask, will remain, on which to establish the divine authority of Judaism; or how can the superstructure of Christianity, which rests upon it, be saved from demolition?

I was perfectly well aware that your

correspondent is not singular in his "inconsistent scepticism." It is a common practice among *liberal* Christians to take unwarrantable liberties with writings which they yet acknowledge as the oracles of truth and the records of revelation, and to reject without ceremony whatever does not square with their notions of probability. Now to me it appears that one miracle is just as probable as another; and supposing the external evidence to be equally good, there is nothing more incredible in the Jewish story of the Israelites marching dry-shod through the Red Sea, while "*the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand and on their left*," than in the Christian miracle of Jesus walking upon the sea of Galilee without sinking. I cannot, therefore, understand why those who admit the truth of the miracles recorded in the New Testament should be so "anxious to give an air of probability" to the miracles of the Old Testament, unless they can shew, what I contend is contradicted by the whole tenour of the Scriptures, that the Jewish and Christian systems are altogether distinct and independent.

Setting aside this inconsistency of admitting Christianity as a divine revelation and denying the same character to Judaism, I find no fault with your correspondent for dealing with the Jewish Scriptures as he would with any other ancient records, in endeavouring to discover the real nature of those events which gave occasion to the marvellous stories they contain. But I am perfectly astonished that he should propound his explanations as the interpretation of the meaning of the writers themselves. If there is any signification in language, the historians of the Jewish nation were themselves convinced, or intended at least to convince their readers, of the really miraculous nature of many of the incidents which they relate. To say that all these stories of miracles were merely "figures of speech," "metaphorical expressions," a peculiar "phraseology employed to describe what a profane author would give us in a simpler style," is to make the Bible a book of enigmas, fitted more to mislead than instruct, and to ascribe to these plain writers flights of rhetoric beyond the wildest vagaries

of Eastern imaginations.—And where, let me ask, did your correspondent obtain the novel information, that "the Jews who lived in the time when the Pentateuch was written, were not themselves deceived by the language of their sacred writers," and that "it was left for Christians in the 19th century to add to the Mosaic history miracle upon miracle"? Let him read Psalm cv. and cvi., and he will find that so early at least as the time of David these narratives were understood according to their obvious meaning. What, indeed, was the ground of that inordinate spiritual pride for which the Jews were so remarkable, but the fond belief which they cherished, that they were the favourite people of God, and that his partiality for them had been manifested by "signs" and "wonders" wrought in their behalf?

With respect to those quotations from the prophecies of the Old Testament which so frequently meet us in the New, the doctrine of those who consider them as merely intended to shew a casual coincidence of circumstances has always appeared to me no better than a miserable shift to get rid of an insurmountable difficulty. To every one not biassed by a system, the language used in these quotations plainly imports that the passages quoted were *bonâ fide* predictions of the events to which they are applied. To say that the authors meant no such thing, is not only to wrest plain language from its plain meaning, but to impute to them *a solemn trifling* altogether unworthy the historians of a divine revelation. Prophecy, I again contend, constitutes the very foundation of the Christian religion. It is not a mere appendage which may be dispensed with, if found cumbersome, but the basis on which the whole safety of the superstructure depends: for it is not only referred to in a few passages here and there, but implied in the very nature of that office or character in which Jesus is industriously held forth in the New Testament. Whatever embarrassment, therefore, the subject may occasion, the ground of prophecy must not be deserted by those who would uphold the divine authority of the Christian religion.

That your correspondent may no longer be at a loss in what light to

regard the querist, and avoid in future the additional inconsistency of rating me as a bigot in one sentence, while in the next he suspects me for an infidel, I beg leave to change my former signature for that of

A CONSISTENT SCEPTIC.

A "Long-Lost Truth."

LETTER I.

SIR, Sept. 25, 1825.

SIR ISAAC NEWTON somewhere speaks of "a long-lost truth in religion." This has been supposed to relate to the doctrine of the simple unity of the Deity; a sentiment which it is believed he had espoused. But there may be more "long-lost truths" in religion than *one*; and if with regard to one of its grand and leading motives, the doctrine of *Future Punishment*, we may, from prejudice or inadvertency, have adopted crude and indigested notions, it behoves us, in a case of such manifest importance, "to examine ourselves and prove our own work," both for our own sakes and to enable us to withstand the attacks of scoffers and gainsayers in this sceptical and inquiring age. All sane and serious persons agree that our reasoning faculties are to be employed in investigating the *evidences* of revelation, but there are many pious men doubtful as to the extent or application of this rule to some of its peculiar *doctrines*, and there are others who directly oppose it. Reason, say they, is the handmaid to conduct us to the porch of the sacred temple, and then she is to retire: as though the Almighty had given us one law in our minds and a contrary one in his written word, furnished us with a great light on purpose that we should put it out, or required us to divest ourselves of reason, in order to be filled with faith. But where will they find this line of distinction in *the Bible*? Certainly our Lord never intended it, when he severely rebukes his disciples as "without understanding," and not able "of themselves to judge what was right;" nor St Paul when, treating on the subject before us, he says, "We are made manifest to God, and we trust also in your consciences." To this omission, as it should seem, is in a great measure owing the multiplicity of religious errors that hath

overspread the world, darkened the fair face of nature, and rendered man an enemy to man. If you object that Reason is corrupt and degenerate, then you are under the greater obligation to strive to rectify it, by making use, under Providence, of *the remnant* of this valuable gift; even as a convalescent, though he cannot walk like a man in health, yet endeavours to do it, and exerts the same muscles and organs for that purpose.

But the Royal Preacher hath given us the proper definition of Reason in the exercise of its proper functions, which is the pursuit and acquisition of *truth*. "The spirit of a man is the candle of the Lord, searching all the inward parts of the belly:" or, to accommodate the sentiment to the fastidiousness of modern taste, "The human understanding is a ray of divine illumination, searching or examining all the parts of the inward man"—his nature, his duty, his present interest and future expectations; that is, Reason consists in acts of the understanding *put to the right use*; and it is well observed by two men, (in the general strain and current of their writings themselves scarcely uninspired,) that "the rule and measure of duty in moral agents is their *knowledge*, and the rule and measure of their knowledge is their own *capacity* and their *means of discovery*."*

"For, what is Reason? Be she thus defined,
Reason is upright stature in the soul:
Reason pursued is faith, and unpursued,
Where proof invites, 'tis Reason then no more.
A God is nought, but Reason infinite!"†

We are not, therefore, justly chargeable with arrogance, as presumptuously "laying hold on the ark of God," or attempting to explore the hidden mysteries of his future kingdom, when with humble and cautious step we trace the line which Reason and Revelation point out in the prosecution of this great and important inquiry, when we proceed according to the nature of things, and "the

analogy of the faith:"* for though "Secret things belong unto the Lord our God, yet those which are revealed belong unto us, and to our children after us, that we may keep all the words of his law."

Let us not then reject the guidance of this celestial monitor; she will check our undue curiosity and presumption; she will conduct her humble votary, though perhaps in paths new and by him untried, not only to the temple of true religion, but through all her palaces; she will accompany him in all her hallowed retreats, in the silent grove and by "the still waters" of meditation, nor ever resign her charge till she introduce him into the sacred presence of this Divinity, where he may contemplate truth itself in the abstract without fear of relapsing into *dangerous error*.

Now there appears to be no rational method of acquiring satisfactory ideas relative to many important truths not immediately obvious, but by a gradual process of the understanding, by which, from truths already known, we ascend to the knowledge of others, as far as they are knowable or comprehensible by us, and tend to assist and confirm us in the religious life. No man can mount to the top of a high tower, where he expects to meet with a beautiful and extensive prospect, without the aid of certain *steps* wisely provided for that purpose; and if, *in religion* for instance, (the reader will pardon a short digression,) if from the shortness and vanity of the present state, considered in *the abstract*, we immediately elevate our conceptions to the contemplation of that *immortal life* revealed in the gospel, as the future portion of the righteous, and not only of the faithful disciples of Christ, but also of the righteous of *every* age and of every dispensation; (which latter position, the parable of the "talents" alone, is sufficient to establish and confirm to the satisfaction of all those who, free from the trammels of system and independent of "the strife of tongues," can readily imbibe what Lord Bacon, by a singular felicity of

* Watts's "Death and Heaven," 1722.

† Young.

* Rom. xii. 6. The French Testament gives the true rendering, as above, "Selon l'analogie de la foi."

phrase, denominates "*the first flowings of the Scriptures;*") if we attempt this rapid ascent, the transition is so great, the idea so overwhelming, that we are momentarily lost and dismayed, rather than persuaded and convinced: a secret infidelity sometimes stirs within us, and for a season interrupts our tranquillity and joy. Now, in such a state of mind, a plain but pious man, "holding the root," the belief in a Supreme Being of eternal and infinite perfections, and "the branch" from the root, the divine mission of Jesus Christ, for the sake of argument, putting himself and his associates out of the question, if he take only the general history of the heathen world, or the outlines of the history of the Bible, may be naturally led to inquire whether it is reasonable to suppose that, under the jurisdiction of a Being of infinite power, wisdom and goodness, all the worthies of ancient time, or the worthies of the Old and New Testament, besides a numerous host of saints and confessors of subsequent ages, considered *merely as to their characters*, should lie down in the clods of the valley, without recovery or restitution to eternal ages; especially when he also considers the mixed state of affairs here below; the natural tendencies of things, and their frequent counteractions; "the violent perversion of justice and judgment—oppression which maketh a wise man mad;" the virtuous set in low places, and the wicked unduly exalted; together with the powers and faculties of the human mind, capable of endless improvement in knowledge, virtue and happiness, and a moral government evidently *begun*, but not consummated: in a word, whether the present vacillating and transitory scene be likely to prove the termination of the Divine plans with regard to *such characters*? And if he must upon serious reflection be persuaded that this *cannot be*, but that they should live again, then it is easy to ascend *one step* higher, and he will readily allow, without any laboured proof, that if there be a resurrection for *one*, there must be a resurrection for *all*; and then, not to enter upon the promises of Scripture, the reasoning of a great Divine may come in to his aid,

namely, that "the life of the righteous subsequent to the resurrection, cannot be conceived to be limited in duration, but upon one of three suppositions—either from their apostacy, when free from every evil, natural and moral, and under the peculiar auspices of God and the Redeemer; or, that the Almighty should destroy them when most conformed to his Divine image and likeness; or that the universe should be too narrow to contain them. The first is *a moral*, the second an *absolute impossibility*, and the last a complete and palpable absurdity."* So that, upon the supposition of any future state of happiness *at all*, it must needs be an *eternal one*, "not," indeed, "of debt, but of grace. Eternal life is the gift of God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." But, is there any process of the understanding or concatenation of ideas which will lead us to form a similar conclusion with respect to the duration of *future punishment*?—We trow not.

Having treated in some former numbers of the Repository on what may be styled the modern orthodox representation of this doctrine, namely, as a state of different degrees of suffering, but of a strictly eternal duration, and endeavoured to shew that, even in this qualified view of the subject, the arguments urged in its favour appear to be invalid and unsatisfactory, whether we reflect on the nature of sin, the nature of man, the nature of eternity, and, as far as we are able to discover them, the Divine perfections and character in a general view, and without an immediate regard to the attribute of goodness; we might now proceed to consider the subject in a direct and positive light, adverting more especially to this glorious attribute of the Deity, and to the general strain and current of Scripture, but that it may be proper to premise a few remarks on some of those leading passages which are urged on behalf of the commonly-received notions on this head; for though the Scriptures cannot be inconsistent with themselves, or with right reason, they contain, nevertheless, certain *dissonances*, or apparent incongruities, which, as they often

* Duchal.

perplex the "babes" in Christ, sometimes "casting them into an amazedness," and require even in the "strong men" a considerable degree of care and attention in order to reconcile them, so they are "*wrested*" by the sceptic, learned and unlearned, into downright absurdities and contradictions. It is one of St. Paul's spiritual paradoxes, "If any man think he knoweth *any thing*, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know." But St. John says, "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know *all things*." How easy for a towering genius, or a self-conceited *lecturer*, to represent these and similar passages in a ludicrous or contradictory point of view, which a little common sense will easily reconcile! Thus the sceptic, "speaking evil of the things which he knows not," and which, while he labours under his present state of mental occæcation, he cannot know, either in the garb of a mild and specious eloquence strives to sap the foundations of the gospel, or with his pen dipped in gall and venom, proceeds in his bold career, beguiling the hearts of the simple, and exulting in his fancied victory. But "Knowledge is easy unto him that understandeth."

Now, the chief passages of Scripture which are supposed to designate eternal punishments, are those translated by the terms *ever* and *everlasting*, particularly Matt. xxv. 46. Here, says the orthodox believer, our Lord sets himself on purpose to describe the future judgment and its awful consequences; he gives the wicked no hope beyond their final award, and employs the same terms as to the duration of the happiness of the righteous and the sufferings of the ungodly. This objection having been sufficiently handled in the Number for *December* last, (p. 719,) needs not to be enlarged upon: the terms must be considered according to *the subject* to which they are applied, and the English reader may recollect similar instances of application in his own language. "The Guardian," speaking of a great writer, says, "He may hope to be rewarded with an immortality, *much more to be desired* than that of remaining in *eternal* honour among mankind."

Here, an absolute eternity is con-

trasted with a finite one.—Dr. Young, on "the day of judgment," says,

"Rocks *eternal* pour
Their melted mass, as rivers once they
poured;
Stars rush, and *final ruin* fiercely drives
Her ploughshare o'er creation!"

Here the *eternal rocks* are converted into *a ruin*!

The parallel passage in John v. 29, as well as in ver. 27, (*κρισεως*), might have been rendered "judgment."

"We cannot determine," says Dr. Doddridge, "how far this language may be literal, and how far figurative. There seems no reason to believe that every particular word and action shall be examined in all its circumstances, witnesses heard, refuted, &c., as in human courts; for this would make the judgment-day millions of years longer than the whole period of the earth's duration; nor can we be sure that those excuses will be made as there represented. These expressions, as well as 'opening the books' in 'the Revelation,' it is probable are to be taken *figuratively*."

Moreover, it is stated by M. Petitpierre, from Grotius and Wittenbach, that the term *κολασις*, translated punishment, is peculiarly applicable to the pruning of trees; and, in a moral view, was commonly used by the Greek philosophers to denote such sufferings as were inflicted on the criminal in order to promote his future amendment.

And surely the wisdom of our Lord is here, as in all his divine teachings, abundantly manifest, in the use he has made, not of equivocal, but of *indefinite* terms; which, as Dr. Doddridge allows, as they preclude the possibility of proving strictly eternal punishments *a priori*, or previous to the event, and thus exclude absolute despair; so they are sufficiently awful and tremendous to alarm the most hardened transgressor, and to urge him to an immediate repentance and reformation.

Upon the whole, we plainly and chiefly learn from this sublime representation of the future judgment, *its certainty, its universality*, a principal *criterion* by which it is to be regulated, and the different *states or eco-*

nomies into which the righteous and the wicked shall immediately enter.

Tophet, or Gehenna. This topic has also been considered in the Number before mentioned. Calvin himself allows this allusion in a figurative sense.

"What shall it profit a man, if he should gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" Or, as in the parallel text, "lose himself and be cast away?" This, at first view, may seem to imply an absolute and strictly eternal loss. In a discussion of this kind, we cannot avoid sometimes repeating the leading arguments; and must here remind the reader, who hath had the patience to accompany the writer hitherto, of those strong hyperbolical expressions which our Lord frequently employs in inculcating religious and moral truth; such as cutting off a right hand, plucking out a right eye, hating our natural parents, and our own lives, and so on; all which, every man of plain sense knows how to *qualify* and understand without a tutor. What wonder, then, that our Saviour, in order to alarm the careless and disobedient, and fully aware of their future danger, should employ this energetic language? But let us consider *the argument* upon which this discourse is grounded. "For the Son of Man shall come," &c., "and then shall he reward every man *according to his work.*" Unless, therefore, we can prove that the wicked works of men, in their very nature, merit eternal punishment, we cannot prove it from this passage.

But, in a scriptural sense, a man may be said to "lose his soul," if he loses any *considerable part* of that genuine felicity, originally intended for him by his All-gracious Creator. An heir loses his inheritance if, on account of his ill behaviour, the time of his enjoying it be *protracted*. A rebel loses his estate by forfeiting it to his prince; but a gracious prince may *restore it* upon due submission and a return to his allegiance. So Adam lost paradise, involving both himself and his posterity in the penalty of death; but "one greater Man" hath restored him, and put all his posterity likewise in a capacity of "regaining the blissful seat." Still many will prevaricate, and fail of the

conditions; some of these, in particular and flagrant cases, our Lord says, "shall not be forgiven, neither in this world nor in the world to come." *Εν τῷ αἰῶνι μαλλόντι*—that is, in the next *aion*, age or dispensation. They will not be the happy subjects of that *first salvation*, immediately to succeed the general judgment. "Having neglected the opportunity of grace in the time of life, they must go the long and tedious round in the painful and *wilderness way*, and pay the *uttermost farthing* required in the course of strict judgment and justice, which nevertheless does not require an *infinite* from a poor *finite*, but proportions their degrees and times of suffering and purgation, according to wise and just measures, suited to this severer way and process."*

"In like manner we are to understand the case of those mentioned Hebrews vi., who having apostatized under the greatest advantages, are represented as under an *impossibility* of being restored; that is, *humanly speaking*, and by those means which they have rejected; but this excludes not their being restored in another way and course, after they have suffered the award of strict justice, and paid the debt required: and the *impossibility* here mentioned, must admit of the same reserve with that of the rich man's entering 'into the kingdom of God,' to whom 'all things are possible;' who can, if he pleases, strike in with exception to the stated rules of courses and dispensations, or appoint others for the effecting that which the former did not or could not."†

Dr. Hartley observes, that "there is nothing in all St. Paul's Epistles from whence the absolute eternity of future punishment can be at all inferred, except the passage 'everlasting destruction,' which, according to the original indefinite signification of similar terms, should be taken in a qualified sense. Nor in St. Luke's Gospel, or in his 'Acts,' in St. John's Gospel, or in his Epistles, or in those of St. James, Peter and Jude. Nor does it appear from the works of the most ancient Fathers, that they

* Roach's Messiah Triumphant, 1724.

† Ibid.

put such a construction upon these terms, and the omission of the doctrine in the ancient *creeds*, shews that it was no *original* doctrine, or not thought *essential*; and, indeed, the Romish doctrine of *purgatory* seems to be the corruption of a genuine doctrine, held by the ancient Fathers concerning a *purifying fire*.*

Many passages in the "Revelation" are now considered, by the best interpreters, as referring to the concerns of the church in the present world, though others doubtless relate to futurity; and we are as yet far from a comprehensive knowledge of this wonderful book. One passage requires consideration, ch. xxii. 11. This can be nothing more than a *solemn warning* at the close, as if the angelic messenger had said—If, after all the extraordinary revelations unfolded to you, and which you are "not to seal up," but to communicate to the world, any should still remain unpersuaded and unconvinced, there is no further *present* remedy at hand; obstinate transgressors must remain under the effects of their own wilful ignorance and blindness, and await the awful consequences. But "he that is righteous let him be righteous still:" the true believer can have now no reason to repent of his choice; he is delivered from all the permanent effects of the original curse; for behold, saith the Judge, "I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to give to every man according as his work shall be."

There is *one* other text strangely introduced upon this occasion, the handling of which, by the obscure author just quoted, is so peculiarly appropriate, that there needs no apology for inserting it; and the severest critics admit of occasional quotations, provided they fit the place. Some conclude the state of the damned to be eternal, from these words of Solomon, Eccles. xi. 3: "In the place where the tree falleth there it shall be." These must first prove that he is here speaking of the state of departed souls; the contrary of which rather appears from the context and the design of the Preacher. He is recommending charity, or *alms-giving*, which he illustrates by *three similes*, running

parallel to each other, and expressing the terms *à quo* and *ad quem*, or the giver and the receiver; the uncertainty of the giver, whether the object of his charity be deserving or not, and yet its being accepted of God, and engaging for a return of the blessing. The first simile is of "bread cast upon the waters," or among a multitude of people in general; the second, of "clouds full of rain, and emptying themselves upon the earth;" the third, of "a tree laden with good fruit" and "falling" for relief of the needy, "either to the north or to the south," whether to objects really deserving the charity or not. Now, each of these *similes* has the same terms and reward; in each is represented the good intent of the giver, the duty performed, *the charity* reaching its term or object, and the return of blessing to be expected. And here, to break the natural and easy *parallelism* and make the *north* and the *south* to signify the different states after this life, because an argument might thence be drawn for doing good while we have opportunity, appears to be forced and abrupt, and contrary to the present design of the wise Preacher. It should be added, in confirmation of what has been said of "the tree falling" being a *third* simile, used in the same manner and to the same intent as the former, that it is introduced in the same form and connected by the same particle, "*if* the clouds be full," &c., and "*if* the tree fall," &c.

"However, let it be granted, for argument's sake, according to the other interpretation, that 'as the tree falls so it lies;' or, that into whatever state the soul enters after death, *there it continues*; it will by no means hence follow, that it must continue there *for ever*, in a strict sense; or that the Preacher here undertakes to determine the point *how long* it is to continue, it being enough for the argument thence to be drawn, that the soul has *then no present opportunity* of exercising this grace, but is gone into the state of receiving the award of its merits or demerits, without regard to the *duration* or *degree* of punishment in the latter. But as 'a tree falling' has *no power to raise itself*, yet, if an *artist*, a carpenter, shall raise it, it may be prepared, fitted and adapted into a building, or serve to other good uses;

* Hartley on Man, Vol. II. 430, &c. Ed. 1749.

sq, a soul fallen into a state of suffering, awarded by the justice of God, though it may have no power to raise itself, yet, as the mercy of God and the power of grace shall be extended to it, it may be raised, prepared and adapted into the temple building of God, and become a member of the church or body of Christ."

"Nor, lastly, is it to be supposed that Solomon, with all his wisdom, should possess the knowledge of the secret decree of God, concerning the utmost latitude of grace, he being but under the law; and such a manifestation rather belonging to the dispensation of the gospel in full, as the due time for its testification." *

Thus much shall suffice, in reference to some passages of Scripture, which are urged in support of the commonly-received doctrine; and the sum appears to be this,—that as the Bible contains simple truisms, which are always the same, without any revelation at all, and likewise abstract propositions or new truths, which, nevertheless, when made known and understood, are perfectly agreeable to Reason, and readily embraced by the reflecting mind; so, (as it was written in ancient times and ancient tongues, by men in peculiar circumstances, and who, though perspicuous enough in all things necessary and important, yet, conscious of their own integrity, did not always attend to those niceties and distinctions of language which prevail in modern times,) the same Bible also contains many passages, the true import of which can only be discovered by studying them under the influence of these principles. In a word, that the letter must in many instances yield to the spirit, or that the Scriptures should always be interpreted in a rational sense.

AN OCCASIONAL READER.

The Well of Down, in Donegall, Ireland.

[From No. IV. of "The Church of Ireland Magazine."]

IMMEDIATELY under the rock is the Well of Down, as remarkable in the religious, as the other is in the military annals of the country. Some

pilgrims were going round the well on their naked knees, in the midst of the miry puddle, while we were there; but there are certain station days, on which the crowds resorting to this place are enormous. Here the sick and the healthy flock together—the sick to procure health, the sound to procure grace. The water not only cures complaints, but it procures marriages; and it is ascertained, that after these stations weddings are very rife, and therefore the young and the healthy, the gay and the well-dressed, resort hither. It really is a very merry business, and as much carnality is mixed up here with the religious devotions and prepossessions of the people, as is usual with the followers of the Church of Rome in all quarters of the world. Of course every one speaks good words of the well of Down; it cures the faithful of their complaints, and the faithless of their infidelity. A striking instance of this was told me by an O'Donnel, who spoke with all sober seriousness, and whose veracity must be unimpeachable, as he said he was descended from one of the great O'Donnells; and if he had not the valour and ferocity of his ancestors, he had a full share of their superstition. "Sir," said he, "the black-mouthed Presbyterians there below on the Lennan, are forced to confess and believe in the wonders of this well. Not long ago a bitter psalm-singing Presbyterian, who farms part of the townland of Drumgarton, his name is John M'Clure, he used to laugh at us Catholics as we passed him by, going to this blessed spot—Oh! it would make your flesh creep to hear all he said, turning the sacred well into game; but one spring, just as we were going to labour the ground for the barley, his horses took the mange, and they got so lean that they were dropping off their standing; they could not plough his field, they were unable to crawl to the bog to bring home a creel of turf, he tried brimstone with them, but it did not do; all the tobacco-water, and sulphur in Derry had no effect; so, says he, half joke half earnest, to his neighbour Jerry M'Swine, I'll go to the Well of Down and wash my horses with your holy water, and who knows but the Saint will cure a Presbyterian's horse as well as a Catholic's cow.

* Roach.

So off set he with his horses, and he brings a pail with him to lift the water, and when he came near the well, as he could not lead his horses close to it by reason of the bog, he tied the cattle to a stone, and down he went to fetch the water, and raising it with his pail, off he set to pour it over his horses. But, my dear honey, he had not gone ten steps from the well, when the pail, as if it had no bottom at all, let out all the water; back he goes again, but not better was his bad luck; he might have been lifting the water until Lady-Day and yet not one drop of the blessed liquid would the heretic be permitted to carry; it stole out of the pail as it would out of a sieve: at length a sudden dimness came over the man's eyes, and it would make you laugh to see Johnny M'Clure wandering about the bog as blind as a beetle, tumbling into the bog holes, rolling and weltering in the mud. At length fear came on the man, and the grace of God gave him a good thought, and he vowed to the blessed Virgin Mary and all the Saints, that if he recovered his sight he would go to mass next Sunday. The moment he said this he saw his eyesight come; up he bounced, ran to the blessed well and took a hearty drink, and he became as good a Catholic and as happy a man as ever you saw; immediately he took up the pail, lifted it full of water, which the pail now carried as staunch as need be, and a Catholic neighbour making the sign of the cross while he washed them with the water, in a hand's turn (as I may say) they became as clean and sound as a trout, and Jack M'Clure went home, his horses cured, and he a good Catholic, which he remained to his dying day."

This story Barney O'Donnel told with all the expression of perfect faith; I verily consider that he believed all he narrated. This well has another excellent effect—the good housewives of the district use it as a certain alexipharmick against infidelity in their husbands; nothing need be done but to keep a bottle of it well corked under the bed's-head, and the good man of the house remains as he should be, true and faithful. A valuable well it must be, and highly to be prized this anti-jealousy water. I was

told even of Protestant ladies who placed full reliance in this simple remedy. What a pity it is not known beyond this little district; the blessed water keeps well; emblematic of the purity it provides for, it is incapable of corruption—it might be sent to all parts of the world—to London, to Paris.

Islington,
Nov. 5, 1825.

SIR,

AN anonymous correspondent wishes me to inform him, through the medium of the Monthly Repository, in what part of Shakspeare's writings I obtained that "beautiful quotation," prefixed by way of motto to the *Sermon on the Education of the Poor*, inserted in my volume of *Tracts* recently published. The lines are thus found in the second part of *Henry the Sixth*, act 4th, scene 7th:

—Seeing Ignorance is the curse of God,
Knowledge the wing wherewith we fly to
heaven!

Capel Loft, in his *Aphorisms* of Shakspeare, attaches to this passage a sentence from *Theognis*, of Megara, a Grecian poet, who lived about 500 years before Christ, in which a similar sentiment is recognized. This heathen bard was remarkable for the purity of his strains; and Dr. Priestley, I recollect, makes use of him in his admirable work on *the Comparison between Socrates and Jesus Christ*. Shakspeare, according to his contemporary, Ben Johnson, had "small Latin and less Greek," yet he may have had sufficient knowledge of the latter language to have read *Theognis*, or he may have become acquainted with him through the medium of translation. But no more on this subject, having touched upon it many years ago in my *Memoir of Shakspeare*, prefixed to my *Illustration of his Seven Ages*, drawn up for the use of the rising generation. After all, in my humble opinion, the sentiment spontaneously emanated from the mind of our great bard, who "was not of an age, but born for all time," so transcendantly gifted by nature, that, as Pope expresses it, he was the organ through which he proclaimed herself to latest posterity! Happily the motto contains a momentous truth, of the importance of which

the present age are apprized, by the establishment of schools, institutes, and even a new University, from which we augur well the accelerated amelioration of the world. The "curse" is avoided whilst *all classes*, pressing forward with avidity, are anxious to seize the "wing by which we fly to heaven."

J. EVANS.

Memoirs of Samuel Pepys, Esq.

(Continued from p. 527.)

A FRIEND complained to Pepys "of the lewdness and beggary of the Court," and his own description shews the complaint was not groundless: "1661, August 31st. At Court things are in very ill condition, there being so much emulation, poverty and the vices of drinking, swearing and loose amours, that I know not what will be the end of it but confusion. And the clergy so high that all people that I meet with do protest against their practice. In short, I see no content or satisfaction any where, in any one sort of people. The Benevolence" (a voluntary contribution to Charles's necessities, something like a *forced loan*) "proves so little, and an occasion of so much discontent every where, that it had better it had never been set up. I think to subscribe £20. We are at our office quiet, only for lack of money all things go to rack. Our very bills offered to be sold upon the Exchange at 10 per cent loss. We are upon getting Sir R. Ford's house added to our office. But I see so many difficulties will follow in pleasing of one another in dividing it, and in becoming bound personally to pay the rent of £200 per annum, that I do believe it will yet scarce come to pass. The season very sickly every where of strange and fatal fevers." I. 115, 116.

Presbyterianism was so far from being banished, that on Sept. 3rd of this year, (1661,) Pepys complains that at the christening of "my Lady's child" by the parson of the parish, *the sign of the cross was not used*, "to his and all their trouble."

Our play-goer sets down, Sept. 7, his going to see Ben Jonson's comedy of "Bartholomew Fayre" which had not been acted these forty years, add-

ing "it being so satirical against Puritanism, they durst not till now, which is strange they should already dare to do it, and the King do countenance it." I. 117.

Relating, Sept. 30th, that "Sir Henry Vane, Lambert and others are lately sent away from the Tower, prisoners to Scilly," he says he does not think there was any plot but only a *pretence*. I. 122. This "pretence," however, he seems to justify on another occasion.

"Dec. 1st. There hath lately been great clapping up of some old statesmen, such as Ireton, Moyer,* and others, and they say upon a great plot, but I believe no such thing; but it is but justice that they should be served as they served the poor Cavaliers, and I believe it will oftentimes be so as long as they live, whether there be cause or no." I. 124.

Pepys was not an indiscriminate admirer of the clergy, least of all of "the old clergy;" for example, "Nov. 17th. To Church; and heard a simple fellow upon the praise of church musique," (yet Pepys was musical,) "and exclaiming against men's wearing their hats on in the Church" (another vestige of Presbyterianism). I. 123.

He gives an account (I. 134) of a pulpit droll:

"1662, Mar. 7th. Early to White-Hall to the Chapel, where by Mr. Blagrove's means I got into his pew, and heard Dr. Creeton," (Creighton,) "the great Scotchman and Chaplain in ordinary to the King, preach before the King, and Duke and Duchesse, upon the words of Micah, 'Roule yourselves in dust.' He made a most learned sermon upon the words; but in his application the most comical man that ever I heard in my life. Just such a man as Hugh Peters; saying that it had been better for the poor Cavalier never to have come with the King into England again; for he that hath the impudence to deny obedience to the lawful magistrate, and to swear to the oath of allegiance, &c., was better treated now-a-days in Newgate, than a poor Royalist, that

* "Samuel Moyer, one of the Council of State, 1653."

hath suffered all his life for the King, is at White-Hall among his friends."

Another notable renegade is introduced (*ib.*), viz. Sir G. Downing, whose baseness is not spared:

"Mar. 12th. This morning we had news from Mr. Coventry, that Sir G. Downing* (like a perfidious rogue, though the action is good and of service to the King, yet he cannot with a good conscience do it) hath taken Okey, Corbet and Barkestead, at Delfe, in Holland, and sent them home in the Blackmore. Sir W. Pen, talking to me this afternoon of what a strange thing it is for Downing to do this, he told me of a speech he made to the Lords States of Holland, telling them to their faces that he observed that he was not received with the respect and the observance now, that he was when he came from the traitor and rebel Cromwell; by whom, I am sure, he hath got all he hath in the world—and they know it too."

"17th. Last night the Blackmore Pinke brought the three prisoners Barkestead, Okey and Corbet, to the Tower, being taken at Delfe, in Holland; where, the Captain tells me, the Dutch were a good while before they could be persuaded to let them go, they being taken prisoners in their land. But Sir G. Downing would not be answered so—though all the world takes notice of him for a most ungratefull villaine for his paines." I. 135.

These, like most of the King's Judges, died with stout hearts:

"April 19th. This morning, before we sat, I went to Aldgate, and at the corner shop, a draper's, I stood and did see Barkestead, Okey and Corbet drawne towards the gallows at Tiburne, and there they were hanged and quartered. They all looked very cheerful; but I hear they all die defending what they did to the King to be just, which is very strange." I. 137.

A picture of the public mind is exhibited, I. 141.

"May 15th. At night all the bells of the towne rang and bonfires made for the joy of the Queene's arrival, who landed at Portsmouth last night.

* "According to Hume, Downing had once been Chaplain to Okey's Regiment."

But I do not see much true joy, but only an indifferent one in the hearts of people, who are much discontented at the pride and luxury of the Court, and running in debt."

We have mention, I. 144, for the first time, of the "Act of Uniformity:"

"May 31st. The Act for Uniformity is lately printed, which it is thought will make mad work among the Presbyterian ministers. People of all sides are very much discontented, some thinking themselves used, contrary to promise, too hardly, and the other that they are not rewarded so much as they expected by the King."

Pepys witnessed the murder (for so we must call it) of Sir Henry Vane, which he thus describes:

"June 14th. About eleven o'clock, having a room got ready for us, we all went out to the Tower Hill, and there over against the scaffold, made on purpose this day, saw Sir Henry Vane brought. A very great press of people. He made a long speech, many times interrupted by the Sheriffe and others there; and they would have taken his paper out of his hand, but he would not let it go. But they caused the books of all those that writ after him to be given the Sheriffe, and the trumpets were brought under the scaffold that he might not be heard. Then he prayed and so fitted himself and received the blow, but the scaffold was so crowded that we could not see it done. But Boreman, who had been upon the scaffold, told us that first he began to speak of the irregular proceeding against him; that he was, against Magna Charta, denied to have his exceptions against the indictment allowed, and that there he was stopped by the Sheriffe. Then he drew out his paper of notes, and begun to tell them first his life; that he was born a gentleman; he had been till he was seventeen years old a good fellow, but then it pleased God to lay a foundation of grace in his heart, by which he was persuaded against his worldly interest, to leave all preferment and go abroad, where he might serve God with more freedom. Then he was called home and made a member of the Long Parliament, where he never did to this day any thing against his conscience, but all for the glory of God. Here he would have given them an account of

the proceedings of the Long Parliament, but they so often interrupted him, that at last he was forced to give over, and so fell into prayer for England in general, then for the churches in England, and then for the city of London: and so fitted himself for the block, and received the blow. He had a blister, or issue upon his neck, which he desired them not to hurt: he changed not his colour or speech to the last, but died justifying himself and the cause he had stood for, and spoke very confidently of his being presently at the right hand of Christ; and in all things appeared the most resolved man that ever died in that manner, and shewed more of heate than cowardice, but yet with all humility and gravity. One asked him why he did not pray for the King? He answered, 'You shall see I can pray for the King: I pray God bless him!' The King had given his body to his friends; and, therefore, he told them that he hoped they would be civil to his body when dead, and desired they would let him die like a gentleman and a Christian, and not crowded and pressed as he was." I. 146.

He afterwards twice adverts to the courage of this political martyr in the article of death, which he says was talked of by the people "as a miracle," but which some of the sycophants of the Court affected to question. The wanton cruelty of Charles's government in this instance made a deep impression upon the nation: Pepys says, "June 22, Coming home to night I met with Will. Swann, who do talk as high for the Fanatiques as ever he did in his life, and do pity my Lord Sandwich and me that we should be given up to the wickedness of the world, and that a fall is coming upon us all; for he finds that he and his company are the true spirit of the nation, and the greater part of the nation too, who will have liberty of conscience in spite of this 'Act of Uniformity,' or they will die; and if they may not preach abroad they will preach in their own houses. He told me that certainly Sir H. Vane must be gone to heaven, for he died as much a martyr and saint as ever man did; and that the King hath lost more by that man's death, than he will get again a good while. At all which I

know not what to think, but I confess I do think that the Bishops will never be able to carry it so high as they do." I. 149.

This *Will. Swann* is a stranger to us; the Diarist speaks of him afterwards with some contempt.

A few days afterwards he sums up the political state of the country, not very creditably to the King and Court:

"End of June. Observations. This I take to be as bad a juncture as ever I observed. The King and his new Queene minding their pleasures at Hampton Court. All people discontented; some that the King do not gratify them enough, and the others, Fanatiques of all sorts, that the King do take away their liberty of conscience, and the height of the Bishops, who I fear will ruin all again. They do much cry up the manner of Sir H. Vane's death, and he deserves it. Much clamour against the chimney money, and the people say they will not pay it without force. And in the mean time, like to have war abroad, and Portugal to assist, when we have not money to pay for any ordinary layings out at home." I. 151.

Some of the Nonconformist ministers are introduced, I. 157, in an anticipation of St. Bartholomew Day:

"Aug. 10. I walked to St. Dunstan's, the Church being now finished, and here I heard Dr. Bates, who made a most eloquent sermon; and I am sorry I have hitherto had so low an opinion of the man, for I have not heard a neater sermon a great while, and more to my content. My Uncle Fenner told me the new service booke (which is now lately come forth) was laid upon the desk at St. Sepulchre's for Mr. George to read; but he laid it aside and would not meddle with it; and I perceive the Presbyters do all prepare to give over all against Bartholomew-tide. Mr. Herring, being lately turned out at St. Bride's, did read the Psalm to the people while they sung at Dr. Bates's, which methought is a strange turn. After dinner to St. Bride's, and there heard one Carpenter, an old man, who they say hath been a Jesuite Priest, and is come over to us, but he preached very well. Mr. Calamy hath taken his farewell this day of his people, and others will do so the next Sunday."

The description of "the last Sun-

day of the Presbyterians" is interesting. Dr. Bates occupies the place in it which we should have assigned to him.

"Aug. 17th. This being the last Sunday that the Presbyterians are to preach, unless they read the new Common Prayer and renounce the covenant; I had a mind to hear Dr. Bates's farewell sermon, and walked to St. Dunstan's, where, it not being seven o'clock yet, the doors were not open; and so I walked an hour in the Temple Garden. At eight o'clock I went, and crowded in at a back door among others, the church being half full almost before any doors were open publicly, and so got into the gallery, beside the pulpit, and heard very well. His text was, 'Now the God of Peace —;' the last Hebrews and the 20th verse: he making a very good sermon, and very little reflections in it to any thing of the times. To Madam Turner's, and dined with her. She had heard Parson Herring take his leave; though he, by reading so much of the Common Prayer as he did, hath cast himself out of the good opinion of both sides. After dinner to St. Dunstan's again; and the Church quite crowded before I come, which was just at one o'clock; but I got into the gallery again, but stood in a crowd. He* pursued his text again very well, and only at the conclusion told us after this manner: 'I do believe that many of you do expect that I should say something to you in reference to the time, this being the last time that possibly I may appear here. You know it is not my manner to speak any thing in the pulpit that is extraneous to my text and business; yet this I shall say that it is not my opinion, fashion, or humour, that keeps me from complying with what is required of us, but something after much prayer, discourse and study yet remains unsatisfied, and commands me herein. Wherefore if it is my unhappiness not to receive such an illumination as should direct me to do otherwise, I know no reason why men should not pardon me in this world, as I am confident that God will pardon me for it in the next.' And so he concluded. Parson Herring read a

* Dr. Bates.

Psalm and chapters before sermon; and one was the chapter in the Acts, where the story of Ananias and Sapphira is. And after he had done, says he, 'This is just the case of England at present. God he bids us to preach, and men bid us not to preach; and if we do, we are to be imprisoned and further punished. All that I can say to it is, that I beg your prayers, and the prayers of all good Christians, for us.' This was all the exposition he made of the chapter in these very words, and no more. I was much pleased with Bates's manner of bringing in the Lord's Prayer after his owne; thus, "In whose comprehensive words we sum up all our imperfect desires; saying, 'Our Father,' &c. I hear most of the Presbyters took their leaves to day, and that the city is much dissatisfied with it. I pray God keep peace among men in their rooms, or else all will fly a-pieces; for bad ones will not go down with the city." I. 159.

Sept. 3, Pepys was told that it was fully resolved in Council that an indulgence should be granted the Presbyters, but this resolve was turned by a speech of the Bishop of London's (Sheldon's). Monk opposed him, but "only in appearance." I. 162.

At the end of September, he says the Presbyterian Clergy were gone out very peaceably, and "the people not so much concerned therein as was expected." Yet by the middle of next month, I. 171, he acknowledges "every body's spirit very full of trouble."

Oct. 5th he went to Church, and remarks, "this day the parson has got one to read with a surplice on; I suppose himself will take it up hereafter, for a cunning fellow he is as any of his coate." I. 168.

He records, Oct. 29, the opinion of Sir G. Carteret that the people that were "clapped up" whose examination he had attended, had not been such great plotters as charged, "so poor and silly and low." I. 174.

On the 31st "all the prisons in towne were full of ordinary people, taken from their meeting-places last Sunday."

Nov. 30, (I. 183,) he allows "public matters in an ill condition"—"that which troubles most is the Clergy, which will never content the city,

which is not to be reconciled to bishops."

Dec. 25th, (I. 188,) he heard Bishop Morley reprehend excess in games, &c., and "they all laughed in the Chapel." The Bishop pressed hospitality and one that stood by whispered in P.'s ear that he do not spend one groat to the poor himself.

Pepys pretended to no Spartan virtue. He says, 1663, April 17, I. 212, after relating that it being Good Friday his dinner was only sugar sopps and fish—the only time they had a Lenten dinner all this Lent—that Good Friday as it was he went to Paul's Churchyard to cause the title of his English "*Mare Clausum*" to be changed, and the new title dedicated to the King, to be put to it because ashamed to have the other seen dedicated to the Commonwealth.

1663, May 29, a holyday—he called at several churches and witnessed the ill temper of the city at this time either to religion in general or to the King; that in some churches there was hardly ten people and those poor people.

The next entry shews us a high churchman beginning anew his vocation: "1663, Aug. 9. To church and heard Mr. Milles (who is lately returned out of the country, and it seems was fetched in by many of the parishioners with great state) preach upon the authority of the ministers, upon these words, 'We are therefore ambassadors of Christ.' Wherein, among other high expressions, he said, that such a learned man used to say, that if a minister of the word and an angel should meet him together, he would salute the minister first; which methought was a little too high. This day I begun to make use of the silver pen (Mr. Coventry did give me) in writing of this sermon, taking only the heads of it in Latin, which I shall, I think, continue to do." I. 245.

— Nov. 8, he gravely and with no little vanity remarks, that at church he found his coming in a periwig did not prove so strange as he feared, for he thought that all the church would have presently cast their eyes all upon him. I. 259. (He had recorded on the 30th ult. that two periwigs cost him, one £3, the other 40s.)

— Nov. 9. Pepys held conversations with Pierce, a surgeon, about

the looseness of the Court, and the shameless debaucheries of the King, and with Mr. Blackburne, as follows:

"Mr. Blackburne and I fell to talk of many things, wherein he was very open to me: first, in that of religion, he makes it greater matter of prudence for the King and Council to suffer liberty of conscience; and imputes the loss of Hungary to the Turke from the Emperor's denying them this liberty of their religion. He says that many pious ministers of the word of God, some thousands of them, do now beg their bread: and told me how highly the present clergy carry themselves every where, so as that they are hated and laughed at by every body; among other things, for their excommunications, which they send upon the least occasions almost that can be. And I am convinced in my judgment, not only from his discourse, but my thoughts in general, that the present clergy will never heartily go down with the generality of the commons of England; they have been so used to liberty and freedom, and they are so acquainted with the pride and debauchery of the present clergy. He did give me many stories of the affronts which the clergy received in all places of England from the gentry and ordinary persons of the parish. He do tell me what the city thinks of General Monk, as of a most perfidious man, that hath betrayed every body, and the King also; who, as he thinks, and his party, and so I have heard other good friends of the King say, it might have been better for the King to have had his hands a little bound for the present, than be forced to bring such a crew of poor people about him, and be liable to satisfy the demands of every one of them. He told me that to his knowledge, (being present at every meeting at the Treaty at the Isle of Wight,) that the old King did confess himself over-ruled and convinced in his judgment against the Bishoppes, and would have suffered, and did agree to exclude the service out of the churches, nay, his own chapell; and that he did always say, that this he did not by force, for that he would never abate one inch by any violence; but what he did was out of his reason and judgment. He tells me that the King by name, with all his dignities, is prayed for by them,

that they call Fanatiques, as heartily and powerfully as in any of the other churches that are thought better; and that, let the King think what he will, it is them that must help him in the day of warr. For so generally they are the most substantiall sort of people, and the soberest; and did desire me to observe it to my Lord Sandwich, among other things, that of all the old army now you cannot see a man begging about the streets; but what? You shall have this captain turned a shoemaker; the lieutenant, a baker; this a brewer; that a haberdasher; this common soldier, a porter; and every man in his apron and frock, &c., as if they had never done any thing else: whereas the other go with their belts and swords, swearing and cursing and stealing; running into people's houses, by force oftentimes, to carry away something; and this is the difference between the temper of one and the other; and concludes, (and I think with some reason,) that the spirits of the old Parliament soldiers are so quiet and contented with God's providences, that the King is safer from any evil meant him by them one thousand times more than from his own discontented Cavalier. And then to the public management of business: it is done, as he observes, so loosely and so carelessly, that the kingdom can never be happy with it, every man looking after himself, and his own lust and luxury; and that half of what money the Parliament gives the King is not so much as gathered. And to the purpose he told me how the Bellamys (who had some of the Northern counties assigned them for their debt for the petty warrant victualling) have often complained to him that they cannot get it collected, for that nobody minds, or if they do, they won't pay it in. Whereas (which is a very remarkable thing) he hath been told by some of the treasurers at warr here of late, to whom the most of the £120,000 monthly was paid, that for most months the payments were gathered so duly, that they seldom had so much or more than 40s. or the like, short in the whole collection; whereas now the very commissioners for assessments and other public payments are such persons, and those that they choose in the country so like themselves, that

from top to bottom there is not a man carefull of any thing, or if he be, is not solvent; that what between the beggar and the knave, the King is abused the best part of all his revenue. We then talked of the navy, and of Sir W. Pen's rise to be a general. He told me he was always a conceited man, and one that would put the best side outward, but that it was his pretence of sanctity that brought him into play. Lawson and Portman, and the fifth-monarchy men, among whom he was a great brother, importuned that he might be general; and it was pleasant to see how Blackburne himself did act it, how when the commissioners of the admiralty would enquire of the captains and admirals of such and such men, how they would with a sigh and casting up the eyes, say, 'Such a man fears the Lord,' or 'I hope such a man hath the Spirit of God.' But he tells me that there was a cruel articing against Pen after one fight, for cowardice, in putting himself within a coyle of cables, of which he had much ado to acquit himself; and by great friends did it, not without remains of guilt, but that his brethren had a mind to pass it by, and Sir H. Vane did advise him to search his heart, and see whether this fault or a greater sin was not the occasion of this so great tryall. And he tells me, that what Pen gives out about Cromwell's sending and entreating him to go to Jamaica, is very false; he knows the contrary: besides the Protector never was a man that needed to send for any man, specially such a man as he, twice. He tells me that the business of Jamaica did miscarry absolutely by his pride, and that when he was in the Tower he would cry like a child. And that just upon the turne, when Monk was come from the North to the city, and did begin to think of bringing in the King, Pen was then turned Quaker. That Lawson was never counted any thing but only a seaman, and a stout man, but a false man, and that now he appears the greatest hypocrite in the world; and Pen the same. He tells me that it is much talked of that the King intends to legitimate the Duke of Monmouth; and that neither he, nor his friends of his persuasion, have any hopes of getting their consciences at liberty but by God Almighty's turning

of the King's heart, which they expect, and are resolved to live and die in quiet hopes of it; but never to repine, or act any thing more than by prayers towards it. And that not only himself but all of them have, and are willing at any time to take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy. Mr. Blackburne observed further to me, some certain notice that he had of the present plot so much talked of; that he was told by Mr. Rushworth,* how one Captain Oates,† a great discoverer, did employ several to bring and seduce others into a plot, and that one of his agents met with one that would not listen to him, nor conceal what he had offered him, but so detected the trapan. He also did much insist upon the cowardice and corruption of the King's guards and militia." I. 260—263.

1663, 4, January 4. Pepys went to see the King play at Tennis, and observes, "but to see how the King's play was extolled without any cause at all, was a loathsome sight—such open flattery is beastly." I. 272.

Pepys gives the following account of a popular Court preacher, I. 288: "1664, March 25th. To White-Hall, and there to chapel; where it was most infinite full to hear Dr. Critton.‡ The Doctor preached upon the thirty-first of Jeremy, and the twenty-first and twenty-second verses, about a woman compassing a man; meaning the Virgin conceiving and bearing our Saviour. It was the worst sermon I ever heard him make, I must confess; and yet it was good, and in two places very bitter, advising the King to do as the Emperor Severus did, to hang up a Presbyter John (a short coat and a longe gowne interchangeably) in all the courts of England. But the story of Severus was pretty, that he hanged up forty Senators before the Senate House, and then made a speech presently to the Senate in praise of his own lenity; and then decreed that never any Senator after that time should suffer in the same manner without consent of the Senate: which he compared to the proceeding of the

Long Parliament against my Lord Strafford. He said the greatest part of the lay magistrates in England were Puritans, and would not do justice; and the Bishops' powers were so taken away and lessened, that they could not exercise the power they ought. He told the King and the ladies, plainly speaking of death and of the skulls and bones of dead men and women, how there is no difference; that nobody could tell that of the great Marius or Alexander from a pyoneer; nor, for all the pains the ladies take with their faces, he that should look in a charnel-house could not distinguish which was Cleopatra's, or fair Rosamond's, or Jane Shore's."

May 31st, (I. 296,) Pepys was told that upon Sunday night last being the King's birth-day, the King was at my Lady Castlemaine's lodgings, dancing with fiddlers all night almost, and all the world coming by, taking notice of it.

"June 6, a great dinner and good company at the Trinity House, where Mr. Prin, who would not drink any health, no, not the King's, but sat down with his hat on all the while; but nobody took notice of it to him at all."

Aug. 4, (I. 308, 9,) seeing several poor creatures carried by, by constables, for being at a conventicle, he remarks, "They go like lambs without any resistance. I would to God they would either conform or be more wise and not be caught!"

Pepys again fell in with Jere. White, from whom he learned some particulars of Richard Cromwell and also of Oliver: "1664, October 13th. In my way to Brampton, in this day's journey, I met with Mr. White, Cromwell's chaplin that was, and had a great deal of discourse with him. Among others, he tells me that Richard is, and hath long been in France, and is now going into Italy. He owns publicly that he do correspond, and return him all his money. That Richard hath been in some straits in the beginning; but relieved by his friends. That he goes by another name, but do not disguise himself, nor deny himself to any man that challenges him. He tells me, for certain, that offers had been made to the old man, of marriage between the King and his daughter, to have obliged

* "John Rushworth, Clerk Assistant to the House of Commons, and author of the Historical Collections. Ob. 1690."

† "Titus Oates."

‡ "Creighton."

him, but he would not. He thinks (with me) that it never was in his power to bring in the King with the consent of any of his officers about him; and that he scorned to bring him in as Monk did, to secure himself and deliver every body else. When I told of what I found writ in a French book of one Monsieur Sorbriere, that gives an account of his observations here in England; among other things he says, that it is reported that Cromwell did, in his life-time, transpose many of the bodies of the Kings of England from one grave to another, and that by that means it is not known certainly whether the head that is now set up upon a post be that of Cromwell, or of one of the Kings; Mr. White tells me that he believes he never had so poor a low thought in him to trouble himself about it. He says the hand of God is much to be seen; that all his children are in good condition enough as to estate, and that their relations that betrayed their family are all now either hanged or very miserable." I. 314, 315.

1665, April 12th. "My Lord Treasurer" asked Mr. Pepys a question, which it does not appear that he answered, "Why will not the people lend their money? Why will they not trust the King as well as Oliver?" I. 336.

Under the date of April 23, 1665, (I. 338,) we have mention of a young divine who long sustained a very important station in the religious world, but who did not grow more tolerant and liberal as he grew older: "To White-Hall Chapel, and heard the famous young Stillingfleet, whom I knew at Cambridge, and he is now newly admitted one of the King's Chaplains. And was presented, they say, to my Lord Treasurer for St. Andrew's, Holborn, where he is now minister, with these words: that they (the Bishops of Canterbury, London and another) believed he is the ablest young man to preach the gospel of any since the apostles. He did make a most plain, honest, good, grave sermon, in the most unconcerned and easy yet substantial manner, that ever I heard in my life, upon the words of Samuel to the people, 'Fear the Lord in truth with all your heart, and remember the great things that he hath done for you.' It being proper to this

day, the day of the King's coronation."

July 27. Pepys met the King and Duke of York at Greenwich, and heard him and the Duke talk, and saw and observed their manner of discourse, "and," he says, as if on the point of a great sin, "God forgive me! though I admire them with all the duty possible, yet the more a man considers and observes them, the less he finds of difference between them and other men, though (blessed be God) they are both princes of great nobleness and spirits. The Duke of Monmouth is the most skittish, leaping gallant that ever I saw, always in action, vaulting or leaping or clambering." I. 355.

The state of morals amongst men of rank and good repute in Pepys's time must have been very low when we find such men as himself and Evelyn meeting on familiar terms and enjoying the society of the mistress of a nobleman. I. 367, 377, and 396.

Pepys relates many interesting particulars of the great fire of London and of the plague, 1665 and 1666—calamities which would have awakened the hearts of Charles and his courtiers to serious consideration if they had not been callous almost beyond example—but these we pass over as less suited to our object in these selections, with the exception of one quotation, the latter part of which relates a heart-affecting instance of parental love, though we are sorry to say the former part exhibits no small degree of selfish coxcombry on the part of the Journalist: he was now at Woolwich:

"1665, Sept. 3rd. Lord's Day. Up; and put on my coloured silk suit very fine, and my new periwig, bought a good while since, but durst not wear, because the plague was in Westminster when I bought it; and it is a wonder what will be the fashion after the plague is done, as to periwigs, for nobody will dare to buy any haire, for fear of the infection, that it had been cut off the heads of people dead of the plague. My Lord Brouncker, Sir J. Minnes, and I up to the Vestry at the desire of the Justices of the Peace, in order to the doing something for the keeping of the plague from growing; but Lord!

to consider the madness of people of the town, who will (because they are forbid) come in crowds along with the dead corpses to see them buried; but we agreed on some orders for the prevention thereof. Among other stories, one was very passionate, methought, of a complaint brought against a man in the town for taking a child from London from an infected house. Alderman Hooker told us it was the child of a very able citizen in Gracious Street, a saddler, who had buried all the rest of his children of the plague, and himself and wife, now being shut up and in despair of escaping, did desire only to save the life of this little child, and so prevailed to have it received stark-naked into the arms of a friend, who brought it (having put it into new fresh clothes) to Greenwich; where upon hearing the story, we did agree it should be permitted to be received and kept in the town." I. 363.

The following account of the enthusiasm of the Jews is curious, that quality being in late times rare in that nation: this people, it seems, always turn every thing, even their religious hopes, to a pecuniary account:

1665, 6, Feb. 19th. "I am told for certain, what I have heard once or twice already, of a Jew in town, that in the name of the rest do offer to give any man 10%. to be paid 100%. if a certain person now at Smyrna be within these two years owned by all the Princes in the east and particularly the grand Segnor as the King of the world, in the same manner we do the King of England here, and that this man is the true Messiah. One named a friend of his that had received ten pieces in gold upon this score, and says that the Jew hath disposed of 1100%. in this same manner, which is very strange, and certainly this year of 1666 will be a year of great action; but what the consequences of it will be, God knows!" I. 392.

1666, Sept. 26. Having described some loose and shameless behaviour of the Duke of York's, Pepys adds, (I. 462,) "Here I met with good Mr. Evelyn who cries out against it —. He observes that none of the nobility come out of the country at all, to help the King, or comfort him, or prevent commotions at this fire; but do as if the King were nobody; nor ne'er a

priest comes to give the King and Court good council or to comfort the poor people that suffer; but all is dead, nothing of good in any of their minds: he bemoans it, and says he fears more ruin hangs over our heads."

1666, 7, Feb. 8th. Sir. W. Batten dined with Pepys. "At dinner we talked much of Cromwell; all saying he was a brave fellow, and did owe his crowne he got to himself as much as any man that ever got one." II. 12.

Feb. 10. By a remark in his Journal of this day (still "Lord's-day") it would appear that he was a little tainted with *heresy*: "To church, where Mr. Mills made an unnecessary sermon upon Original Sin, neither understood by himself nor the people." The same day he makes a remark upon a conversation with an old friend, which shews more honesty than benevolence: "We had much talk of all our old acquaintance of the College, concerning their various fortunes; wherein, to my joy, I met not with any that have sped better than myself." II. 13.

As profligate a thing as is recorded of Charles is told, II. 21, that in his new medal he caused the face of one of his mistresses (Mrs. Stewart) to be done "in little;" "and a pretty thing it is," says Pepys simply or ironically, "that he should choose her face to represent Britannia by."

Pepys gives, II. 22, no favourable character of Sir G. Downing: he describes his "ridiculous thrift," and calls him a "niggardly fellow, jeered all over the country."

The Sunday entries in the journal are to us most interesting. They give us at least his own or the general opinion of the divines of the day and their services. Thus, (II. 6, 1666, 7,) Jan 20th, he writes, "I to church, and there beyond expectation find our seat and all the church crammed by twice as many people as used to be; and to my great joy find Mr. Framp-ton in the pulpit, and I think the best sermon for goodness and oratory, without affectation or study, I ever heard in my life. The truth is, he preaches the most like an apostle that ever I heard man, and it was much the best time that ever I spent in my life at church."

And again, (II. 28,) Mar. 17th, "I to walk in the park, where to the Queen's Chapel, and there heard a fryer preach with his cord about his middle in Portugueze, something I could understand, shewing that God did respect the meek and humble as well as the high and rich. He was full of action but very decent and good, I thought, and his manner of delivery very good. Then I went back to White-Hall, and there up to the closet, and spoke with several people till sermon was ended, which was preached by the Bishop of Hereford,* an old good man that they say made an excellent sermon. He was by birth a Catholique, and a great gallant, having 1500*l.* per annum patrimony, and is a Knight Barronet: was turned from his persuasion by the late Archbishop Laud. He and the Bishop of Exeter, Dr. Ward, are the two Bishops that the King do say he cannot have bad sermons from."

There are those that yet censure the patriots that stood up against Charles IInd's Government: let them read the following description of it by a Courtier, and then say whether virtue lay in submission or in resistance:

"1667, April 26. To White-Hall, and there saw the Duke of Albemarle, who is not well and do grow crazy. Then I took a turn with Mr. Evelyn, with whom I walked two hours, till almost one of the clock, talking of the badness of the Government where nothing but wickedness, and wicked men and women command the King: that it is not in his nature to gainsay any thing that relates to his pleasures, that much of it arises from the sickliness of our Ministers of State, who cannot be about him as the idle companions are, and therefore he gives way to the young rogues; and then from the negligence of the clergy, that a Bishop shall never be seen about him, as the King of France hath always: that the King would fain have some of the same gang to be Lord Treasurer, which would be yet worse, for now some delays are put to the getting gifts of the King, as Lady Byron who had been, as he called it, the King's seventeenth mistress abroad,

* "Dr. Herbert Croft was made Bishop of Hereford 1661, but he could not then be very old, as he lived till 1691."

did not leave him till she had got him to give her an order for 4000*l.* worth of plate to be made for her: but by delays, thanks be to God! she died before she had it. He confirmed to me the business of the want of paper at the council-table the other day, which I have observed; Wooly being to have found it, and did, being called, tell the King to his face the reason of it. And Mr. Evelyn tells me of several of the menial servants of the Court lacking bread, that have not received a farthing wages since the King's coming in. He tells me the King of France hath his mistresses, but laughs at the foolery of our King, that makes his bastards princes, and loses his revenue upon them, and makes his mistresses his masters. And the King of France did never grant Lavalier any thing to bestow on others, and a little subsistence, but no more to his bastards." II. 45, 46.

1667, June 25. Pepys heard of Sir H. Cholmly, that the King had declared in Council his determination to call a Parliament, "against the Duke of York's mind flatly, who did rather advise the King to raise money as he pleased; and against the Chancellor's (*Clarendon*), who told the King, *that Queene Elizabeth did do all her business in Eighty-eight without calling a Parliament, and so might he do for any thing he saw.*"

The 28th of this month he detected his wife "making of tea; a drink which Mr. Pelling, the Potticary, tells her is good for her cold and defluxions." II. 85.

July 12, 1667, (II. 91,) recording the lavish expenditure of the public money by a debauched Court, P. says, "It is strange how every body do now-a-days reflect upon Oliver, and commend him, what brave things he did and made all the neighbour princes fear him; while here a prince, come in with all the love and prayers and good liking of his people, who have given greater signs of loyalty and willingness to serve him with their estates than was ever done by any people, hath lost all so soon, that it is a miracle what way a man could devise to lose so much in so little time."

The waste of the King's revenue upon his vices left his household in a

miserable situation. One of Pepys' friends tells him, (July 29, 1667, II. 107,) "that the King hath not greater enemies in the world than those of his own family; for there is not an officer in the house almost but curses him for letting them starve, and there is not a farthing of money to be raised for the buying them bread."

The King was as poor-spirited as he was profligate. One of his mistresses made him ask her forgiveness upon his knees and promise not to offend any more, and nearly "hectored him out of his wits." (II. 108.) We are not surprised at finding Mr. Evelyn tell Pepys, Aug. 8, 1667, (II. 109,) "that wise men do prepare to remove abroad what they have, for that we must be ruined, our case being past relief, the kingdom so much in debt, and the King minding nothing but his lust."

(To be concluded in the next Number.)

SIR,
SINCE the time when Dr. Chalmers published his *Astronomical Discourses*, I have been expecting that some suitable answer to the argument of that work would appear in the *Monthly Repository*; for as a defence is therein attempted, not of our common Christianity, but merely of those peculiar dogmas which a prevailing majority of Christians have confounded with it, it became Unitarians to guard against the injury which the cause of truth was likely to sustain from this association with error, as well as to seize the opportunity for a seasonable vindication of their own sentiments. What others, abler and better, have left undone, their continued silence induces me to attempt; a feeble opponent, indeed, to such a Goliath in divinity as the author before us, but armed, I trust, with weapons simple and mighty through God, like David's stone and sling, the force of truth and right reason. Acknowledging then, in one word, the great esteem which is due from all parties to Dr. Chalmers, as an able, amiable and excellent man, and very eloquent writer, I shall proceed at once to point out what appears to me to be the fallacy of the argument which forms the burden of his *Astronomical Discourses*.

He observes, in effect, that from the boundless extent of the material world with which modern astronomy has made us acquainted, a plausible objection has been drawn to the supposed Christian doctrine of the incarnation and death of the second person of the Godhead. In a manner very beautiful and eloquent he reviews the sublime discoveries of the telescope, the infinitude of suns and systems which appear to fill the interminable realms of space; freely admitting the inference that the globe which we inhabit is but a speck, an atom, amidst their countless hosts. And as the world in which we live is but one amongst endless myriads, so he allows it reasonable to believe that that race of reasonable creatures, the human species, by which it is occupied, is also but one variety amidst innumerable others of moral and intelligent offspring who have derived the blessings and responsibilities of existence from the Father of all. All this having been largely stated, he proceeds to notice the objection thence derived, viz. that if mankind form so infinitely small a part of the rational creation those mighty measures for human redemption which are commonly believed in by Christians, are incompatible with the extent of the Divine engagements, and disproportionate to the relative insignificance of our world and its inhabitants. This is a very natural, and, after all that Dr. Chalmers has written, it appears to me a very just objection to what are called orthodox doctrines. That a being not only possessing in himself the nature and perfections of Deity, but standing to the whole universe in the relation of its maker, preserver, and constant providential governor, should for a certain season abandon this exalted situation in order to retire on a visit of mercy to a minute spot like this world, is to me a thought that will not bear reflection, and appears more and more improbable the more it is considered. I shall, however, endeavour to do justice to Dr. C. by giving both the objection and his answer as nearly as possible in his own words: "God would not have manifested himself in the flesh for the salvation of so paltry a world. Neither would the eternal Son of God, he who is revealed to us as having made all worlds, and as holding an

empire amid the splendours of which, the globe that we inherit is shaded in insignificance; neither would he strip himself of the glory which he had with the Father before the world was, and light on this lower scene for the purpose imputed to him in the New Testament." "The objection which we are discussing I shall state again in a single sentence. Since astronomy has unfolded to us such a number of worlds, it is not likely that God would pay so much attention to this one world, and set up such wonderful provisions for its benefit as are announced to us in the Christian revelation. This objection will have received its answer, if we can meet it by the following position—that God, in addition to the bare faculty of dwelling on a multiplicity of objects at one and the same time, has this faculty in such wonderful perfection, that he can attend as fully and provide as richly, and manifest all his attributes as illustriously, on every one of these objects as if the rest had no existence, and no place whatever in his government or thoughts." I shall quote directly another passage, to shew the manner in which Dr. C. substantiates and illustrates this position, which contains in itself a very just and sublime sentiment. But I must here take the liberty to say, that this position, although conceded to him, is such as he can make no legitimate use of in respect to the scope of his main argument. He here affirms, and in the subsequent pages he proves at large, that the Divine providence and attention so regards the whole as not to be withdrawn for a moment from the minutest part, which is very right. But what will this avail in reply to the objector, who does not quarrel with the minuteness or perfection of the attention which God is supposed to bestow on the part, but with the idea that he can so attend to the part as to withdraw his attention for a season from the whole? This is evidently quite another thing, and we may safely grant this champion of orthodoxy the position which he thinks so commanding, without fearing at all any advantages which it can give him. It is totally irrelevant to the main point at issue, and it is to me surprising that so ingenious a man should handle his argument in a manner so

inconclusive. The objector denies that God would for thirty years abandon his charge of the whole; the advocate insists on the minute and perfect attention which the Divine Providence, without neglecting the whole, can bestow on the part; the reply therefore does not at all meet the objection, but leaves it entirely unrelieved. Dr. Chalmers, in order to meet this objection fairly, was obliged to do one of these two things: either to advance such a statement of the Christian doctrine as would not involve the notion of God's resigning for a season his charge of the whole, or otherwise to defend the reasonableness of supposing that he might on some occasions do so. But neither of these has he done, or attempted to do; and his argument therefore, though adorned with the fascinations of a rich and lofty eloquence, and animated, I fully believe, with the sacred flame of piety, is yet altogether fallacious and futile, as every argument must be which misses the main point in dispute, and wastes its strength in establishing what is not denied.

But I believe the weakness is rather in the cause than in its advocate. Could Dr. C. if he were to take the argument up again, answer this objection? I think not; but let us consider it. The objection is this. The doctrine that the Divine Being, the Author and Preserver of the universe, divested himself for a season of that high function and condition, and shrunk, as it were, into the state of a man, is unreasonable, nay incredible, because the connexion of the Creator with his works must needs be supposed to be immutable, as well as his own nature and condition, and their absolute dependence on him is such that we cannot conceive they could even exist, much less preserve their order, without his superintendence, for a single moment. To deny this would indeed, as Chalmers says, be to expunge a perfection of the Deity, and to obscure his glory. He himself expresses this absolute and constant dependence of all things upon God in a very beautiful manner. "At the very time while the mind of the Deity is abroad over the whole vastness of creation, there is not one particle of matter, there is not one

individual principle of rational or of animal existence, there is not one single world in that expanse which teems with them, that his eye does not discern *as constantly*, and his hand does not guide as unerringly, and his spirit does not watch and care for as vigilantly, as if it formed the one and exclusive object of his attention." And is this very argument of the constant universal providence of God to be brought forward to prove that he could abandon the charge of all his works, to devote himself for a season to the concerns of this single world? Again I repeat that we cannot think too highly of the perfection of the Divine attention and concern towards every the smallest creature; but we must remember that he so attends to each as not to neglect any other, much less to forego his charge of the whole, even for the twinkling of an eye.

But, perhaps, Dr. C. would concede this point, although, as far as the person of the Son is concerned, the expressions which occur in his work make this doubtful. But supposing it conceded, that the attention of the Deity to his works cannot be supposed to have been intermitted for a single instant, with what view of Christian doctrine can this concession be reconciled? That which calls itself orthodox must take refuge in one of these two alternatives, which I think will be found no better than the two horns of a dilemma—it must either be supposed that God the Son, in becoming incarnate, remained still unchanged in his divine condition and functions; or, as is the more popular opinion, that he for a season laid his divine condition and glory and operations aside, at least in very great measure, and was reduced to the obscure and feeble state of humanity. One of these alternatives must, as far as I see, of necessity be embraced. If we assume the first, we must admit that Jesus, in his incarnation, laid nothing aside, nor abandoned any glory: he merely superadded the circumstances of his humanity to his previous divine condition. This supposition, indeed, gets rid of the objection of his neglecting the universe in order to attend to this world; but it exposes us to others not less formidable. These arise from the *absolute incompatibility* of the con-

ditions of humanity and deity at one time in the same individual person or being. Nothing can appear to us absurd or impossible, if it does not appear so to suppose that Jesus was, at one and the same moment, filled with all the unutterable bliss of deity, and distressed with pain, and sunk in anguish and dismay; or that he who was at the moment regulating the universe, could in any sense have been truly tempted by the offer of an earthly kingdom; or that he who possessed at that very instant the omniscience of deity, could with any honesty have declared himself ignorant of the day when his own predictions would be fulfilled. If our faith is to embrace such incongruities as these, then all objection to religious doctrines or practices, whether Christian or Heathen, on the ground of their intrinsic absurdity, must be at an end. It is in vain to urge, as is often done, that Christ united these contradictory qualities by virtue of his two natures; that argument only recoils upon itself, and manifests the impossibility of two incongruous natures existing at one time in the same person. If these absurd consequences result from this supposed union of natures, the only inference is, that such supposed union is itself absurd.

Turning from this hypothesis, which indeed makes the whole life of Christ look more like a piece of theatric hypocrisy than a faithful reality, an empty show of infirmity and suffering affected by one who was throughout the whole potent and blissful—turn, I say, from this—let us consider the more popular doctrine. According to this, God the Son really emptied himself of his pre-existent glory, and reduced himself to the condition of a man of sorrows. Having really assumed the nature and state of man, he was for a season really feeble, ignorant and afflicted. He had resigned his part in the Divine government not to resume it till his work on earth was accomplished. But this hypothesis, sufficiently appalling from its absolute inconsistency with the immutable perfection of the Divine nature, is also open to the force of that objection already noticed, and which it is the scope of Dr. Chalmers's work to combat. It represents one to whom belonged, by virtue of his essential

Deity, in conjunction with the two other members of the Divine Triad, the infinite characters of the Creator and Preserver of all things, as ceasing for a season, no matter how long or how short, but in this instance not less than thirty years, (though the argument would be the same if it were but for an hour,)—as ceasing for this period from the exercise of these great and divine functions and energies. The world, then, for thirty years was able to go on as well as usual without the presence and agency of this its Creator and Upholder; for that period he was no longer present with the adoring spirits who derived from him their existence and their bliss: he heard neither their prayers nor their praises: so far from attending perfectly to every thing, there was but one out of the whole to which he was attending. Such is this popular doctrine, which I forbear to expose further, lest I should seem to border on impiety: but I think the dispassionate reader will agree with me that Dr. Chalmers has left unanswered that objection to orthodoxy which he fancies he has annihilated.

The work before us is a very handsome piece of declamation, nay more, it is in many respects a very eloquent and interesting display of the perfection of the Divine Providence; but with reference to the strength of argument and soundness of sense which are to be found in it, I am constrained to say, *Satis eloquentiæ, sapientiæ parum!*

T. F. B.

On Second Part of Dr. Carpenter's Reply to Archbishop Magee.

Manchester.

SIR, November 1, 1825.

IN the 9th page of the Preface of Dr. Carpenter's Reply to Bishop Magee is exhibited an *outline* of the plan of the proposed SECOND PART of that interesting publication, which is as follows:—"Inquiry into the Scripture Doctrine of Redemption.—I.

Mode in which the Controversy ought to be conducted.—II. Great Importance of Revelation, as sanctioning the Hope of Divine Forgiveness and Acceptance.—III. The Jewish Dispensation and Sacrifices, and the Connexion between the Jewish and Christian Dispensations.—IV. General Principles taught by or immediately deducible from Revelation.—V. Various erroneous or defective Hypotheses respecting the Ends of the Death of Christ.—VI. Consideration of the Scriptural Expressions respecting the Death of Christ, and his Agency in effecting the Salvation of Mankind.—VII. General Conclusions from the Testimony of Scripture.—VIII. Advantages of this View of the Ends of our Saviour's Death."

From the very interesting nature of the articles which this outline embraces; it is much to be regretted that the able writer has not met with that encouragement which his valuable labours in the cause of Christian truth so well deserve. "For the remaining" (i. e. 2d) "part," observes the Doctor, "I have made considerable preparation; and two or three months of tolerable leisure would enable me to complete it for publication."—It is now nearly six years since the volume appeared from which the preceding extract has been made, and it may be reasonably presumed that the proposed *second part* is by this time sufficiently matured for publication. If I am correct in this presumption, I would take the liberty of urging the completion of this great work; and, to induce the author to proceed, I would propose that 100 gentlemen should subscribe 20s. each, to guarantee the expense of publishing.

H. W.

P. S. Can you inform the Subscribers to Mr. Rutt's edition of Priestley's Works, when the completion of that publication may be expected? It is now more than twelve months since the last volume appeared.

REVIEW.

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

ART. I.—*The Christian Rule of Equity enforced and applied. A Sermon preached in the Cathedral Church of St. Peter, York, before the Hon. Sir John Bayley, Knight, and the Hon. Sir George Sowley Holroyd, Knight, Two of his Majesty's Justices of the Court of King's Bench, March 26, 1825.* By the Rev. James Tate, M. A., late Fellow of Sidney College, Cambridge, and Rector of Marske, Yorkshire. Published at the request of the High Sheriff, (John Hutton, Esq.,) and the Gentlemen of the Grand Jury. York, printed by Wilsons. Sold by Longman and Co., London. 1825. 8vo. pp. 16.

THIS preacher discourses on the golden rule of equity, as laid down by Jesus Christ in Matt. vii. 12; in respect of which he well observes, that “in the utmost extent to which Pagan moralists had been able to penetrate, the negative precept only was discovered, ‘Do not to others what you would resent if done to yourself.’” In a spurious addition to Acts xv. 29,* we meet with the same negative precept; a reading for the introduction of which it cannot be difficult to account.†

JUSTICE is a most appropriate subject for an assize sermon: nor can the application of our Saviour's maxim be less seasonable and momentous than the enforcement of the duty. Mr. Tate attends to both these objects, and does not forget that he is addressing an audience brought together by a very solemn public occasion. He begins with drawing an impressive picture of our courts of judicature: then he adverts, in general yet glowing terms, to the prosperity of the nation; and he next insists on the vast impor-

tance of our deportment and character, as a community, being governed by Christian principles. Thus his comment on the golden rule of equity is naturally and easily introduced.

We pass over his intermediate and general reasoning, and hasten to notice his illustrations of it in two most affecting cases—colonial slavery and incomplete toleration. Here he perceives (and what man of thought and sensibility does not perceive?) national disobedience to the great rule of justice. Concerning the present state of West-Indian slavery he says, that it exhibits “an immense mass of evil and of cruelty and vice, amid rights scanty enough and worse protected, morals shockingly depraved, and religious knowledge faintly dealt or absolutely withheld,—a horrible blot altogether on the Christian name, still calling aloud for active interference from this country, first for mitigation of the wrong, and then by wise and cautious but resolute measures, ultimately, for its extinction also.” We proceed to his remarks on the other example of a violation of public equity:

“The remaining subject, that of our yet incomplete toleration, I approach with delicacy, as becomes me, but not without animation too from the kind aspect which in certain high places seems now to be worn. Different classes of rights appear to be brought into discussion with far less prejudice, with much more good nature than before; and different classes of men begin to view each other in a more favourable light, even amidst conflicting interests, so supposed, and claims once deemed irreconcilably hostile.

“Much however here also still is left to be done. But the disposition for peace and good-will is happily at work. May God prosper its benignant operation! Nor let it be forgotten, that the humblest voice which rises in concord, must swell the general harmony, and that every heart which from this hour cherishes one kindly feeling more than it did, may help to consolidate the union of an empire.

“In the mean while, let us pursue the line of our argument, and consider those inferences from it which remain to be drawn.

* Griesbach and Matthai in loc. See, too, the 20th verse, in the critical editions of the N. T.

† We strongly conjecture that the addition was a marginal note, suggested by the Apostle Paul's reasoning in Rom. xiv., xv., and in 1 Cor. viii. &c.; and perhaps by the Noachic precepts.

"No man who loves and adores the gospel of Jesus Christ, but must deplore in the depth of his soul the greatest and worst of scandals which could possibly befall it, the intolerance, the unnatural intolerance, by professed Christians shewn to one another. Even towards those, in affection our enemies, who hate and ill treat us, we are solemnly commanded to extend our forgiveness: towards those who in opinion only differ from us, what pretence can we have to be angry and unkind?"

"As individuals, at least, in our personal relation, the case is perfectly clear. That privilege which every man assumes to worship God according to the sincere conviction of his own mind, he can assume on no possible ground on which his neighbour may be denied it. Christian equity allows to every man the same right which it claims for itself. Christian charity prays for the salvation of those, supposing them to be in error, whom it cannot convert. And Christian forbearance when it sees brother even frowning on brother, by the mouth of St. Paul cries out, 'Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth.'

"Nor is the claim which Christians have to perfect toleration from Christians, much if at all altered in a Christian church being established by a Christian state. The foundation must limit the superstructure. What Jesus Christ and his apostles have laid down as groundwork, must direct the outline of all that man builds upon it. And in the great charter of our religion, 'to do unto others what we would they should do unto us,' is the golden rule, the divine law itself, the unalterable right and duty of all Christian persons, in every concern of life, in every relation of society.

"From this plain statement we may deduce at once the nature of true and complete toleration. It supposes the establishment of one church, but it excludes the persecution or ill treatment of any other. It is the exact medium indeed betwixt persecution on the left hand and establishment on the right. True and complete toleration does not punish, does not degrade, does not disfranchise, the member of another religious body, because his conscience will not let him join in the worship of the religion established. Perfect toleration ensures to all Christians,* without consideration of sect or creed, the full enjoyment, as good subjects, of all rights, civil and political. And whenever the Church

and State of England shall agree to grant the boon of such a toleration, in the very same proportion in which it shall be granted, the State will rest on a basis of adamant, and the Church, even beyond its present excellence and glory, will become the most benevolent and most apostolical Church in Christendom."

These sentiments richly merit circulation. Amidst the wretched sophistry and most disgraceful bigotry that we are so often doomed to witness, on what, with some impropriety, is termed *the Catholic question*, we feel ourselves animated by such reasoning as this from the pen of a scholar like Mr. Tate;* and we rejoice that it comes before the world under the sanction of the High Sheriff and the Grand Jury of Yorkshire—a circumstance extremely honourable to that large province, and indicative, we trust, of the extension of good feeling and of sound thought and knowledge!

The ground which this author has taken, is immovable. A Christian and a Christian preacher, he proves that the Justice enjoined by the gospel requires the exercise of perfect toleration. In a country and age professing to be eminently religious, this is the correct way of considering the subject. Our remaining observations will be of the nature of a commentary on Mr. Tate's argument.

Man's "brief authority" is never so wantonly exercised as in matters of faith and conscience: and religious fortitude and wisdom are never so essential as in resisting this abuse of human power.

Were it asked of the great body of our countrymen, "Whether they do not reprobate persecution?" we believe that they would, to a man, reply, "We utterly detest, abjure and disclaim it; inasmuch as it is a most formidable monster, alike hateful to God and to his rational creation." But were we to follow this question by another, and inquire, "Why persecution yet lingers within these favoured islands?" numbers around us would deny the fact, and express, perhaps, indignation at the charge. Truth and Justice and Candour, will

* We would say, "to all good subjects, whether they be *Christians* or no."

* See I. Walton's *Lives, &c.*, by Zouch, 2nd ed. pp. xxiii. xxv., and Hippol. *Coron. Eurip.* (Monk) Prefat. p. x. ed. 2.

not permit us to concur in their opinion.

All disabilities whatever, that a member of the community lies under, as such, by reason of his religious faith, are of the essence of persecution. The authority which enacts them, is no other than the authority which, once, upon our own shores, and even yet in some foreign lands, has consigned and consigns reputed heretics to the dungeon and the stake. It is civil authority, stepping far beyond its proper sphere, violating the eternal laws of equity, and doing infinite wrong to the interests both of religion and of civil government. We live, it is true, in an advanced period of the world: we are inhabitants of a country pre-eminent in the general and practical liberty which its sons enjoy. Yet the fine gold of Freedom is still alloyed: dark spots are found in the almost noon-day beams of our prosperity. Coercive and penal statutes in the concerns of religion, disgrace our code of laws, and occasionally are carried into execution. This is not all. Even what public men denominate *toleration*, and consider as a mighty boon granted by the State, ought to be better understood and better practised. A right or, as some call it, a favour, should not wear the aspect of injury and insult. What, although Dissenters, both Catholic and Protestant, severally assemble for worship, without fear and molestation? What, although for thus assembling no magistrate drags them to the bar of criminal justice, but protects them in the act? Will you maintain that even toleration is complete, when for this very worship we are pronounced ineligible to offices and honours, from which neither the occasional nor the habitual conformist is excluded, and which only *they* forego who obey the dictates of a conscience at least sincere and tender, and, as we believe, enlightened? Do we then repine at the sacrifice and the privation? Unquestionably not: religious consistency, Christian honesty, peace of mind, the hope of the Divine favour, the esteem of wise and good men, would be cheaply purchased by more extensive privations and by costlier sacrifices. What we insist upon is, that a sacrifice and a privation there are: and we add, that the award of them

cannot be defended, if Persecution is indefensible.

To speak of *religious toleration*, and of *political toleration*, is, on this subject, to frame a distinction without a difference. Ought religious sentiments or practices to create political disabilities? The fact that they create them, is the matter of our complaint: this fact it is which Mr. Tate with reason stigmatizes as flagrantly unjust.

Our best writers on *toleration*, mean by it universal and mutual forbearance, and equity in the concerns of religion. We adopt the term with much pleasure in this sense. If, on the contrary, *toleration* import the mere sufferance or endurance of what we cannot approve, it has something of usurpation in its aspect, and of mischief in its tendency. It then becomes precarious and imperfect, on which ground we are now arraigning it: for precarious and imperfect it is, as understood by numbers of mankind, and as exercised by the State. Such indeed it cannot fail to be, when it is not equal justice.

Are the ineligibilities, of which both the Catholic and the Protestant Nonconformist complains, enacted or continued in return for defects in his civil obedience? That, we think, will not be pretended: or, if it be, the imputation may easily be repelled. On the other hand, do dissidents lie under this proscription, as the effect of their religious creeds and discipline? If they do, then we say that human authority here interferes most unjustly in cases of religion, and incurs the guilt of what, however modified, is nothing short of persecution. For in what terms shall *persecution* be defined? Take the definition in the words of a writer who never was too partial to Nonconformists: "*persecution*," according to Dr. Samuel Johnson, "is the infliction of penalties for opinions." And shall we be told that disabilities are not penalties? We envy neither the judgment nor the feelings of the man, who will hazard the assertion. It may as well be alleged that they are privileges.

But we are informed that "the safety, nay the welfare, of the State demands the enactment or, which is the same thing, the continuance, of such disabilities, and a ready submission to them." Prove, nevertheless,

your position before you require us to adopt it. Recollect, too, that never did persecutor arise, who insisted not on this very plea, who was not actuated by this panic fear, either real or artificial. It is even "the tyrant's plea," and should not be lightly used by men who are desirous of breathing the air of Freedom. The public security and welfare, will, no doubt, require that punishment be executed upon *crime*: but where in the case before us is the crime, though the punishment is sufficiently notorious? Independently on statute law, no modification of Nonconformity can be criminal: and statute law has pronounced it void of crime.*

It has been alleged,† that the allotment of offices and honours in the State is matter of favour, of discretion. Be it so, in regard to the selection of the *individuals*, on the part of the *executive* government. After all, what is this allegation to the purpose? Our present question concerns a *legislative* act: and substantial justice, not favour and discretion, will surely be the basis of the proceedings of a British Parliament!

"But civil ineligibilities are created by means of limitations of age, of property, of local situation." Here, again, the cases are not analogous; and this plea for incomplete toleration is overthrown. If unripened years, if insufficient property, if a specific residence, make me incapable of a given office, still, time, or the act of my own will, or the exertion of my own industry, may remove these obstacles. My religious sentiments are not thus under my controul. And do you ask me to sacrifice them to any earthly considerations? Do you punish me for refusing such a sacrifice, and leave me without hope of an amendment in my civil situation? When the claims of *Christian equity* are fully understood and obeyed, no such attempts will be put forth to render men "either hypocrites or martyrs."

N.

* Furneaux's Letters to Blackstone, (2d ed.) pp. 277, 278.

† Blackstone's Commentaries, (ed. 15,) IV. 52.

ART. II.—*The Vision of Las Casas, and other Poems*. By Emily Taylor. 12mo. pp. 130. Taylor and Hessey. 1825. 6s.

ADOPTING the popular opinion, sanctioned by Robertson, that Las Casas was the original proposer of the African Slave-Trade, from motives of humanity towards the oppressed aboriginal Americans, Miss Taylor exhibits in successive visionary scenes the principal occurrences of his eventful life, with suitable moral and Christian reflections and anticipations of the future state of the new world and the African race. The author makes no attempt to form an interesting story, or to create new incidents. Her power, of which she is conscious, consists in easy description and the expression of intense feeling, of both which many striking examples may be selected from "The Vision."

The discovery of America is announced in the following stanzas:

"—There rides a bark in triumph o'er
the wave!
Her full sails catch the home-breeze
joyfully:
Joy to the glorious heroes! to the
brave
Who tried the perils of that unknown
sea!
What though the closing waves indig-
nantly
Reject the marks of man's far-spreading
sway,
The conquest is achieved!—by thine,
and thee,
Dauntless Columbus! is the dubious
way
Unlock'd, display'd at once—all darkness
turn'd to day!

How beautiful she comes! Her errand
peace
And joy, and tidings of a world new-
found!
Well may the toils of wonted labour
cease;
Well may the countless thousands
throng around,
And Grief forget her sufferings!—
Hark! the sound
Of hallelujahs, glorifying Him
Whose hand hath framed the earth's
extremest bound,
And, as the light of ancient worlds grows
dim,
Bids us at other fanes the lamp of Sci-
ence trim.

And are there brothers o'er that watery
waste—

Our new-found kindred? Oh! to carry
there
The peaceful Olive-branch, and bid them
haste

Our Arts to learn—our wondrous tales
to hear!

Oh! to commingle joys—with them to
share,

In sweet and sacred fellowship, the store
Of blended good which each to each
may bear!

And, more than all, together forth to
pour

The mingled breath of praise—together
to adore!"

Pp. 10, 11.

The first voyage of Las Casas to
America is described in lines of true
poetry:

"He went:—the dangers of the deep,
though fraught

In those dark days with terrors long
gone by,

In vain assail'd him, in his lonely thought—
Perhaps they came to terrify, to try:

Whom will they *not*?—even when the
steady eye

Is fix'd on Him who rules the winds and
waves,

(And they obey Him!) yet the sea,
the sky,

The threatening murmurs of the ocean
caves,

Smite with a chilling awe, which scarce
one spirit braves.

And even when winds are hush'd, the
soft air balm,

And the light bark rests gently on the
deep,

There is oppression in that awful calm,—
The death of Nature rather than her

sleep;
The eye looks round for help,—we

cannot keep
Its glance from wandering o'er that va-

cancy;
And, if a speck appear, the soul will

leap,
Fill'd with the spirit of society,

Over the watery bound, its loneliness to
fly.

No! there is nothing lonely like the
sea:

Though thousand thousand sails be
speeding o'er,

And the mind knows the friendly wave
to be

Medium of blessings to the farthest
shore,

Still 'tis a changeful and capricious
power,

Too fickle for man's mind to rest upon;
In its most smiling times he hears the
roar

Of distant thunder, and he feels like one
Who dreads to wear a smile, lest cause
of smile be gone.

In such a time, well pleased, the eye will
turn

From the deep waves below to Heaven
above,—

Beautiful region! where the night-fires
burn,

And seem to breathe benignity and love.
What though beyond the burning line

we rove,
Where, one by one, each light must dis-

appear
We knew in childhood; never can we

move
Beyond the glories of the starry sphere,

Or feel the Almighty arm less manifestly
near!

And there are feelings which the voyager
Can well remember—when upon his

eye,
Ranging beneath another hemisphere,

First came the vision of the Southern
sky.

Yes, there they shine! those stranger
lights on high—

The dream of childish years! Yes, there
they are!

Bright Southern Cross, so dear to me-
mory,

The Wolf, the Ship of Heaven, the Phœ-
nix—there

Pouring their mingled lights—how beau-
tiful, how fair!"

Pp. 15—17.

Miss Taylor celebrates the virtuous
labours of the philanthropists who
have devoted themselves to the aboli-
tion of Negro-slavery:

"Then, starting into life, Las Casas sees
A holy band, their fathers' faults re-
trieving;

With pious hands they hasten to appease
Nature's long anguish, o'er her children

grieving,
And gently, duteously, their task a-

chieving,
Like him who clears defacing stains away

From the pale marble, all its glory
leaving;—

So toil'd they on, for many a weary day,
Even from their morn of youth to age's

evening grey.

And from the snares of wealth, from
pleasure's maze,

From all that cheers and soothes the
heart of man—

From ease, from leisure, earthly peace
and praise,

Undaunted turning, they their work
began:
Cold in their veins the life-blood often
ran,
For they had human feelings;—yet to be
Heaven's ministers, and work upon its
plan,
Breathed through their souls resistless
energy,
And the world heard their voice—'The
Negro SHALL be free!'"
Pp. 32, 33.

The poet binds a wreath around
the heads of Clarkson and Wilber-
force, whose true honour it is to be
revered and loved by the purest and
most amiable of their species.

The moral of "The Vision" is ex-
plained in the two concluding stanzas:

"O thou who read'st! whose heart has
felt the glow
Of warm benevolence; whose untired
feet
Have trod those paths of duty here
below,
Where toil is sanctified and trouble
sweet,—
Blessings be on thee! As thy labour
great,
Great be the harvest;—yet remember
still
How unsuspected lurks the deep de-
ceit,—
How oft, for good, we snatch the cup of
ill,
And, brimming though it be, that cup
yet higher fill.
Instructed, go!—Each high and noble
aim
Still in thy deepest musings love to
rear!
Go!—light more eagerly the holy flame
Of love to all mankind; and if the
fear,
That where thy wish a smile decreed,
a tear
May flow the faster for thine erring
zeal,—
If doubt like this intrude, a throne is
near,
Where they that meekly and incessant
kneel,
Strengthen'd and heal'd themselves, shall
others learn to heal."
P. 38.

The "Other Poems," forming two-
thirds of the volume, are characterized
by the same power of numbers and
felicitous simplicity of language, the
same refined moral sensibility, and the
same enlightened and fervent devotion.
We find in them some which have
already appeared in our Repository,

and amongst them the "Address to
the Deity," [see Mon. Repos. Vol.
XIII. p. 62,] which in all that con-
stitutes the excellence of sacred poe-
try yields only to Mrs. Barbauld's
lines bearing the same title.

ART. III.—*A Treatise of Christian
Doctrine, compiled from the Holy
Scriptures alone.* By John Milton.

(Continued from p. 613.)

CHAP. III. is "Of the Divine De-
crees." These Milton distributes
into General and Special. "God's
General Decree is that whereby he
has decreed from all Eternity of His
own most Free and Wise and Holy
Purpose, whatever he willed, or what-
ever He himself was about to do."

The Decree is not absolute, the
author argues, in any thing which is
left in the power of free agents. He
maintains the theory of contingent
decrees with great subtlety, but with
much the same success that has at-
tended all disquisitions on this difficult
subject, the writers of which have re-
sembled Milton's own metaphysical
angels, who

"reasoned high
Of providence, foreknowledge, will and
fate,
Fix'd fate, free-will, foreknowledge ab-
solute,
And found no end, in wand'ring mazes
lost."

Having referred to some of the de-
crees of God in the Scripture, which
are put conditionally, he says,

"It is argued, however, that in such
instances not only was the ultimate pur-
pose predestinated, but even the means
themselves were predestinated with a
view to it. So indeed it is asserted, but
Scripture nowhere confirms the rule,
which alone would be a sufficient reason
for rejecting it. But it is also attended
by this additional inconvenience, that it
would entirely take away from human
affairs all liberty of action, all endeavour
and desire to do right. For the course
of argument would be of this kind—If
God have at all events decreed my salva-
tion, whatever I may do against it, I
shall not perish. But God has also de-
creed as the means of salvation that you
should do rightly. I cannot, therefore,
but do rightly at some time or other,
since God has decreed that also,—in the
mean time I will act as I please; if I
never do rightly, it will be seen that I

was never predestinated to salvation, and that whatever good I might have done would have been to no purpose."—P. 34.

Milton's reason as well as feelings led him to assert the libertarian hypothesis, and to look with no friendly eye upon the opposite doctrine. It must be admitted, however, that he treats the subject in a religious, more than in a philosophical sense.

"To comprehend the whole matter in a few words, the sum of the argument may be thus stated in strict conformity with reason: God of his wisdom determined to create men and angels reasonable beings, and therefore free agents; at the same time he foresaw which way the bias of their will would incline, in the exercise of their own uncontrolled liberty. What then? Shall we say that this foresight or foreknowledge on the part of God imposed on them the necessity of acting in any definite way? No more than if the future event had been foreseen by any human being. For what any human being has foreseen as certain to happen, will not less certainly happen than what God himself has predicted. Thus Elisha foresaw how much evil Hazeael would bring upon the children of Israel in the course of a few years, 2 Kings viii. 12. Yet no one would affirm that the evil took place necessarily on account of the foreknowledge of Elisha; for had he never foreknown it, the event would have occurred with equal certainty, through the free-will of the agent. So neither does any thing happen because God has foreseen it; but he foresees the event of every action, because he is acquainted with their natural causes, which, in pursuance of his own decree, are left at liberty to exert their legitimate influence. Consequently the issue does not depend on God who foresees it, but on him alone who is the object of his foresight. Since, therefore, as has before been shewn, there can be no absolute decree of God regarding free agents, undoubtedly the prescience of the Deity (which can no more bias free agents than the prescience of man, that is, not at all, since the action in both cases is intransitive, and has no external influence) can neither impose any necessity of itself, nor can it be considered at all the cause of free actions. If it be so considered, the very name of liberty must be altogether abolished as an unmeaning sound; and that not only in matters of religion, but even in questions of morality and indifferent things. There can be nothing but what will happen necessarily, since there is nothing but what is foreknown by God,

"That this long discussion may be at length concluded by a brief summary of the whole matter, we must hold that God foreknows all future events, but that he has not decreed them all absolutely: lest all sin should be imputed to the Deity, and evil spirits and wicked men should be exempted from blame. Does my opponent avail himself of this, and think the concession enough to prove either that God does not foreknow every thing, or that all future events must therefore happen necessarily, because God has foreknown them? I allow that future events which God has foreseen, will happen certainly, but not of necessity. They will happen certainly, because the divine prescience cannot be deceived, but they will not happen necessarily, because prescience can have no influence on the object foreknown, inasmuch as it is only an intransitive action. What therefore is to happen according to contingency and the free-will of man, is not the effect of God's prescience, but is produced by the free agency of its own natural causes, the future spontaneous inclination of which is perfectly known to God. Thus God foreknew that Adam would fall of his own free-will; his fall therefore was certain, but not necessary, since it proceeded from his own free-will, which is incompatible with necessity."—Pp. 40—42.

The following quotation will explain Milton's drift in his argument, and also the zeal with which he maintains it:

"There are some who in their zeal to oppose this doctrine do not hesitate even to assert that God is himself the cause and origin of sin. Such men, if they are not to be looked upon as misguided rather than mischievous, should be ranked among the most abandoned of all blasphemers. An attempt to refute them, would be nothing more than an argument to prove that God was not the evil spirit."—P. 43.

Milton opens Chap. IV., which is entitled, "Of Predestination," with a definition of the "principal special decree of God relating to man." This, he says, is termed "Predestination, whereby God in pity to mankind, though foreseeing that they would fall of their own accord, predestinated to eternal salvation before the foundation of the world those who should believe and continue in the faith; for a manifestation of the glory of his mercy, grace, and wisdom, according to his purpose in Christ."

He distinguishes Predestination from Reprobation, and asserts that "wherever it is mentioned in Scripture, election alone is uniformly intended."

He observes that "mention is frequently made of those who are written among the living, and of the book of life, but never of the book of death."

By election he understands that eternal predestination whose ultimate purpose is the salvation of believers; and he reasons that there is no particular predestination, but only general, "that the privilege belongs to all who heartily believe and continue in their belief,—that none are predestinated or elected irrespectively, e. g. that Peter is not elected as Peter, or John as John, but inasmuch as they are believers, and continue in their belief,—and that thus the general decree of election becomes personally applicable to each particular believer, and is ratified to all who remain steadfast in the faith."

He allows (p. 53), that "in the Old Testament it is difficult to trace even a single expression which refers to election properly so called, that is, election to eternal life."

We arrive, in Chap. V., at the most important part of the great author's work,—*"Of the Son of God."* He felt that he was entering upon dangerous ground, and premises these "few introductory words:—"

"If indeed I were a member of the Church of Rome, which requires implicit obedience to its creed on all points of faith, I should have acquiesced from education or habit in its simple decree and authority, even though it denies that the doctrine of the Trinity, as now received, is capable of being proved from any passage of Scripture. But since I enrol myself among the number of those who acknowledge the word of God alone as the rule of faith, and freely advance what appears to me much more clearly deducible from the Holy Scriptures than the commonly-received opinion, I see no reason why any one who belongs to the same Protestant or Reformed Church, and professes to acknowledge the same rule of faith as myself, should take offence at my freedom, particularly as I impose my authority on no one, but merely propose what I think more worthy of belief than the creed in general acceptance. I only entreat that my readers will ponder and examine my statements in a

spirit which desires to discover nothing but the truth, and with a mind free from prejudice. For without intending to oppose the authority of Scripture, which I consider inviolably sacred, I only take upon myself to refute human interpretations as often as the occasion requires, conformably to my right, or rather to my duty as a man. If indeed those with whom I have to contend were able to produce direct attestation from heaven to the truth of the doctrine which they espouse, it would be nothing less than impiety to venture to raise, I do not say a clamour, but so much as a murmur against it. But inasmuch as they can lay claim to nothing more than human powers, assisted by that spiritual illumination which is common to all, it is not unreasonable that they should on their part allow the privileges of diligent research and free discussion to another inquirer, who is seeking truth through the same means and in the same way as themselves, and whose desire of benefiting mankind is equal to their own."—Pp. 80, 81.

Milton's doctrine is entirely Arian, but not the highest Arianism. From Scripture, he says, (p. 87,) "nothing can be more evident than that God of his own will created, generated or produced the Son before all things, endued with the Divine Nature, as in the fulness of time he miraculously begat him in his human nature of the Virgin Mary." He exposes the absurdity of the conceit of eternal generation. He also refutes the commonly-received doctrine of the Son being one in essence with the Father.

"—unless the terms unity and duality be signs of the same ideas to God which they represent to men, it would have been to no purpose that God had so repeatedly inculcated that first commandment, that he was the one and only God, if another could be said to exist besides, who also himself ought to be believed in as the one God. Unity and duality cannot consist of one and the same essence. God is one ens, not two; one essence and one subsistence, which is nothing but a substantial essence, appertain to one ens; if two subsistences or two persons be assigned to one essence, it involves a contradiction of terms, by representing the essence as at once simple and compound. If one divine essence be common to two persons, that essence or divinity will either be in the relation of a whole to its several parts, or of a genus to its several species, or lastly of a common subject to its accidents. If none of

these alternatives be conceded, there is no mode of escaping from the absurd consequences that follow, such as that one essence may be the third part of two or more."—P. 89.

He proposes to discard reason or human hypothesis, and to follow the doctrine of Holy Scripture exclusively. He forbears to "introduce all that commonly-received *drama of the personalities in the Godhead*;" since it is most evident from numberless passages of Scripture "that there is in reality but one true, independent and supreme God," and, "according to the testimony of the Son, delivered in the clearest terms, the Father is that One True God, by whom are all things." Having quoted and explained Mark xii. 28, &c.; Deut. vi. 4; John viii. 41, 54, and iv. 21, he concludes,

"Christ therefore agrees with the whole people of God, that the Father is that one and only God. For who can believe that the very first of the commandments would have been so obscure, and so ill understood by the Church through such a succession of ages, that two other persons, equally entitled to worship, should have remained wholly unknown to the people of God, and debarred of divine honours even to that very day? especially as God, where he is teaching his own people respecting the nature of their worship under the gospel, forewarns them that they would have for their God the one Jehovah whom they had always served, and David, that is, Christ, for their King and Lord. Jer. xxx. 9: *They shall serve Jehovah their God, and David their King, whom I will raise up unto them.* In this passage Christ, such as God willed that he should be known or served by his people under the gospel, is expressly distinguished from the one God Jehovah, both by nature and title. Christ himself therefore, the Son of God, teaches us nothing in the gospel respecting the one God but what the law had before taught, and every where clearly asserts him to be his Father. John xvii. 3: *This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* xx. 17: *I ascend unto my Father and your Father; and to my God and your God:* if therefore the Father be the God of Christ, and the same be our God, and if there be none other God but one, there can be no God beside the Father."—Pp. 90, 91.

He next produces many passages from the apostolic writings to prove

the sole Deity of the Father, and then remarks,

"Though all this be so self-evident as to require no explanation,—namely, that the Father alone is a self-existent God, and that a being which is not self-existent cannot be God,—it is wonderful with what futile subtleties, or rather with what juggling artifices, certain individuals have endeavoured to elude or obscure the plain meaning of these passages; leaving no stone unturned, recurring to every shift, attempting every means, as if their object were not to preach the pure and unadulterated truth of the gospel to the poor and simple, but rather by dint of vehemence and obstinacy to sustain some absurd paradox from falling, by the treacherous aid of sophisms and verbal distinctions, borrowed from the barbarous ignorance of the schools."—Pp. 93, 94.

He examines John x. 30, and explains it, not of unity of essence, but only of intimacy of communion; and also 1 John v. 7, the spuriousness of which he suspects, but which he shews, after Beza, may be interpreted "of an unity of agreement and testimony."

In answer to those that assert that the name and attributes and works of God, as well as divine honours, are habitually ascribed to the Son, he proceeds to prove, "1st, That in every passage each of the particulars above-mentioned is attributed in express terms only to one God the Father, as well by the Son himself as by his apostles. Secondly, that wherever they are attributed to the Son, it is in such a manner that they are easily understood to be attributable in their original and proper sense to the Father alone; and that the Son acknowledges himself to possess whatever share of Deity is assigned to him, by virtue of the peculiar gift and kindness of the Father; to which the apostles also bear their testimony. And lastly, that the Son himself and his apostles acknowledge throughout the whole of their discourses and writings, that the Father is greater than the Son in all things."

The gloss of the "orthodox" commentators upon our Lord's answer to "the mother of Zebedee's children," that when he said, *It is not mine to give*, he spoke in his mediatorial capacity, draws from Milton the following admirable remarks:

"But questionless when the ambition

of the mother and her two sons incited them to prefer this important petition, they addressed their petition to the entire nature of Christ, how exalted soever it might be, praying him to grant their request to the utmost extent of his power, whether as God or man; Matt. xx. 20, *Worshiping him, and desiring a certain thing of him*, and ver. 21, *Grant that they may sit*. Christ also answers with reference to his whole nature,—*It is not mine to give*; and lest for some reason they might still fancy the gift belonged to him, he declares that it was altogether out of his province, and the exclusive privilege of the Father. If his reply was meant solely to refer to his mediatorial capacity, it would have bordered on sophistry, which God forbid that we should attribute to him; as if he were capable of evading the request of Salome and her sons by the quibble which the logicians call *expositio prava* or *æquivoca*, when the respondent answers in a sense or with a mental intention different from the meaning of the questioner. The same must be said of other passages of the same kind, where Christ speaks of himself; for after the hypostatical union of two natures in one person, it follows that whatever Christ says of himself, he says not as the possessor of either nature separately, but with reference to the whole of his character, and in his entire person, except where he himself makes a distinction. Those who divide this hypostatical union at their own discretion, strip the discourses and answers of Christ of all their sincerity; they represent every thing as ambiguous and uncertain, as true and false at the same time; it is not Christ that speaks, but some unknown substitute, sometimes one, and sometimes another; so that the words of Horace may be justly applied to such disputants:

Quo teneam vultus mutantem Protea nodo?—Pp. 101, 102.

“With regard to divine honours,” he shews, p. 105, that “as the Son uniformly pays worship and reverence to the Father alone, so he teaches us to follow the same practice.”

His interpretation of the word *Elohim*, and his exposition of various passages commonly adduced in this controversy, prove him to be an erudite, sagacious and sound biblical critic. Take for example his observations on Thomas's confession, John xx. 28:

“He must have an immoderate share of credulity who attempts to elicit a new confession of faith, unknown to the rest of the disciples, from this abrupt exclamation of the apostle, who invokes in his

surprise not only Christ his own Lord, but the God of his ancestors, namely, God the Father;—as if he had said, Lord! what do I see—what do I hear—what do I handle with my hands? He whom Thomas is supposed to call God in this passage, had acknowledged respecting himself not long before, John xx. 17, *I ascend unto my God and your God*. Now the God of God cannot be essentially one with him whose God he is. On whose word therefore can we ground our faith with most security; on that of Christ, whose doctrine is clear, or of Thomas, a new disciple, first incredulous, then suddenly breaking out into an abrupt exclamation in an ecstasy of wonder, if indeed he really called Christ his God? For having reached out his fingers, he called the man whom he touched, as if unconscious of what he was saying, by the name of God. Neither is it credible that he should have so quickly understood the hypostatic union of that person whose resurrection he had just before disbelieved. Accordingly the faith of Peter is commended—*Blessed art thou, Simon*—for having only said—*Thou art the Son of the living God*, Matt. xvi. 16, 17. The faith of Thomas, although as it is commonly explained, it asserts the divinity of Christ in a much more remarkable manner, is so far from being praised, that it is undervalued, and almost reproved in the next verse—*Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed*. And yet, though the slowness of his belief may have deserved blame, the testimony borne by him to Christ as God, which, if the common interpretation be received as true, is clearer than occurs in any other passage, would undoubtedly have met with some commendation; whereas it obtains none whatever. Hence there is nothing to invalidate that interpretation of the passage which has been already suggested, referring the words—*my Lord*—to Christ,—*my God*—to God the Father, who had just testified that Christ was his Son, by raising him up from the dead in so wonderful a manner.”—Pp. 112, 113.

Milton gives the Unitarian sense of most of the texts alleged by Trinitarians. He was aware of a various reading in Acts xx. 28, but he understands the word *blood* of offspring or son. He interprets 1 Tim. iii. 16, *God manifest in the flesh*, of the Father, who was manifested in the Son, his image; who was justified, &c. On Titus ii. 13, he says, that “the definitive article may be inserted or omit-

ted before the two nouns in the Greek without affecting the sense," adding, as if in anticipation of the vauntings of some modern scholars, "Surely, what is proposed to us as an object of belief, especially in a matter involving a primary article of faith, ought not to be an inference," "hunted out by careful research from among articles and particles, nor elicited by dint of ingenuity, like the answers of an oracle, from sentences of dark or equivocal meaning." Pp. 117, 118. He takes notice of the article-argument again in his examination of Jude, ver. 4, p. 120. He renounces the modern Arian notion of Christ being the angel that conducted the Mosaic dispensation, and quotes Heb. viii. 6, to shew that "it does not seem to have been suitable that Christ who was the minister of the gospel should also be the minister of the law." P. 122. He considers Isaiah ix. 6, favourable to the Antitrinitarian doctrine, for here Christ receives his name from the Father: he reads "Everlasting Father," *Father of the age to come*,—"that is, its teacher, the name of father being often attributed to a teacher." On this and other passages usually brought to prove the eternity of the Son, he reasons thus logically and unanswerably:

"Him who was begotten from all eternity the Father cannot have begotten, for what was made from all eternity was never in the act of being made; him whom the Father begat from all eternity he still begets; he whom he still begets is not yet begotten, and therefore is not yet a son; for an action which has no beginning can have no completion. Besides, it seems to be altogether impossible that the Son should be either begotten or born from all eternity. If he is the Son, either he must have been originally in the Father, and have proceeded from him, or he must always have been as he is now, separate from the Father, self-existent and independent. If he was originally in the Father, but now exists separately, he has undergone a certain change at some time or other, and is therefore mutable. If he always existed separately from, and independently of, the Father, how is he from the Father, how begotten, how the Son, how separate in subsistence, unless he be also separate in essence? since (laying aside metaphysical trifling) a substantial essence and a subsistence are the same thing. However this may be, it will be

universally acknowledged that the Son now at least differs numerically from the Father; but that those who differ numerically must differ also in their proper essences, as the logicians express it, is too clear to be denied by any one possessed of common reason. Hence it follows that the Father and the Son differ in essence."—Pp. 133, 134.

From a collection of passages relating to the divine honours of Christ, he concludes, (p. 143,) "that when we call upon the Son of God, it is only in his capacity of advocate with the Father."

This great writer concludes this most important chapter with a citation of texts, to prove that the doctrine which he has laid down "is alone taught in Scripture, is acceptable to God, and has the promise of eternal salvation;" to which he adds, that "this is the faith proposed to us in the Apostles' Creed, the most ancient and universally received compendium of belief in the possession of the Church." We regret that we have not been able to make larger extracts, as examples of his vigorous mind and accurate scriptural learning; especially from those parts of the chapter that are devoted to the exposure of the "Vertumnian distinctions and evasions" by which the reputed "orthodox" church, with her ever "ready subterfuge," makes the Scripture of none effect: but we are not without hope that this, with some other parts of the work, may be reprinted in a cheap form for popular circulation. The Unitarians would be wanting to their cause if they did not avail themselves of the discovery, proclaimed by Royal authority, that on the one great question between them and Trinitarians, they may now claim as their own, in addition to the mighty names of LOCKE and NEWTON, the not inferior name of MILTON.

ART. IV.—*Memoir of the Rev. Benjamin Goodier*. 12mo. pp. 265. Liverpool printed, and sold by R. Hunter, London. 1825.

SUCH of our readers as remember the account given of Mr. Goodier in our XIVth. Vol., pp. 69—74 and 142—145, will scarcely be surprised that his friends should devote this volume to his memory, and, we may

add, to the service of practical piety. He was an extraordinary young man, excelling equally in virtue and in talents. His example is a beautiful lesson to young men, and especially to young ministers; shewing the degree to which self-improvement may be carried, the tendency of an amiable disposition and pure morals to win esteem and friendship, and the consolation and support which a heartfelt sense of rational religion provides for the sick and dying bed.

The "Memoir" is drawn up by a nameless author. It is, however, well

known to be the work of a pen which would adorn any subject. The biographical incidents are of course few, but they are rendered exceedingly interesting by being related chiefly in Mr. Goodier's own words, taken from his Journals and Letters.

We heartily wish the volume an extensive circulation; and are sure that there are none of our serious readers that shall adopt our recommendation, who will not thank us for bringing under their notice so pleasant a picture of unspotted, useful and happy life.

OBITUARY.

1825. Oct. 5, aged 54, MARY, the wife of Mr. Thomas RYLAND, of *Birmingham*, whose faithful and exemplary discharge of the duties of a wife, a mother and a Christian, has rendered her removal no ordinary loss. Those who best knew her will most earnestly assent to the justness of the following observations on this mournfully interesting event: * observations so beautifully descriptive and appropriate, as to supersede not merely the necessity, but perhaps even the propriety, of any additional expressions of that sorrow and regard which was so sincerely felt by those who were acquainted with the real excellence of their lamented subject: "The sepulchre does not, in general, close over a treasure so rich as what we now consign to it. From a wide circle of kindred and of friends, an individual so practically wise, so kind, so circumspect, so habitually and unfeignedly devout, is not every day torn away." "Examples of the female character formed and adorned by religion, may be removed from our eyes: but they live, nevertheless, in memory and in hope. We think with profound, it may be, yet still with tempered grief on those who 'opened their mouth with wisdom, and on whose tongue was the law of kindness'—whose manners, the natural expression of their sobriety of mind, and affection of spirit, and firmness of principle, and correctness of understanding, and most perfectly free from vanity or pride, would have graced the highest circles, while they spread ease and pleasure and secured admiration and esteem wherever they appeared; on those who gave unostentatiously to religion their hearts,

and voices, and lives, neither disregarding the form, nor being strangers to the power of it—those whose children rise up and call them blessed."

Oct. 21, at *Chowbent, Lancashire*, in the 82nd year of his age, Mr. WILLIAM CANNON. He was born in the parish of Kells, in the upper district of the Stewartry of Galloway, Scotland, and was the third son of a large family, which had resided for nearly a century and a half, and which still resides, on the soil that gave him birth. Upon his entrance into life, Mr. Cannon made his selection of the trade of carpenter: shortly after the expiration of his apprenticeship, he removed to the adjacent towns in England, where a wider field for improvement in the business he had chosen, presented itself. Having two brothers at Bolton, he was induced to visit that neighbourhood about the year 1772, when the various inventions of Hargreaves, Arkwright and others made their first appearance in that district (being one of the earliest seats of the Cotton Trade in England): and availing himself of this new era of improvement, he there acquired the art of machine making, as a journeyman, and finally established himself at Chowbent for the manufacture of the various machinery then introduced. Shortly after his outset in this branch, he had to contend with the prejudices which existed against machinery, and the insults of mobs he met and resisted with manly firmness at the risk of his little property and of his life: his firmness, perseverance and strict integrity then and during the whole course of his life, secured to him the respect and esteem even of his enemies. From his early connexions he introduced a number of his young country-

* By the Rev. J. Kentish.

men as his apprentices, who have since settled in Manchester and other parts, and their industry and desire to obtain a knowledge of their business evince the goodness of the example he set before them: the intimate friendship which has always existed between him and them bear honourable testimony to the zeal with which he discharged his duties. He acquired in his business as machine maker a comfortable independence, sufficient for his simple and primitive habits, and had prepared for his two sons more extensive operations; but the great Disposer of events in his wisdom bereft him of that part of his family which he had hoped to succeed him—he in consequence retired from business in 1799. His activity and energy never deserted him; he found employment in the discharge of his duty to his neighbour and his friend. In religion he was a decided Unitarian, from a firm conviction that the doctrine he espoused was strictly scriptural, and, like the Puritans of old, he maintained it at all hazards. In politics he was a Whig, and with the same independent spirit he defended his opinions, and to his last moments was an inexorable foe to tyranny, oppression, and intolerance. His protracted illness he bore with exemplary resignation, and departed this life in the perfect hope of a better and more exalted state of existence.

This brief memoir is humbly submitted by one of his few surviving pupils.

Oct. 26, at *Bridgewater*, in the 81st year of his age, Mr. THOMAS OSLER, upwards of sixty years an active and valuable member of the Unitarian congregation in that place. Though exempted to a very late period from the usual infirmities of advanced life, and constitutionally

possessed of remarkable cheerfulness of mind, he had long looked forward to his dissolution with steadfast and resigned tranquillity; and finally closed, in devout peace, a long life diligently spent in doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly.

Oct. 26, in the 57th year of his age, WALTER FAWKES, Esq., of *Farnley Hall*, *Yorkshire*.

— 29, in the 25th year of her age, of pulmonary disease, MARIA BENNETT, second daughter of A. Bennett, minister of the Unitarian Meeting, *Poole*, *Dorsetshire*. It can be said with truth, that the deceased was highly respected by all who knew her, and many tears of affection and lamentation flowed on account of her death. In human judgment her character was virtuous, Christian, and pious, which gives to her parents and friends an humble but confident hope, that the Almighty and merciful God who gave her life and who has taken it away, will approve her, and make her eternally happy in his glorious presence. She was laid to rest in a vault in the burial-ground belonging to the above Meeting, on Friday, the 4th of Nov., and on the Sunday evening following, to a numerous and sympathizing audience, a very excellent and most impressive discourse was delivered on the occasion by the Rev. J. B. Bristowe, of *Ringwood*, from 2 Sam. xiv. 14.

A. B.

— 31, at *Edinburgh*, EMILY, wife of Archibald MACBEAN, Esq., Royal Horse Artillery, and only daughter of William Johnston, Esq., of *Muswell Hill*.

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC.

RELIGIOUS.

Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty.

(Continued from p. 633.)

One gentleman has applied for advice to this Society, from a place so distant as *Malta*. The case I am alluding to is that of Lieutenant Dawson, a gentleman of high character and connexions, of liberal education, who had been in the army from his earliest days, and who had fought the battles of his country in many

a land. In the year 1823, he was stationed at *Malta*. I have stated that he was a man of family and of character, but, above all, he was a man of principle, and he held the dictates of his conscience superior to any other mandate. He was directed on a particular day, a day of festivity, dedicated to the patron saint of the island, (for though *Malta* is under British dominion, it is a Catholic country; and there Catholics enjoy, as they ought to enjoy, the free exercise of their religious rights and ceremonies,) to pay a salute to the procession of this saint, as it passed along. I, who seek for toleration, or rather I, who loathe toleration

and seek for liberty, complain that a gentleman, a Protestant, who, with the conscience of a member of the Church of England, read in its homilies, and finding there that many of the ceremonies of the Roman Catholic Church, are idolatry, should have been commanded to cause the bells to ring, and a salute to be fired, because a procession moved upon the day dedicated to the patron saint. It was with this order that Mr. Dawson declined to comply, and his captain also refused; the major who commanded, did not insist on their compliance, but gave the order in their absence, and the bells were rung, and the salute was fired. He yielded to the scruples of those men who had bared their bosoms, and had fought when England waged a war with her enemies. The lieutenant and the captain were however summoned before a Court Martial, the president of which was a Roman Catholic; they were found guilty, and the sentence was confirmed by the Judge Advocate at home. The lieutenant and the captain were both cashiered, and the major was severely censured for his lenity. It seems then that, in performing his duty, an English officer must forget the claims of conscience; and that if he be so commanded, he must hail a sacrifice to Budhoo, and sanction the horrid murders committed under the pretence of religion.

To the next particular I shall but briefly advert, since it has been frequently before the public. It occurred the 29th of July last. On that day, two persons, of decent appearance, dressed soberly in black, with nothing unclerical in their exterior—nothing improper in their demeanour—waited on the Rev. William Marshall, a clergyman of the Established Church, in the town of *Newport Pagnell*. There these poor people introduced themselves into the presence of the Vicar of the parish, and in the course of their conversation presented to him a book containing the names of subscribers towards the erection of a chapel for the use of the General Baptist Revivalist's Society. They stated to him, that they had been deputed by the good people of that Society to collect subscriptions for the purpose stated; and they then came to solicit his aid. In doing this they certainly were *not* aware that they were in the presence of the clergyman of the parish; but even though they had been apprized of such a circumstance, they, Dissenters as they were, did not imagine themselves guilty of much presumption. Mr. Marshall turned on them as enemies of the Establishment—was astonished at their presumption—inquired their names—declared them to be impostors;—(which term he speedily retracted;) and

threatened them with punishment. After such a reception they naturally wished to withdraw; they desired to retire in peace; but even that poor privilege was denied them. No! they had approached too near the lion's den, and having once entered, it was in vain that they attempted to escape unhurt. The constable and the churchwardens were sent for, and although Mr. Marshall admitted that they were not impostors, yet he would have sent them to prison; for, as he said to them, "Some of your people are supposed to have committed a murder somewhere or other, and you are therefore dangerous persons, and must not be allowed to go at large;" accordingly they were then taken up to the house of the attorney, and there being no magistrate there, and none any where in the neighbourhood, with the exception of a certain clergyman of the Established Church, then engaged at a cricket-match, those very Reverend Divines were in consequence sent for from the cricket-ground, and one of them, a Rev. Mr. Lowndes, being called upon, he forsooth signed the mittimus under which these unfortunate men were deprived of their liberty, and lodged in a common gaol. That at such a place, such tyranny should have been perpetrated is what you, in London, can hardly conceive. You can scarcely form an idea of the scorn and obloquy which in more remote places are heaped upon the heads of Dissenters. In proof that these men were not impostors, and were entirely undeserving of the oppression which they endured, it was shewn that they had signed the declaration, had taken the oaths, and the book which they produced contained a signature, which, to every enlightened and liberal man, would have proved sufficient evidence, that of ROBERT HALL, of *Leicester*. In this conduct is combined that horrid mixture of malice and ferocity, buffoonery and cruelty, which characterized Nero, who fiddled when Rome was on fire. I will now read to you extracts from the minutes of the examination of these victims to High Church intolerance.

Mr. Marshall.—Do you know that you are breaking the law?

Horner.—No, I do not.

Marshall.—I do not wish to enter into any discourse with you, for I believe it is your intention to overturn the Establishment—by so doing you are breaking the law.

Edgell.—Did you ever see two men more like vagrants? How long have you been a preacher?

Horner.—About three years.

Marshall.—What were you before you became a preacher?

Horner.—A gentleman's servant.

Marshall.—Who did you live with?

Horner.—The Rev. Mr. Erskine.

Well, Sir, you seem to be the chief orator; let your learned brother come forward.

Edgell.—What were you before you were a preacher?

Wood.—A mat-maker.

Edgell.—There! did you ever see two men more like vagrants in your life? The one a livery-servant and the other a mat-maker! What school were you educated at?

Horner.—At that school where they teach to speak the truth and tell no lies.

To what denomination do you belong?

Horner.—The General Baptist *Revilists*.

Marshall.—It should have been *Revilists*.

William White said, "I believe they are collecting the money to put in their own pockets."

Mr. Marshall.—I do not think so; but I do believe their intention is to overturn the Establishment, therefore I give you into the hands of the constable.

The constable now took them into his custody, and they were committed to the gaol at Aylesbury, without even being apprised that they were entitled to appeal, or that they might be held to bail; there they were confined for three weeks, in common with the basest felons; amongst convicted thieves of the most abandoned character. Nay, more, they were sentenced to the tread-mill, and kept at hard labour there; though during the time one of them was afflicted with spitting of blood. Their papers were seized upon, their money was taken from them, and by means of it the expenses of sending them to prison were defrayed. So soon as my excellent friend, the Hon. ROBERT SMITH, the nephew of our Chairman, and the Member for the County, heard of this piece of ecclesiastical tyranny, he immediately rode twenty miles across to Aylesbury, determined that, in his county at least, no oppression should be practised with impunity. He went immediately to an attorney, whom he employed; he used every exertion that was possible, though without being able then to effect their liberation, but he was determined that, if possible, it never should be said that in his county tyranny should go unpunished; that if no other means could be obtained, he would himself defray every expense which might be incurred in their liberation and support. Immediately on my being made acquainted with the case, I sent a person down to Aylesbury to investigate the circumstances, and my intention, under advice, was to apply to the Court of King's Bench for a writ of habeas corpus. When Mr.

Lowndes discovered that we were determined to resist, and likely to resist with success, he let prudence take the place of passion—he let the men out of goal—he, the committing magistrate, having power to do so. It was long before their papers were returned to them. Yet all this, gentlemen, has been perpetrated in England—in Bucks—not in the remote district of Wales, or of Cumberland, but within a short distance of London, and yet, for my interference in such a case as this, I am called "*a meddling Attorney!*" Contrast what has been our conduct under existing circumstances with what would probably have been theirs had they been placed in our situation. Contrast our forbearance with their uncompromising severity; observe how they overbear and proscribe the timid and the weak, but how silent and subdued are they when confronted with those who understand their own rights, and are determined on their vindication. When first the committal of Mr. Lowndes came to be questioned, the Establishment took a high tone—their conduct was not to be animadverted on—all that they did was to be regarded as sacred—the lustre of their high name was not to be sullied by the disgrace of a prosecution. They subscribed largely to escape the threatened danger. They, forsooth, would not allow Mr. Marshall to be prosecuted. But a short time sufficed to moderate their haughty tone; they very soon applied to know on what terms we were willing to let Mr. Marshall off. What would induce us to forego the triumph which then awaited our cause? There never was an occasion that would have proved more tempting to an overweening or vindictive spirit. There never was a time when, if we desired a triumph, we could have obtained it in a more signal and decisive manner. But such was not our aim; for we wished to set our enemies a living example of that tolerant spirit which was to them unknown. You may, perhaps, think that we erred on the side of lenity, and betrayed too much kindness and indulgence to those who had dealt out towards us a full measure of harshness and severity; but we were determined *not* to imitate their evil example, and therefore to release them on terms which you perhaps will consider too mild, viz., that Mr. Marshall should apologise—that the apology should be in writing—that it should be advertised in the county papers—that he should pay the expenses incurred by the county attorney—and also present *Fifty Pounds* to the injured men. [Mr. Wilks then read from the "*Bucks Chronicle*" an advertisement, signed "*WM. MARSHALL*," which, after stating the particulars of the arrest and imprisonment

of Horner and Wood, went on to say, that the writer acted under the influence of a mistaken opinion, and deeply regretted the consequences of his error.]

When I was lately at a meeting in Bucks, I detailed to the persons there assembled the noble and excellent conduct of Mr. ROBERT SMITH. I told, and most truly told them, that it was their duty at the next election to crowd to the hustings in his support; and to such amongst you as have votes for that county, I feel bound to give the same advice, and to enjoin you to act under the impulse of that gratitude towards this young nobleman which ought, and which I am sure does, fill the breasts of all who are attached to the cause of Dissenters.

There is one other circumstance of considerable importance. Some clergymen have affected to doubt whether those who have not been baptized were entitled to be married in their parish churches. Of this a remarkable case occurred at *Langain*, in the diocese of St. David's. In that parish, DAVID DAVIDS was to be married to MARY JENKINS;—she belonged to the Society of Baptists. At the time appointed for the celebration of the marriage the resident clergyman was from home, and the Rev. DANIEL ROWLANDS, for the time, filled his place, and that person, though the banns had been previously published by the resident clergyman, thought proper to intimate that he would refuse to perform a ceremony to which the individual for whom he acted would have made no objection. The father of the young woman, understanding that some difficulty existed on account of his daughter having been brought up as a Baptist, waited on the clergyman for the purpose of ascertaining his intentions. Having arrived at that gentleman's house, he happened only to see his wife, who, holding a lofty tone upon the occasion, gave it as her opinion that certainly her husband would withhold marriage to Dissenters at his Church—and so the father came away.

In Wales a very ancient custom still prevails, one of which is spoken of by Tacitus as existing among the Germans of his day; it is the assemblage at every wedding of all the inhabitants of the surrounding country. This is called a "bidding," and forms a remarkable contrast to the retired and secret way in which marriages are generally solemnized amongst the upper ranks in this country. From an ancient paper which I have seen, the neighbours are bidden to the wedding, to partake of bread, butter and cheese, and are at the same time requested to bring with them their current offerings. On the occasion of the intended wedding of David Davids and Mary Jen-

kins, about two hundred of their neighbours were assembled to sympathize in their emotions on the happy occasion! All was festivity and glee; every countenance looked bright with pleasure, and every heart beat high with happiness! and all would have continued joyous, were it not for a clergyman of the Established Church! This clergyman had been previously heard to say to one of his neighbours, "*Come to Church to-day, and we shall have some fun!*" In conformity with his intention to create fun, as he was pleased to term it, he, instead of being in the usual place, was to be seen in the large pew beneath the pulpit. When the wedding party came to the church, it was intimated to him that the young couple came to be married, and he, addressing the intended bride, said, "Mary Jenkins, have you been baptized?" And receiving an answer in the negative, he replied, "Then I shall not marry you."—"Not marry me!" rejoined the disappointed girl, with consternation. Her natural feelings struggled strongly against her conscientious scruples. The clergyman repeated that he would not marry her unless she were baptized. "You are no Christian," said he; "you had better be baptized." She struggled long; at length she said she would consent to be baptized if she could be *immersed*. "Oh, there is not sufficient water for that," said the clergyman; "that cannot be!" The old father could endure this mockery no longer: he came forward and indignantly interfered. I think I see the old Welsh patriarch, the blood boiling in his veins. "No, Sir, I will not, I cannot endure this—your purpose is to dissolve my religion, and I will not submit to it—she shall not be baptized." The clergyman then repeated his determination *not* to marry the parties. They left the church, their friends followed them to bring them back, the clergyman was entreated to return—the young girl hesitated; I am sure you will not condemn the struggle between inclination and duty. Again within the church, the question was repeated—"Now will you be baptized?" She still hesitated, and the clerk was directed to bring the water. But at length *firmly she refused*. Yes! she determined that she would rather return and be *no bride*, than consent to the sacrifice of Christian principle, or to depart from the ordinances of that faith in which she had been educated. When the detail of this outrage upon religious feeling was communicated to me, I wrote immediately a polite letter to the clergyman in question. At first he hesitated, and then I wrote more peremptorily; he then replied to me, but it was from the Episcopal Palace of St. David's that he

addressed the letter. He replied in language of determined refusal and defiance. For a long month the nuptials of this couple were delayed; nor were they celebrated at all, until the return of the resident clergyman of the parish. Then they were married; and though we shall never see them, let us join in the wish that they may indeed be very happy! Now the remedy for the wrong done to the feelings of this unoffending pair and their friends is by a proceeding in the Ecclesiastical Courts—proceeding, forsooth, against a clergyman in a court where the judges are clergymen—the Bishop's Court, of the diocese of St. David's, where those who sanctioned the outrage would be called on to decide on its enormity—called on to pronounce their own condemnation. Though perfectly aware of the strong hold in which he was thus entrenched by the Ecclesiastical law, he was not content with being on his defence; he thought the best way to insure perfect impunity would consist in becoming himself the assailant, and not wait for any reprisal from those whom he had so deeply injured. Accordingly, he has instituted a suit against the old man, the father of Mary Jenkins, for *brawling* in the church, when he entreated that his child might not be compelled to deviate from the religious principles of her fathers. Now this brawling carries with it very heavy penalties, and the party convicted of it is liable to excommunication. In this way, it seems, the determination of the clergyman was to overwhelm this poor old man with costs, by bringing him before a court where none but clergymen are to judge a case where a clergyman is the complainant. We, however, by the advice of our excellent friend, Dr. LUSHINGTON, have been enabled to remove the case to the metropolis, where it is to be hoped that a more impartial hearing will be obtained; and I am determined, yes, *determined*, that no effort shall be spared to procure ample justice, and completely to vindicate the oppressed.

To many other subjects our attention has been drawn during the past year; amongst others, to an application to Parliament to concede to Unitarian Dissenters the right of being married in their own chapels. The "*British Critic*" has thought proper to say I am the author. The statement is incorrect—neither with the bill or with petitions for its enactment have I interfered—but I am still very desirous for its success. By this measure there would be licensed, for the purpose of matrimony, *three* chapels in the metropolis, *two* in five or six of the largest towns, and *one* in those of smaller size. It will also be required that these

shall be twelve months registered before marriages can be celebrated in them; that an inscription shall be on the outside, stating that they have been so registered, and the minister shall obtain a regular certificate of the same. The marriages may be performed either by license, or after banns published. If by the former mode, the license is to be obtained from the officers of the Established Church—if by the latter mode, the banns are to be published in church, and all fees are likewise to go to the Establishment. They, therefore, have reserved to themselves every portion of the profits and the power, with the exception of what relates to the mere act of celebrating the marriage itself. This bill, I hope, will pass; at the same time that I wish, as you do, that marriage should rather be regarded as a civil contract than as a sacred ceremony. However, it is perfectly laudable and natural that after a civil marriage has been performed, people should begin to wish about them the pious members of their congregation, that their pastor may breathe over them a prayer to heaven, that religion may sanction, and God may ratify the compact into which they have just entered.

I regret to say that in *France* efforts are making to restore the prerogatives of the Established Church in that country with regard to marriages, by seeking to make it necessary that the marriage by the priest should precede the civil marriage; the obvious design of which is to increase their own power and authority, and to terminate that which, for a century and a half, has been the blessing of that country.

ROMAN CATHOLICS, in this country, labour under considerable disabilities as regards their marriages; and the "*British Critic*" has thought proper to denounce the same "*meddling attorney*," of the name of Wilks, for interfering in this matter, with a view to place them in a better situation. This I consider no discredit; here at least my sectarian feelings could not have influenced me. The poor Irish who come here think that marriage is one of the sacraments of their Church; and that, in the eye of heaven, their state of life cannot be blameless, unless it have the benediction of their priest. And why should not such a marriage have the validity of law? One of the consequences of refusing that validity is, that the workhouses of this country are filled with multitudes of children, who, being in the eye of the law illegitimate, find a settlement in the parish where they were born, and cannot be sent to Ireland. I have interfered in this matter, and I will continue to interfere still further, confident that in this

assembly, however we may differ upon other points, the all-pervading sentiment of religious liberty glows in every breast, and beats in every heart!

In Canada great difficulties exist. It was a Catholic province, and there are also Protestants, Episcopalians, and Independents, and I believe Presbyterians have succeeded. At Montreal, a chapel for Independents has been erected. But still there we are refused the rights to marry and inter the dead; and there many persecutions do exist. But on his Majesty's Government the points must still be urged; and I would put it to them as statesmen. If we wish to maintain our place—if we desire still to navigate those vast lakes, let not these afflictive demons agitate and annoy!

As to the REGISTRY of BAPTISMS, some doubt still unhappily exists, and it is the opinion of Mr. Justice Bayley, a judge not less eminent for his integrity than for his legal skill, that the registry of a baptism is no registry of birth. The registers of Dissenters certainly never can be received in the same way with parochial churches; the one is a record universally recognized in the courts, but the entry in the registry, in Williams's registry, possesses no such force. Dissenters ought to know the real situation in which they stand; and, apprised of their peril, I trust they will join in an attempt to procure security.

There is another point on which it is absolutely requisite that we should be incessant in our solicitations, I mean the repeal of the *Test and Corporation Acts*; resolutions, however, on this subject, perfectly in unison with my sentiments, will be laid before you; and it is therefore the less necessary that I should now enlarge upon this subject. We are told by the "*Quarterly Review*" that many of the laws of which we complain are obsolete, and are rendered inoperative by the effect of the annual *Indemnity Act*; but I maintain that, notwithstanding that act, these laws do oppress us most severely, and an instance shall be given.—Mr. MUNN is a respectable solicitor at *Tenterden*, in Kent, and is much and deservedly esteemed by the corporation of that town, and who, on the death of his partner, was offered the situation held by him in that corporation; yet here the laws to which I have alluded prejudicially interfered, and deprived him of an honourable and lucrative office, otherwise within his reach. The design of the corporation in his favour was completely frustrated. The annual *Indemnity Act* furnished no remedy; if previous to any election notice was given that the candidate was a Protestant Dissenter, had not within the year received the sacrament

according to the ritual of the Established Church, every vote given in his favour was nullified; and hence the honest expectations of every man are frustrated, who loves his conscience and his God better than self! Here then is one flagrant instance, at the least, where the wishes of the corporation, and the hopes of an honest man, were entirely set at nought; and an individual was elected who otherwise could not possibly have succeeded. Let us then this day, and in this place, vow that we will never be satisfied until not a remnant of them shall remain! It is only by sound acquaintance with the generally diffused and unceasing exertions for their repeal, that we can ever hope to conquer these oppressive statutes. While they remain, they will be made instruments for our injury, and it is only by soundness in religious principle that we can prevent the continuance of these wrongs.—I turn to AMERICA. What was theory, is there fulfilled in fact. There, there is no state religion, and there is not a happier nation upon earth—there is not a country where education and religion are more eminently diffused! Each denomination is permitted to celebrate its own rites in perfect independence, and all live in perfect harmony and love! There they are not enlisting human power to support the arm of the Almighty—as though Omnipotence could not rule over his own dominion; and as though HE, whose will is destiny, wanted the withered arm of man to carry on his work below. I am glad of an opportunity of adverting to this, for it does honour to human nature: I will not permit myself to fear that freedom will continue to lie under a cloud. No! we who have our Bible Societies throughout the world—we who are sending missionaries to every part of the earth, ought not, must not, doubt that there is a change approaching when all its glory, all its ardent and demonstrating effects shall be fully known. No; we will not fear but that the love of liberty, the love of true and pure religion will yet burst forth with all its glorious and refulgent light. In this good cause then I trust that we shall all advance. When our old friends have departed, our younger ones will rally round the standard, and the inclination to sustain religious freedom shall grow into a principle. And if the spirit of oppression should still arise, I at least when departing will say in the words of that brave General who lay immortal and not dishonoured, but dying in the dust, "Fear not the mass of opposition; but ONWARDS, ONWARDS, ONWARDS, and expire!" Mr. Wilks sat down amidst long, loud, and reiterated cheering.

The Rev. Dr. BOGUE, in proposing the first resolution, considered the Society as most important, in consequence of its connexion with religion. He desired to impress the importance of religion in order to secure the enjoyment of civil and political liberty; religion was the surest foundation to liberty, and to her might be attributed all the freedom we enjoyed; and both would ever flourish together. When a man became religious, he began to feel his own dignity, and exclaims, I am an intelligent being: and would he who thus felt himself to be a man and a Christian, be treated as a dog? No; he would demand and obtain justice and freedom. Let justice be done, and let every one have justice rendered to him! Those were the principles of the gospel, and the principles of civil liberty.

The Rev. TIMOTHY EAST seconded the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

The Rev. JAMES BENNETT, of Rotherham, in rising to move the second resolution, began by remarking, that if the term "Religious Liberty" be censurable, it must be that it is a pleonasm; for true religion is always free, and the truest freedom is the most religious. Where true religion is, we feel the force of that maxim, "If the Son make you free, then you shall be free indeed." But while he held religious liberty to be the first blessing which a kind Providence had bestowed on the country, he was called upon to express a sentiment that the Established Church of this country was more tolerant than most others established by law. He thought they owed but little to the Establishment. It was to the true and enlightened patriots in the Legislature that their gratitude was due. To the Church they owed none. Were Religious Liberty to appear in the form of a fair nymph before that assembly, her brow bound round with myrtle—were she to be interrogated as to whom she owed most—she would say, To the Third William, and the four Georges. But while they owed so much to their princes, were they again to question that bright seraphim, to whom in earlier times she owed the continuance of those blessings, she would instantly reply,—To the persecuted Puritans; to their tears and to their blood I owe my establishment in this happy land. But if, on the other hand, Persecution should venture to appear, should we not say, Haggard fiend, with thy snaky locks and pestilent breath, what hast thou done, but created suffering and woe? But no! I should rather say, Though I so much detest thee, yet for some things which thou hast unintentionally done, I could almost rejoice in thee; because by expelling those Puri-

tans from our own land, thou hast planted them in America. He had that day discovered what he had never before known, why in so many countries the devil was worshiped. It must be that that arch demon has unintentionally done so much good. And if ever there could be a fiend whom he might be tempted to adore, it must be him whom he so heartily detested in the demon persecution. But while he rejoiced in the strength that overruled the demons, he could not but remember how much was due to the Royal House of Brunswick; and they should offer constant prayer for the life of their Prince; nor did he doubt that those prayers would avail; for though it was the maxim of *the Church*, No pence no pater, yet he rejoiced that the gate of heaven was open to their unpaid prayers when they said, "God save the King." Now it is well known, that should the King of England depart from the prescribed forms of the Established Church, he would forfeit his crown; and could they suppose that man is made of such metal as to forfeit an earthly for an heavenly crown? They had no right to impose such a necessity; and he prayed that the time might come when the Kings of England would no longer be liable to have their crowns snatched from their brow if they bowed to the dictates of their own conscience, rather than to the arbitrary mandates of the hierarchy. Still he felt the most cordial satisfaction in the persuasion, that this country possessed more liberty than any other, with one glorious exception. He could say, "England, with all thy faults I love thee." And though he had set his foot on another and another shore, he had still felt that he was not at home. His resolution was, "that as Protestant Dissenters they could not submit." That required some explanation. He had once thought that unresisting submission was the duty of Christians, but mature consideration had induced him to alter his opinion. Even our Saviour said, "If I have spoken evil, testify against me; but if well, why smitest thou me?" And when Paul had been wrongfully imprisoned, and the magistrates wished him to go sneaking out of prison, Paul said unto them, "They have beat us openly, uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast us into prison, and now do they thrust us out privily? Nay verily, but let them come themselves and fetch us out." And there is another kind of resistance with which the oppressors should be met—by love, by forgiveness, and most hearty prayers, that they might partake of the same spirit with themselves. Did he wish ill to the Established Church, he should say, Interfere not—let them go on

to ruin their own cause. But he was no such foe to the Established Church, and he would therefore say,—Deplore your errors—retrace your steps—and seek to raise your church to eminence by a display of those virtues held out by the example of Jesus to all mankind.

The Rev. JOHN TOWNSEND assured the meeting, that so entirely was he the friend of peace, that if he thought the Society tended in the least degree by its principles, constitution or proceedings, to the promotion of discord or disunion, he would be the last to approve or support it; but he contemplated it as an Institution formed for protection and defence, and principally of those who were unable to protect themselves. The representation that had that day been made to them sufficiently established the importance of its objects, and the propriety with which those objects were effected. The cases only of the two ministers apprehended at Newport Pagnell, and of the Welsh couple who had been refused marriage because they were Dissenters, were of themselves amply sufficient to prove the utility of the Society. But for its assistance those parties never could have obtained redress. And thus, while protecting the feeble against the mighty, the Society should by all be justly approved. And he particularly would remember, not only the good that it has actually performed, but *the evil it has prevented*. Doubtless had it not been for its existence, even worse instances of persecution would have occurred; for it was well known that in this Society the humblest would be able to procure redress, and thus the proudest were cautioned to “Beware.” He knew many clergymen who were most excellent and kind, and who would be as ready as himself to deprecate the various instances of wrong which others of their body had performed. He concluded by re-expressing his warm attachment to the *principles* of the Society, and his desire for its success.

The Rev. SPEDDING CURWEN moved the two next resolutions, which were seconded by

The Rev. Dr. CODMAN, from America, who assured the meeting that he should have hesitated to step forward upon that occasion, had not the kind, affectionate and liberal sentiments which had been expressed in reference to his beloved country, really compelled him to appear. And though an American, it afforded him the highest pleasure to address a Chair filled by a Member of the British Parliament. With uncommon pleasure he had attended at the meeting, and had listened to the proceeding which had occurred, but with especial delight to the luminous

and most interesting Report which had been delivered by their truly eloquent and enlightened Secretary, whose name, with that of his venerable father, and his active and pious brother, in the city of Paris, would to him be ever dear. Descended from Puritan ancestors, and coming from a part of the world which was peopled by the Nonconformists of this country, he could not but rejoice in the establishment of a Society for the support of those principles for which these holy men left their native shores, and planted the standard of the cross in the western world. The meeting would be now persuaded to rejoice with him, when he assured them that in *America* there was no need for the establishment of *such* a society! There every denomination enjoy the same rights and privileges. There, he thanked God, no question would arise as to the emancipation of *any* body—for there *every* man, whether Catholic or Protestant, Episcopalian, Presbyterian or Baptist, or of any other denomination, is eligible to serve in the highest offices of state. And no evil had been produced; but effects precisely the reverse;—and he would conclude with an expression of his ardent wish that Religious Liberty would prevail, unshackled and complete, in every country throughout the world.

The Rev. JOSEPH FLETCHER, M. A., in proposing the next resolution, observed, that the atmosphere was oppressive—but it was the atmosphere of liberty! He felt that duller should he be than the dull leaf that grew on Lethe’s banks, if he did not willingly take a part in the proceedings of the day. It had been well remarked, that religion and liberty must ever be intimately allied, and that in their true principles they were identified:—where religion was received, liberty would be permitted—and where liberty, with its moral and religious influence, was established, religion would be permanent and secure. He could not but regret the existence of such a Society as the present—or rather the *necessity* for its existence. And yet he must mingle rejoicings with his lamentations, that, in the midst of such dire necessity, an agency so powerful and efficient had been raised up. Thus when God intended the serpent should be strangled, he provided the strength of an Hercules for the achievement;—and thus, when a brooding darkness was gathering over the kingdom, and the great principles of liberty were exposed to innovation, this Society arose to establish them on a proper basis, and, by its effectual and efficient operation, to form the only compensation that can be received for the wrongs inflicted and the evils endured. He rejoiced that

the Chair was filled by one who was uniformly the powerful and constant advocate of civil and religious liberty, and he looked with confidence to his support when the great question concerning the Test and Corporation Acts should be brought before the British Senate. He knew the value of conscience—he felt that liberty was indeed the most invaluable possession—that liberty gave the flower-fleeting life its lustre and perfume; hence that the cause of God can never require the petty bulwarks of man for its support—or human efforts retard the growth of *that* kingdom which is not of this world. He mentioned that the Bishop of St. David's lately called on Dr. Boothroyd, an author and Dissenting minister in the North of England, conversed with him of literary subjects, and walked with him to his carriage at the inn; observing, when complimented on his condescension, There is no aristocracy in the republic of letters! He wished the sentiment to be applied to the Christian world—he would not undervalue the splendour of rank—he would not pluck a laurel from the brow dignified with the wreath or the coronet—but when he entered the church of God, he then felt that there should be no aristocracy, that they had one Master, even Christ, and that here all men were brethren.

After several other gentlemen had addressed the meeting, Dr. BROWN said he must ever maintain, that the mere right to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience, no man daring to make him afraid, was not all that could be desired or deserved—he could not think *that* liberty which imposed any disabilities for matters of faith. He never looked to the word *toleration* without a feeling of degradation. He regretted that an unaccountable backwardness pervaded the minds of Dissenters in the assertion of their rights, and in the vindication of their characters. He contended that for talent—for wealth—for independent and patriotic principles, the Dissenters were not a whit behind their brethren of the Church. He remembered that Howard, with whose character he was intimately acquainted, was exposed to all the penalties of the Corporation Act. He was liable to a penalty of £500 for taking on himself the office of Sheriff, yet he did take it, and it was the acceptance of this office, with all its penalties, that led to all his subsequent and philanthropic and godlike enterprises. He then adverted to the difficulty which existed as to the Register of Births. The only effectual remedy which, as far as his experience went, was, that the father of a family should insert in his will the date of the birth of his children—that could be pro-

duced in a court of justice; and he hoped that it would be adopted, till some better mode could be devised. He moved the resolution with great satisfaction. He had seen men of legal eminence and high rank occupy that Chair, and he was glad that now some of their legislators came to hear what it was they required; and he doubted not but that the Honourable Chairman would, when the important time arrived, stand forward to advocate their cause.

The Rev. Mr. DWIGHT, from America, assured the meeting, that till then he knew not that any occasion for such a Society existed. He had once, when travelling in Switzerland, been mistaken for an Englishman—and having at Lausanne met with one who had been banished from his country for his attachment to the cause of God—he said, as an Englishman, "Give me the liberty of a British monarchy, and not the liberty of Switzerland oppression."—He told them that in England no man could suffer on account of religion, every man could preach any where what he believed to be the word of God; and when he heard the statement that day made, he remembered that conversation, and could not but think, Where was he? Surely not in England! There could not be such things in the country from which he was descended. In America there was no persecution for religion; all there was free, but with one exception, the African Slavery. But he must in her defence say, that she was bound not to interfere in that for a period as yet incomplete. In America there could be no refusals to marry; if the minister of one sect refused, you had but to go to that of another, or to the magistrate, let him be Jew, Mahometan or Heathen, it mattered not: churches were open to all—and every American possessed an equalization of right, and a community of privilege.

The resolution of thanks to the Chairman, proposed by Dr. Brown and the Rev. Mr. Dwight, was received with repeated acclamations, and the whole of the vast assembly rose to express their approbation in a most distinguished manner.

The CHAIRMAN assured the meeting that his feelings could not be expressed. On ordinary occasions he might utter fluently his acknowledgments, or receive approval with some consciousness of desert, but that praise from an assembly so numerous, respectable, intellectual, and well principled, afforded him a pleasure he could not describe. The interest excited by the information communicated and the vast eloquence displayed, had never been surpassed; and he should

ever rank the honour of presiding at that assembly among the proudest circumstances of his life. But if language could then ill express the emotions he felt, he would endeavour hereafter to evidence their intensity by the better eloquence of deeds. By his honoured friend, their excellent Secretary, they had been informed that he was a member of the Established Church, yet from his youth he had been the friend of Religious Freedom, and conscientiously disclaimed any approval of what was denominated *the High Church*. He was no *High Churchman*, nor could any person in that room more dislike or deplore the doctrines and conduct which that party taught and displayed. The true interests of the Church they could never promote,—for high assumption would disgust and repel many whom moderation and Christian charity would retain and attach. The impressive statement to which he had listened with an eager ear, and an anxious heart, would confirm his dislike, and make him hold perfect toleration, or rather perfect Religious Liberty, additionally dear.

He almost partook the astonishment which the gentleman from America described; but felt a shame and sorrow which he trusted no native of America would ever know. Though aware that wrongs are often done from acrid prejudice, and by petty power, he had no conception that such abuses existed, and that there was such cause for complaint. He had heard the too long catalogue of ignorance and bigotry with displeasure and pain. Could he have thought of interruption to public worship, by unlawful demands of tolls—of taxation for the relief of the poor sought to be charged for buildings raised by true benevolence, for the preaching of truths that lessened the number of the poor, and gave to the necessitous their best relief!

But that in England, Dissenting teachers should be seized and sent to the Tread-mill—that interment should be refused to the departed—and that rites of marriage should be withheld, were events of which even in his moodiest moments, he had never dreamt. Of the persons guilty of those deeds he was more disposed to speak in sorrow than in wrath. Pity prevailed: he regretted that any fatuity should lead to such results, and thought that probably the contempt that must follow on such deeds might be punishment enough. The necessity and importance of that Institution who could doubt? Now public opinion too had a great and just authority, and the existence of this Institution, and their publication of such deeds, would either prevent their recurrence or ensure redress. Yet he must hope liberal principles and

a true tolerant spirit did not decline; he thought that he discerned their exercise, and though there were dark clouds, yet the sun of knowledge was daily diffusing new and brighter beams, and finally the clouds would be dispelled. On general education he placed a great reliance. A well-instructed people could not be slaves or bigots; and he should ever strive to promote on liberal principles the universal and religious education of the poor. In the resolution of the meeting as to the Test and Corporation Acts, he concurred with all his heart. No difference of religious ceremonies or opinions should exclude from office, or lead to a monopoly of power. Those acts were founded in injustice, and their retention could only be intended as an insult to the great and useful portion of the people who were thereby oppressed. That insult ought to end. Too long had the Dissenters allowed those acts to remain—various and good reasons might have delayed their exertions, but those circumstances have now ceased; and a general, respectful, but hearty application for their total abrogation should now be made, nor should they be daunted if they did not meet with immediate success. Again, again, and again, should they renew their applications; and the righteous cause of a body so great and so respectable must finally prevail. And whenever the application should be made, his principles, his inclinations, his gratitude, would all induce him to afford his support. Renewing his acknowledgments for the pleasure received, and the honour conferred, the Chairman retired amid universal acclamations, and the meeting was dissolved.

The newspaper from which we take this report says, with self-evident truth—"Mr. JOHN SMITH, the Chairman, is not Mr. W. Smith, M. P., for Norwich," and adds, "but is M. P. for Medhurst, brother to Lord Carrington, and uncle to the Hon. R. Smith, M. P., for the county of Bucks."

Shropshire, Cheshire and Staffordshire Unitarian Association.

THE Third Half-yearly Meeting of this Association was held at the Chapel on Delamore Forest, on Tuesday, the 27th of September. [At the last meeting, held at Nantwich, Mr. Bakewell of Chester proposed that the next meeting be held at his chapel, supposing that it would meet the approbation of his congregation, and probably contribute to the advancement of the cause of truth in that city. On communicating this design, many approved, none objected. But after ministers were engaged to preach, and public notice

given, some individuals signified their disapproval of such a meeting, and their minister, finding that he could not remove their objections, consented to annul all the arrangements that had been made. It being so near the day appointed for meeting when this unexpected opposition was made, there was scarcely time for making other arrangements, nor any possibility of giving proper notice of those which were hastily made. If any persons were disappointed, this explanation, it is hoped, will exculpate the person who gave the notice that the meeting would be held at Chester. In justice to the Chester congregation it must be mentioned, that nearly twenty of its respectable members attended this meeting to testify their approval of the existence of such Association.] In the morning there was a public service at the chapel, the devotional parts of which were conducted by the Revds. Green and Ashton, and the sermon was preached by the Rev. J. G. Robberds, from John x. 30, "I and my Father are one;" shewing that the Oneness of Christ with the Father was not that of essence or nature, but of will, design, and co-operation, in effecting the glorious purposes of the Gospel. The argument was clear and powerful, illustrating, by a happy reference to other parts of scripture, the meaning of the passage under consideration. In contending for the truth, the preacher earnestly sought to produce impressions cheering to the mind and improving to the heart. Should this sermon ever make its appearance in print, it will be a valuable tract to put into the hands of those who so confidently declare that God and Christ are one Being; and of those too, who, having embraced correcter views on this controverted subject, have yet to learn the practical value of Christ's declaration, "I and my Father are one." After the usual business of the Association was transacted, the friends, both male and female, to the number of forty-five, repaired to a small village, about a mile distant from the chapel, to partake of a friendly dinner.

The circumstances under which the meeting was held at that place led to a general expression of opinion with regard to the utility of forming and supporting such associations. During the afternoon the meeting was addressed by Messrs. Robberds, Hincks, Bakewell, Hawkes, Astbury, Cooper, Ashton, Philp, Green, Marriott, and Johnson. Most of the persons who attended the morning service, with several strangers, went to the chapel in the evening at half-past six. The Rev. J. Marriott conducted the devotional service and read the Scriptures; and the Rev. W. Hincks preached from Eccles. vii. 10, "Say not thou, What is the cause that the former days were better than these? for thou dost not inquire wisely concerning this." The words declare the object of the preacher, viz. to shew the superiority of the present over former times in respect to the improvement and condition of mankind.

RICHARD CARLILE is said in the newspapers to have been let out of goal without fine or bail. We understand that a petition was sent to the Secretary of the Home Department, for his release.—Application has been made to the present Lord Mayor, (VENABLES) to put a stop to the *Christian Evidence Society*, meeting in Cateaton Street, under the conduct of a Mr. Taylor, formerly a clergyman, for the sake of impugning the doctrines of Divine Revelation. The worthy magistrate states that similar applications had been made to his predecessor, GARRATT. He says that the "irreligious conduct of the persons promoting the objects of the Society is disgusting in the extreme—but that he does not entertain the slightest intention of noticing the communications made to him in any other way than by expressing publicly his contempt for the Society, about which so much unnecessary alarm had been felt." This appears to us to be the right course. Had the same wise policy been adopted with regard to Carlile, he would never have been looked up to either as a hero or a martyr.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from Dr. Evans; Messrs. W. Johns; A. Clarke; and H. R. Bowles: and from Spectator; A Berean; and C.

The suggestion of a *General Index* to the Twenty Volumes of the Monthly Repository is under consideration.

ERRATA.

P. 596, col. 2, line 2 from the top, for "Seldon," read *Selden*.

— 602, col. 2, 17 lines from the bottom, dele the inverted commas.

— 602, col. 2, 11 lines from the bottom, add, "Vol. I. pp. 360—362."