

THE
Monthly Repository

No. CCXLI] JANUARY, 1826. [Vol. XXI.

Observations on the Miracle recorded in John ix.

“ — the account of the cure and examination of the blind man, in the ninth chapter of St. John’s Gospel, bears every mark of personal knowledge on the part of the historian.” —

IF a miracle precisely of this kind were reported to have been very lately wrought in our own neighbourhood; if, on any decent authority, we were informed that a man said to have been blind from his birth had, on the sudden, received the sense of vision, and had received it entire, and independently, on any ordinary means of cure and relief, and professedly by a miraculous power exercised in his behalf; we should not, I presume, be indifferent to the report. I have supposed that it comes to us on decent authority; for which reason, we should hardly dismiss it without some investigation. When no inquiry takes place, there can be no enlightened judgment on the effect of evidence, no proper conviction, whether of truth or falsehood. Some men’s unbelief has a sort of *credulousness*: for he who, without and against testimony, admits every report, and he who admits not even what unexceptionable testimony sustains, possess no very different states of mind; they have the same want of discrimination, the same imbecility of intellect.

In the case which I have been putting, what would be our points of examination? Should we not ask, Who the man was on whom a miracle is said to have been wrought? Whether, in fact, he had been born blind? Whether he was blind at the time when his benefactor met him; and whether it afterwards appeared that he was, in truth, cured? * Let us pursue these questions: let us observe whether such inquiries were made, and how they were answered, in an instance which claims to be

matter of history, and not of supposition.

Who was the subject of the alleged miracle? Although, till this moment, he had been a stranger to sight, he possessed, nevertheless, the use of the other senses, and of the faculties of his mind. “He is of age,” said his parents; “ask him; he shall speak for himself;” which he did with great propriety and effect, in a manner which clearly proved that he was master of his reason, and a competent judge of his own situation, and of the questions with which he was addressed.

But had he, in fact, been born blind? This point too was naturally and carefully examined by the adversaries of Jesus Christ.† The Jews did not believe concerning him that he had been blind and received his sight, until they called his parents, of whom they made the inquiry. His parents, however fearful they were of giving a reply which might seem to acknowledge any faith of theirs in the Messiahship of Jesus, answer, “We know that this is our son, and that he was born blind.” Can evidence be more decisive as to his identity and his former situation? For the rest, they refer the inquirers to their son himself.

Here a third question is suggested: Was he actually blind at the time when his benefactor is stated to have relieved him by a miracle? Nor was this part of the case overlooked by our Saviour’s foes; nor was the doubt (if indeed doubt had any existence) unresolved. The change in this person’s condition and appearance seems to have excited astonishment: and the historian tells us, very artlessly and unaffectedly, that “the neighbours who before had seen the man that he was blind, said, ‘Is not this he who sate and begged?’” At first, their opinions were rather divided on this head: some said, “This is he;”

* Sermons by William Gilpin, Vol. III, No. 16.
VOL. XXI.

* Ver. 21. † Vers. 13, &c., 24, &c.

others said, "He is like him;" and any suspicion of his identity, if any yet remained, was instantly done away by his avowing, "I am he." His answer to the inquiry, "How were thine eyes opened?" proves, as does the inquiry itself, that up to this moment he had been blind. Of the same purport, and conclusively to the same fact, is his subsequent language,* "One thing I know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see."

But the most comprehensive and important question of all remains: it is, Whether we have evidence that the man was, in truth, cured? Now this very inquiry was made on the spot where the miracle is alleged to have happened, at the time when it is said to have been wrought, and in the presence of the persons who were most disposed and best able to scrutinize the report.

It cannot be immaterial to observe that our Lord previously intimated his design of performing a miracle in favour of this individual, and, by this intimation, courted the scrutiny which his mighty deeds would bear: "I must work the works of Him that sent me, while it is day; the night cometh when no man can work—as long as I am in the world I am the light of the world;" its light in the highest and most interesting of all senses, but, at the same time, in the act by which I give sight to those who are literally blind! When he had thus spoken, he proceeded to remove the blindness of this individual: and should it be objected that, in effecting the removal of it, he seemed to employ means which some may regard as naturally leading to that end, the answer is obvious—he used these signs, with the view of denoting that he himself was the instrument of Almighty God in granting this extraordinary relief.

The cure was so instantaneous and perfect, that it could not have been brought about by merely human agency or outward remedies. Men who by any ordinary applications receive their sight, after long and total blindness, cannot however for a considerable time endure the rays of light, but must be introduced to it by degrees, and with the nicest caution. I may even intimate the probability that with-

out a miracle such applications would aggravate and confirm, and not remove, the evil.

Happily for the Christian cause, the Pharisees sifted the evidences and the circumstances of this cure with the utmost rigour. Still they could not deny the event—either its existence or its quality. All which they could finally object, was, that the miracle had been wrought on the Sabbath-day, that he who performed it was therefore a sinner, that of such a cure there had been no previous example, and that the subject of it was a man of humble rank; objections which could weigh nothing against direct evidence.

If we examine yet more carefully the language and deportment of the individual who thus received his sight, and those of our Lord's enemies, we perhaps shall have a still fuller conviction of the reality of the miracle.

The account given by the patient himself is this: "A man, who is called Jesus, made clay, and anointed mine eyes, and said unto me, Go to the bath of Siloam, and wash; and I went and washed and received sight." Here we have an extremely plain and inartificial testimony, in which he who had been blind persevered, in despite of all the endeavours that were used to make him retract it; nay, though for continuing to bear it he suffered the lesser excommunication,* or was cast out of the synagogue. In truth, nothing can be more pertinent than this man's answers to the questions of the Pharisees; nothing, of the sort, more judicious and convincing than his remarks; nothing more natural and impressive than his acknowledgment of the Messiahship of him who had poured the light of day on his recently sightless eye-balls. No wonder that he who uttered such language † admitted the claims of Jesus, and prostrated himself before him, not in token of adoration, but in proof of his submission to him, as his religious Lord and Teacher!

There is something too in the whole of what the Pharisees said and did, on this occasion, which denotes that vice and passion were now struggling with their judgment. They cannot meet

* Ver. 34. See the marginal translation, and Bishop Pearce, in loc.

† Vers. 36—39.

* Ver. 25.

direct testimony in behalf of the act; while they take great pains to bring it into doubt and suspicion, by means of objections which have no proper relation to the case. What they say to the parents of the man, to the man himself, and to Jesus, indicates the anger of persons who feel that they are baffled and disappointed. They have recourse to calumnies and threats and violence, the sure indications of a bad cause. How perfectly frivolous the plea, "This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the Sabbath-day"! How significant the act of excommunication; and how self-condemnatory the declaration, "Thou wast altogether horn in sin, and dost thou teach us?" Yet the Pharisees were at the head of a numerous body of the Jewish people: they were what our Lord termed them, "blind teachers of the blind;" and it was by authority, not by argument, that they induced any of their countrymen to resist the power with which he acted, and the wisdom and persuasion with which he spoke.

If we compare the several parts of this narrative with each other, we shall be sensible that it exhibits the strongest marks of what Paley calls "personal knowledge" in the historian: it possesses a vividness and circumstantiality of description, which are incompatible with the supposition of its having been framed on any inferior authority. Such a comparison I have now instituted: let me hope that, as the result of it, my readers are more fully satisfied of the Evangelist John having been an eye-witness of the event which he here records.

I finish this series of remarks by adding, that Christianity invites, sustains, and will abundantly reward, *investigation*. As the Pharisees by narrowly examining into the miracle before us established its reality,* so the adversaries of the gospel, both in early and in succeeding times, have undesignedly but powerfully served the cause which they laboured to overthrow.

N.

* Archbishop Newcome on our Lord's Conduct, &c., p. 489, 2d ed.

SIR, December 7, 1825.

THOUGH I cannot but feel gratified by the approbation of your correspondent Mr. Cogan, as expressed in your Number for October last, [XX. 606,] yet, I trust, that he will allow me to differ from him on what I conceive to be the purport of his remark on the term *mystery*. Nothing, I admit, can be more justly censurable than that love of the mysterious on subjects of religion by which many theologians, Protestant as well Roman Catholic, are unfortunately characterized; but, in my opinion, those writers who deviate into the opposite extreme are not less obnoxious to reprehension. From the language adopted by many Unitarians in particular, we might be led to imagine that the term *mystery* ought to be for ever abolished, and that it can never be consistently applied to any of the inferences of natural religion, or to any of the doctrines of pure Christianity. That it has been made a subterfuge by controversialists when pressed with difficulties which they find themselves unable to answer, must be acknowledged and lamented; but yet it is perfectly obvious, that there are numerous theological and metaphysical propositions to which it is impossible to refuse our belief, though, at the same time, they confessedly exceed the limits of human comprehension. Nor is it to be disguised that there are some few, even, which wear the semblance of contradiction, and which nevertheless require, if not the full assent, yet certainly the acquiescence of our imperfect understandings. In a greater or less degree, mystery appears to be inseparable from many doctrinal points of religion as well as of metaphysics; and those who are the greatest enemies to the name, and who would fondly persuade themselves that they have banished it from their creed, afford apposite examples of the fault they condemn.

It is affirmed by a writer highly esteemed among the Unitarians, that the great advocates for the final extinction of the impenitent after enduring ages of torture, have been avowed members of that denomination of Christians; and yet there cannot exist a doubt that these individuals were firm believers in the infinite jus-

tice and benevolence of the Deity. All, therefore, who hold a tenet only less terrific than the eternity of future torment, must believe that the all-merciful Father of the human race can consistently with his benevolence render the existence of the majority of his creatures a curse instead of a blessing! They must maintain, or, at least, if not inconsistent with themselves, they ought to maintain, that justice is compatible with the infliction of a preponderance of evil, and with the persuasion that a Being of boundless compassion may sacrifice the happiness of the many to that of the few. This is surely only one remove from the horrors of Calvinism.—But it is really almost incredible that the same doctrine of final annihilation should be entertained even by some of the defenders of philosophical necessity; and, if I mistake not, this was the case with Dr. Priestley for a considerable period of his life.

To believe that intelligent creatures are placed in a world without their consent, (to adopt an expression of Bishop Newton,) where their volitions, in the crimes which they commit, and the depraved habits which they form, are the necessary result of circumstances over which they have no controul; to believe that, in consequence of this conduct and these habits, they will undergo either eternal punishment, or temporary punishment with final extinction; and yet to believe that their Creator is a being of irresistible power and infinite goodness, is indeed to embrace a mystery at which human reason “stands aghast,” and human faith may justly be “confounded.” How can it excite surprise that the Necessarian doctrine, unaccompanied with a belief of the ultimate happiness of the species, should be rejected by so many acute and inquiring men with absolute abhorrence?

Allow me to mention an example which is applicable to no particular party, of the necessity of assenting to what is mysterious in the truest sense of the word. It is evident, from the discussion on the *origin of evil*, which occupied some of your former pages, but which I have no intention to revive, that we must unavoidably believe—either that it was not in the power

of the Almighty to exclude evil from his works, or that he designedly made use of it for effecting some ulterior purpose. Of those who embrace the first of these opinions, that the Supreme Being could not possibly prevent the intrusion of *moral* as well as natural evil, we might reasonably inquire—what utility can result from the *prohibition of sin*, when its prevalence is foreseen, and its necessity acknowledged? The inability of the Creator to exclude it, is only rendered more conspicuous by the promulgation of ineffectual mandates. Nor does it seem to be altogether compatible with our ordinary ideas of justice, to represent the Moral Governor of the universe as commanding his feeble and short-lived creatures to avoid that which he himself, in all the plenitude of his power, is unable to avoid! Will any one undertake to affirm that this creed is not incomprehensible?

But supposing the second part of the alternative to be adopted—that evil is purposely selected as the *instrument* of good; then the Deity may be considered as issuing his peremptory commands against what he has expressly ordained, and as declaring his abhorrence of what he knows will be productive of good. In one view, however, this side of the question is attended with less difficulty than the other; for the Divine Being may very consistently prohibit his imperfect creatures from making use of moral evil for the promotion of good, though he himself may adopt that method, because it is impossible that their limited faculties should foresee the remote consequences of their plans, or should provide against the numerous circumstances which may frustrate their benevolent intentions. Still even this hypothesis is surrounded by darkness, which we shall in vain attempt to penetrate. But without repeating any of the remarks that were made on this topic on a former occasion, I will merely ask one question. If the prohibitions against the practice of moral evil were universally obeyed, where would be that portion of happiness which vice, as we now believe, is made instrumental in producing? If the precepts of religion were invariably complied with, one great source of moral and intellectual enjoyment

ld confessedly be lost; that is, he would be much less real bliss if mankind were uniformly virtuous, than will result from the actual prevalence of the worst passions and the most atrocious deeds! The commonly-received maxim, that the world would be a paradise if men were universally pure and righteous, must, on this supposition, be false, and the following paradoxical conclusion stares us in the face:—that it is in the highest degree expedient that the majority of the human race should trample on the laws of virtue and religion, and egregiously violate the commands of their Maker!

Notwithstanding these appalling difficulties, one or other of the two opinions I have here described we must necessarily embrace, and in either case it is impossible to avoid believing what is *transcendently mysterious*. The true ground of complaint appears to be, not that men should assent to what the human intellect in its highest vigour cannot comprehend, for this, with our present imperfections, is inevitable; but that they should *enforce* the belief of *palpable contradictions*, and should prohibit others from calling them in question, under the pretext of their being *sacred mysteries*.

All that I mean to assert is, that to whatever system of faith we may be attached, mysteriousness, abstractedly considered, does not furnish a substantial argument against the truth of any doctrine which involves no absolute contradiction, (similar to Dr. Coppleston's example of apparent incongruity,) and which is sufficiently supported by reason or revelation.

CLERICUS CANTABRIGIENSIS.

P. S. In his extraordinary vindication of the genuineness of the *Three Heavenly Witnesses*, your correspondent Ben David [XX. 533] seems to consider it as self-evident that if the text be once admitted to signify *unity of testimony*, it can never be adopted as an argument by the advocates of the Trinity. But what is the language of one of the greatest champions of orthodoxy in the Anglican Church? It is clear that Ben David never met with the following passage in Bishop Horsley's Sermons: "The

apostle says, *These three are one*; one in the unity of a consentient testimony; for that unity is all that is requisite to the purpose of the apostle's present argument. It is remarkable, however, that he describes the unity of the testimony of the three celestial and the three terrestrial witnesses, in different terms; I conceive, for this reason: of the latter, more could not be said with truth, than that *they agree in one*, for they are not one in nature and substance: but the Three in heaven being in substance and in nature one, he asserts the agreement of their testimony in terms which predicate their substantial unity, in which the consent of testimony is necessarily included; lest, if he applied no higher phrase to them than to the terrestrial witnesses, he might seem tacitly to qualify and lower his own doctrine."

Critical Synopsis of the Monthly Repository for December, 1824.

HISTORY OF THE IRISH PRESBYTERIANS. Few readers, probably, are aware of the almost complete toleration which has been granted for a century to the Irish Presbyterians. After perusing the present account, one cannot but ask the question, where would be the danger of admitting the English Dissenters to at least an equal footing with that indulged to their Irish brethren?

There is something quite imposing in the ecclesiastical order and system of Presbyterianism. We Unitarians and Independents talk and feel much about the value of our liberty, and of its being unfettered by the restraints of discipline and supervision. But after all, such a system is only adapted to a few strong and independent minds. A majority of mankind actually love subjection to some controul. They love to have their path marked out before them. The conscious weakness of the individual flies for support to some exterior apparatus of combined numbers. One's numerical and perhaps personal insignificance borrows a sweet importance from one's affiliation with an organized body of reverend men. Such a system will doubtless at times

become the instrument of ambition and tyranny, and be subjected to other inconveniences; but I question if they may not be more than compensated by the order, beauty and momentum infused by it into the life of social religion. Have not many young Unitarian preachers experienced a feeling of desolation from the solitary and unleaning bravery with which they have been compelled to throw themselves on the current of their duties? They want some immediate, fixed and definite standard of ecclesiastical authority to refer to in doubtful cases; some system of rules as the channel of their general exertions; some sympathy and even controul from an uniform community. What mighty effects were produced by the monastic orders! Do we suppose that the Reformation has eradicated from the human breast the *esprit-du corps*? Proud and mistaken Unitarians! It still survives, and operates as one of the most effectual engines that play from every quarter on your cause. I felt a kind of envy towards the young Irish Presbyterian, when I came to the following sentence in the description of the Synod's discipline, &c.: "He is now denominated a probationer, and is under the controul and direction of his Presbytery." I almost longed to be bound by the same trammels. My imagination was captivated by the humbleness and meekness of the situation. I thought to myself how good, how obedient, how *Presbyterian* I would be, if I were the servant of such a master, or, to soften the terms, the member of such a community, which might be rendered as democratical in its polity as is consistent with a proper exercise of regular government. Doubtless such a relation might contribute much to one's happiness, virtue, and intellectual advancement. Will a correspondent of the Repository present the considerations that belong to the opposite side of the question?

I am uncertain whether the following phraseology in note, p. 706, be pure English, "George I. who, it is reported, *should say*," &c. Although in some parts of America it is used in common conversation, yet I believe it is avoided by the most

careful speakers, and I never saw it in print.

Bigotry of the Home Mission Magazine. A just but mild remonstrance.

Mr. Frend on the British Critic. The remarks on the term Monotheism are a most ingenious retort.

Mr. Frend's proposal, towards the close of his communication, seems nearly impracticable, because, although the propositions, on which he recommends discussion, possess the utmost truth, interest and importance, yet they are precisely such as our brethren of other denominations deem fundamentally erroneous in the outset, and would therefore decline discussing altogether. Can you get a circle of English courtiers to assemble with a knot of rank republicans, and discuss the merits of democratical government?

Dr. Gale a Trinitarian. Dr. Evans's assertion may yet appear justifiable, notwithstanding these proofs to the contrary, during one period of Gale's life.

Friendly Correspondence between an Unitarian and a Calvinist.

The first letter here is truly a sublime composition. Yet why write sublimely, or argue ingeniously? If the following propositions of the Calvinist be correct, this whole correspondence is one of the most nugatory things in the world: "You and I are all blind by nature. The Lord, I trust, will give you sight and me too." Probably if his correspondent agreed in speculation with him, the Calvinist would think that time had come. Yet he appears to me very inconsistent in holding so long an argument with him. He expects from an unawakened Universalist all the docility and reasonableness of an awakened Calvinist. He says, that pride cannot consist in an awakened Calvinist. But cannot something *very like* pride consist in him, so as to deceive and provoke the undiscerning world? In reply to one of the arguments of the Universalist, the Calvinist says, "Time will shew: we shall see how it will be." Would he permit his opponent to use such an argument? One of these notes, however, contains, I think, a very happy and unanswerable retort. The Uni-

list says, that in a future state, every individual *will* shall be rendered conformable to the *Divine* will." The Calvinist immediately subjoins, "Then nothing that the blessed will see will cause pain." This is strong. What becomes now of the argument, that the happiness of the blessed in heaven will be imperfect, as long as there is a sinner suffering in hell? Soon comes a feeble, if not a dangerous argument. When the Universalist anticipates from scripture that "death and hell shall be swallowed up in victory," the Calvinist only replies, "We want more light to understand this." Is it so? Then why not want more light to understand every Calvinistic text in the Bible? You have put into the mouths of the unregenerate a triumphant answer to your own most urgent and solemn appeals. The following maxim of the Calvinist is, in some points of view, sufficiently excellent and weighty: "People do not incur evil by fearing it, but by not fearing it enough." But has not the Calvinist known persons whose fears are a greater curse to them than the apprehended evils? He talks about the paramount necessity of being *awakened*. Will he not allow, that there are good and amiable beings, so unexceptionably pure and moral in their lives, from the cradle to the tomb, that it would be better not to awaken them? The following is unfair: "You do not adduce proselytes of the character of deeply convinced persons, walking close with God, living in the light of his countenance, and blessed with the sealing evidences and unction of his Holy Spirit." I have known Universalists, to whom every letter of this description of blessedness exactly applies. This testimony I cheerfully accord, though I am not absolutely an Universalist myself. "As to quotations from Scripture," says the Calvinist, "I did not like to offend you by mentioning them." This is singular enough. "Let us strive," he says, "to obtain *full* convictions of sin." A Calvinist in religion is what a pure mathematician is in practice. Both are conversant in an ideal world. Both aim at metaphysical, unattainable impossibilities. Neither of them is aware of the unavoidable *frictions*

in this world of matter. It will not do, the Calvinist thinks, to look upon sin as it actually exists in life, with its common mixture of motives, original infirmities, strong temptations, ignorance, &c. We must reduce it to a kind of essence. The newly-invented extracts of bark and ipecacuanha illustrate well his notion of the nature of human sin. The woody, earthy matter of the plant is entirely separated, and leaves the medicine in a state of pure crystal, of which a single grain is all-powerful, and the very taste of which remains on the tongue for hours.

The Unitarian ends the controversy in a somewhat pettish style. I could have wished from him a different conclusion.

On the Friendly Correspondence, &c. I am a little astonished at this communication. It has at least well nigh confirmed me in my suspicion of a stratagem in the correspondence. I scarcely can believe that any *real* W. W. would have treated an existing Calvinist with so little delicacy and liberality. The latter might well say to him, "You have first injured me by publishing my correspondence without my consent, and then you have added insult to injury by the contumelious language of your second paragraph." No. This paper of W. W. I must believe, is only a pleasant fiction.

Remarks on a Friendly Correspondence, &c. Will the following alteration be any improvement upon the common rendering of 1 Tim. ii. 3—5, &c.?—"Who will have all to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth, *namely*, that there is one God, and one Mediator," &c. This seems to preserve a connexion in the passage, and to throw on it a light, which are wanting in the present translation. That *γὰρ* may be properly rendered *namely*, see Schleusner.

The considerations under No. 4, are very well urged. At a late attempt among the Calvinists of Boston, New England, to get up an awakening, some of their most intelligent preachers and writers came out quite boldly with the sentiment that there are certain doctrines which must not be preached during revivals of religion; such as our inability to

do any thing of ourselves, election, and the like. There was, therefore, a general understanding to waive the preaching of these doctrines during the revival, since it was found that they too much paralysed the wished-for process. Observe, the *truth* and *importance* of the doctrines were not denied. After persons had once come forward and become converted, then the intention was, if possible, to make them embrace the doctrine that they had no moral ability to do any thing of themselves. All this dramatic arrangement, and a great deal more, passed for consistency and fidelity with some tolerably wise men among the orthodox.

The present correspondent might better look a little after the state of his candour, when he makes such remarks as that "all schemes, which have *necessity* for their basis, tend naturally to produce in their advocates a species of mental aberration in different degrees, which renders them impenetrable to the plainest reasonings." I suppose that Necessitarians coolly entertain the same opinion of their opponents—and so, which party shall build a retreat for the insane?

Bible Contest in Ireland. The cause of Unitarianism is certainly advancing with a good pace. If Roman Catholics "personate" Socinians so well already, the next step must speedily be, to advocate their sentiments "in propriâ personâ."

Dr. Jones on Philo and Josephus. I cannot look at all this as any thing but a string of happy analogies, and not of convincing proofs—no, not even *moral* proofs. A leading feature of Dr. Jones's mind seems to be, to accept of analogies for arguments. He is unquestionably the grand Scriptural Transcendentalist of the age. After studying the present communication with much care, I can only accede to Dr. Jones's conclusion with the following modification, inserted in brackets, of his own language, viz. that "Josephus, in his books against Apion, is the historian and apologist of [something like] the gospel." Perhaps, however, I have formed a wrong notion of Christianity, and from early education have conceived it to be something more definite, palpable, and positive in its nature, than

can be inferentially extracted from shadowy descriptions of Joseph. Why could not a Jew seize upon the handle furnished by Dr. J.'s argument, and maintain, that the New Testament was only a concealed defence of the Mosaic religion, because it coincides in so many points with Josephus's open defence of it? Moreover, is not *Cicero*, according to Dr. J.'s principles, a pretty good Christian, or, to speak more chronologically, a spiritual Judaist? However, let me attempt briefly to do justice to the writer's arguments, or rather analogies, by characterizing them in order:

1. Clear and strong.
2. Strong, but not perfectly clear.
3. Ingenious; but such speculations would better satisfy the loose and accommodating theologians of a century ago, than the rigid critics of the present day. I should be glad if I could understand any thing in the Psalm here quoted, but an expression of confidence that God would not permit the Psalmist *to die* by any premature or unnatural cause.
4. Very good.
5. Very strong.
6. Good, in corroboration of the general argument. With these opinions of his positions, I accede to Dr. Jones's conclusion, as above modified, assuring him that I am not one of those who consider him, (especially as long as the monthly journals take no notice of him,)

"An ignis fatuus that bewitches,
And leads men into bogs and ditches:"

for so the typographer might have more poetically arranged the sentence on the top of p. 725.

Orthodoxy of the Irish Quakers. May I ask the Editor if any Unitarians could "with perfect good faith" publish this Quaker Creed, as asserting the *divinity* of Christ, without some disingenuous reservation on that same word *divinity*?

Letters from the Baxter MSS. I muse if all this quaint and abrupt matter were plain reading to Baxter, or if he were obliged to study it out, as I am. How is every part compressed with thought and reasoning! Original sin is one of the topics on which the writer makes even a little merry. A venerable lady was lately

induced to be silent on this doctrine by a friend of mine, who asked her, if she could *repent* of her original sin. The question is a silencing one.

The explanation of 2 Cor. v. 14, appears to me strained. That of Rom. iii. 20, very acute. There is some mighty reasoning on Rom. iii. 23, &c.

This writer is an admirable opponent; for while he pushes up his arguments to the utmost, he is candid in making all possible allowances.

Let me suggest an emendation. P. 728, col. 2, near the middle, place a period after *sinne*, and read thus: "But of some in the Indies, I have read," &c.

In the next column, the author seems to be an Antipædobaptist. Does this corroborate or not the suspicion of his being Gilbert Clerke? I observe his name is omitted in the Repository Index for 1824,* and therefore presume that this hypothesis is abandoned.

Hints for Sunday-Schools. The original design of these institutions (which commenced in England) was, I believe, to instruct those children whom poverty or parental neglect deprived of the usual advantages of an elementary education. In America, and perhaps in England, this object has been blended with another, and is producing, I think, some exceptionable results. The managers of the schools collect together in a body all the children of their respective congregations, rich and poor, abecedarians and tolerable proficients, and drill them into one uniform system. In this manner, they take out of the minister's hands one of the most pleasing, easy and useful of his duties, viz. the purely religious instruction of the young, with whom he ought to become early acquainted, and to carry on a course of mutual and familiar communication. Now it is unnecessary and oppressive to confine those children, who have every opportunity and advantage through the week, to the stale routine of a common Sunday-school. Let them occasionally recite some easy exercise to the minister only, and let the Sunday-schools still be continued by zeal-

ous members of the congregation, whose object might be, to prepare the poorer and less privileged children for the pastor's class.

The Close of the Year. Smooth and sweet poetry. I would not be questioned about its fire or originality.

Notes on Passages of Scripture. Some of the pleasure which this writer intimates in his motto that he derives from scriptural criticism, he is fortunate in imparting to the readers of his speculations.

It is a bold maxim with which he begins this article. The usual practice of many critics has been, to invert it, and to investigate the New-Testament phraseology, first, by an examination of the classics, and then, of the old Testament. I feel not certain of that degree of pre-eminence which our critic assigns to the Septuagint translation for this purpose. I am aware of the familiarity which all the Jews possessed with that version. But would not the modifications, necessarily made in the language for nearly 300 years, take from the Septuagint a little of the standard character here suggested, and transfer it to contemporary classics, but particularly to the works of Philo and Josephus? Moreover, I am surprised to find the Greek classics in general by this writer so much depreciated as sources of the verbal interpretation of the New Testament. Surely, the phraseology of the Septuagint itself must be in a great measure antecedently illustrated by the classical writings. And then, are we to suppose that the authors of the New Testament had read no other Greek than that sacred manual? Was Paul's style unaffected by his extensive erudition? Had not St. John evidently read a class of works essentially different from the Septuagint? Was not St. Luke acquainted with a more common basis of Greek, than could be furnished from that version? On all these accounts, I hesitate, though probably from imperfect acquaintance with the subject, at the assertion, that it can seldom be "essential or important" to shew how a word in the New Testament is employed in the classical writings of antiquity, even if the same word can be found in the Septuagint.

* An oversight of the Compiler of the Index. ED.

Modern Example of Tritheism. All the unfairness of which Unitarians are generally guilty in controversy, is, to draw legitimate consequences from the principles of their opponents. Most Trinitarians complain bitterly against this procedure, but I have found a few, like the preacher here mentioned, who glory in adopting, to the greatest latitude, every extravagant deduction that orthodoxy can engender.

Mr. Smith's Rejoinder to Mr. Bakewell. "The philanthropy which feeds and clothes the body, is not a *Christian* virtue, if it have not unspeakably stronger feelings for the guilt and misery of a sinful state." But suppose it is exercised in consequence of Christ's command, and in humble reference to his authority and promises, is it not a Christian virtue then? I dare not straiten my code of gospel ethics so closely as Dr. Smith; nor did Jesus himself venture to impose quite such unrelenting conditions, if we may judge from the conclusion of Matt. xxv. In order to give point to his stern morality, Dr. Smith quotes these interrogatories from Zechariah—"Did ye it at all unto ME, even unto me? Did ye not it unto yourselves?" But a milder prophet than Zechariah, a more practical casuist than Dr. Smith, has regarded the infirmities and imperfections of human nature, and has pronounced on the doctrine of the Old Testament the following unconditional commentary: "INASMUCH as ye have done it unto the least of these my brethren, ye *have* done it unto me!"

A weaker support could not have been sought by Dr. Smith than the letter which closes his communication. It is full of flippant and contracted prejudices. No sooner has the writer entered Geneva, and found nothing under its clear sky to blame, than he asks, with a childish and unfair suspicion, *But is all right?* Had Geneva corresponded in its ecclesiastical character with that of the London Christian Instructor, doubtless all *would* have been right, long before the writer had stepped abroad to make a single observation or inquiry. In another part of his letter, there is not only the same want of

candour, but such a ridiculous display of perverted taste, that it will be amusing to hold up the example *in extenso*, as well as useful to shew what wretched shifts are resorted to by those who are determined at all hazards to find fault with Unitarian preaching. Speaking of a preacher whom he heard at Geneva, the writer first acknowledges that his "*subject* was beneficence, charity and almsgiving." And what fault can the reader imagine was discovered in this sermon on *benevolence*? Why, "there was not a word on the necessity of repentance, nor a syllable on the subject of faith in the great atonement!" Why not go on to the enumeration of forty more topics which were omitted in the discourse, but were as nearly related to benevolence as these? The existence of God, the resurrection of Christ, the creation of the world, &c. &c. &c. &c. I scarcely recollect in the course of my experience a more violent predisposition to censure than this. So much for the beginning and middle of this epistolary morceau, and now for the end: "The religious services of the city, which began at nine in the morning, were all over by three o'clock, and at six the theatre was open, and an actor from Paris was announced, to take his leave in a tragedy by VOLTAIRE!" But did the *same* persons generally crowd the theatre who had crowded and wept at the church in the morning? And even if they did, is it not an invidious and unfair exaggeration to put the name of Voltaire in capitals, and illustrate it with a note of admiration, as if it were the *man* they went to honour, and not one of his most innocent and *improving* productions?

Dr. Smith's Second Rejoinder, &c. Never can Dr. Smith extricate himself or his party from the dilemma to which Mr. Bakewell has reduced them, on the subject of Justification. He says, that his statements had no reference to personal holiness, and the unchangeable obligations of universal virtue. But why repel such a charge? Of what value will holiness and virtue be to any man, if, after all, a man's *Justification in the sight of God* have no dependence on them? Why pretend to revere them so profoundly, and to disclaim the idea of impairing

them? Is it, that you may keep one side well with the world, with the uninitiated, with mere moralists by nature, while you shew the other to the lovers of mystery and hugeness? From Calvin down to Dr. Smith, there has reigned this everlasting shuffle in their school, this vain attempt to reconcile common sense with contracted and obstinate principles of interpretation. But it cannot be. Our matter-of-fact world will never swallow nor care any thing about the tremendous Calvinistic dogma of Justification by Faith, unless it be frittered down to pure morality, and then they will receive, not the dogma, but the morality. Dr. Smith may depend upon it that this is all he can get by covering over the subject with a wordy plausibility. Men are not going to have their moral sense violated so easily; or if they do, they will choose to go the whole length, and rush at once into the mental slavery or mental reservation of the Romish Church. I should regard the doctrine in question, if it could possibly be believed, as a worse mystery than that of the Trinity, because it is less purely speculative and arithmetical; it touches upon *morals*; it would tend to overthrow the whole system of good practice, and would destroy all confidence between man and man. Many of its supporters pretend to lift their eyes in abhorrence at Antinomians; but that sect are the only consistent and true believers in the doctrine, and it will sooner or later be acknowledged, that there is no medium, no alternative between Arminianism and Antinomianism. To these remarks the answer will be, that I do not understand the doctrine of Justification by Faith, and I shall be pointed to the intricate explanations which make it intelligible and innocent, reducing it, after all, to a sort of Justification by Works. But why adopt and persist in a phraseology, which is liable to be misinterpreted and misunderstood? The substance of your religion, I should hope, will not evaporate with the language which clothes it.

What does the long extract from Hooker prove? If any one can follow the thread of it, and analyse its meaning through a cloud of misty figures and vain distinctions, he will

see that there is no explanation at all, but a confused repetition of the very doctrine to be explained, and strangely mingled up at the same time with a metaphorical resolution of it into simple morality. "Faith is the only hand which putteth on Christ unto Justification, and Christ the only garment, which, being so put on, covereth the shame of our defiled natures, hideth the imperfection of our works, preserveth us blameless in the sight of God," &c. &c. Now to infuse any meaning into this passage, and not to rest satisfied, dazzled and delighted with its mere mysticalness, how is *Christ a garment*? And is there any other true way of covering our shame, hiding our imperfection, &c., than the love and practice of that personal holiness and universal virtue which Christ *prescribed*? Is it not a dangerous matter to hold out to men's imaginations the idea that there is such a kind of a thing as a *garment*, somewhere or other, they know not where, but separate from their personal holiness and exertions, which shall huddle up and muffle over their sins? Surely, it is not for such writings that Hooker has been immortalized by the epithet *judicious*.* By the way, Mr. Smith can revere and quote the authority of the Anglican Church, when it suits his purpose. I supposed him not to be so flexible a Dissenter.

Mr. Bakewell's concluding Remarks. Mr. Bakewell, on several accounts, deserves the fervent gratitude and lasting respect of the Unitarian public, for conducting, as he has done, the present controversy. Our first matter of gratification is, that we have found so able a defender of so good a cause. Mr. Bakewell has turned to admirable account the opportunities which he had enjoyed for information on the topics in dispute. Nor is this all. He has proved himself a match for his opponent, who must be acknowledged on all hands as a controversialist of no ordinary lubricity.—Even on theological ground, where we might have had most reason to expect that our hero would be foiled,

* Was it for his doctrinal, or for his ecclesiastico-political writings, that the Anglican Church have generally crowned him with this laurel?

he has encountered his adversary with sufficient knowledge, adroitness and sagacity. Nor, on the whole, would Unitarians in general, and the injured Genevese in particular, have wished to see their cause consigned on this occasion into better hands.—Another subject of congratulation is, that a salutary, though partial, check has probably been given to the wanton torrent of attack and misrepresentation, which so many writers think it their sacred duty to pour out upon Unitarians. Nothing would be much more superfluous or uncalled for than the greater portion of Mr. Smith's strictures on the theologians of Geneva. The faults of M. Chenevière's publication, and the defects in his cause, lay so much on the surface, that even Unitarians, nursed in English freedom, could perceive them without much illustration or comment. Had Dr. Smith contented himself with briefly pointing them out, though the task would have been unnecessary, yet we could have easily indulged him in such an exhibition of fond sectarianism. But to seize upon the occasion with all the ardour of an interested and personal enemy, to write confessedly with the scantiest stores of information, to stigmatize indiscriminately the religious and moral character of a whole ecclesiastical community, and to breathe the odium of a local dispute upon the general principles of Unitarianism—all this evinced the character of the bigoted partizan, rather than of the philanthropist or the Christian. He has been instructed, however, in the course of this controversy, that there is some glass to be broken in his own house as well as in his neighbour's. And such a lesson is often not without its valuable uses. If Mr. Bakewell, simply by the present example, shall have taught our adversaries to become wary and discriminating in their attacks, he will not have written, either for them or us, in vain.—A third obligation, under which we lie to Mr. Bakewell, is, that in a professional view, his defence has been perfectly gratuitous and disinterested. It is consoling, that Unitarianism has nourished and brought up secular sons in her own lap, who perceive her worth sufficiently to step forth and protect her with a generous heroism when assailed, in spite of the

unpopularity to which they may in consequence be exposed. Our controversy, for some pretty obvious reasons, may be expected to result in more speedy success for us, when not left entirely to the conduct of mere divines. Although truth is truth, from whatever quarter it comes, and Unitarian ministers pursue it with a singleness of motive which enmity itself cannot impeach, yet still, the pardonable little prejudices of the world invest a theological argument from a layman with more power than if it came from the pen of a professional advocate.

I observe that Dr. Smith has published his strictures in a collected form. I hope that Mr. Bakewell will, in this instance, follow his example.

Philaletes on Mr. Brown. If one could tell how much is sly, and how much is grave, in this little paper, one might venture a remark or two.

Remarks on Rom. viii. 9. With the exception of what appears to me a loose and unfounded interpretation of the expressions "flesh" and "spirit" in the beginning of the chapter, these strictures tell very well. The conclusion at the end of third paragraph is good. Paragraph four is strong. Paragraph five is strong too.

Mr. Wright in Answer to Mr. Worsley. This controversy is much to be regretted. I suppose we all think Mr. Wright is on the best side. But it appears to me that he uses too vehement a term when he interprets Mr. Worsley's expressions as necessarily implying *censure*.

Is it good English to say, that one thing is different to another? It is rather common in America. I never saw it in English print till now.

Devon and Cornwall Committee on the Same. I trust that these slight ruffles in the tide of Unitarianism are only indicative of the force with which the main current is sweeping along.

Sonnet on the Death of S. H. Pure and gentle as the being it weeps over.

Obituary. Mr. James Torrance. To the lover of general humanity this notice is gratifying, as it exhibits the increasing dignity and importance of those who have been called the lower orders.

Appointments and Removals of Ministers. With English Unitarians,

who have been educated in sight of the practices of their national church, the custom of ministerial removals seems to be frequent. There is a strong prejudice against the practice in this country, not only among Dissenters, (to use a term somewhat improper with us,) but also among Church - of - England Episcopalians. The settlement of a minister is generally regarded here in the light of a matrimonial tie—better for better, worse for worse, and till death the parties do sever. Under such a system, there is not probably among preachers quite the same degree of competition and stimulated excellence as where the best churches are in the market; but, on the other hand, some heavy evils incident to the latter state of things are avoided, and peace reigns more securely within our Zion's palaces.

Intelligence. Is it possible that the Protestant Society for defending Religious Liberty is inimical to the Catholic Claims? How have they been able to stir or speak under such a load of inconsistency?

Correspondence. On *Obituary Notices of Humble Personages*. I cordially join with Hylas. No department of the Repository furnishes more interest and variety than the Obituary. Though a far distant stranger, yet I read it constantly with instruction and gratification. I have a melancholy pleasure in becoming acquainted for a moment with so many worthy people just over their fresh graves. Where is the individual who has not some specific difference in his character, that furnishes an interesting object of contemplation? A collective biography of every son of Adam, written after the manner prescribed by John Foster, would be one of the best books in the world. A history of the development of each man's mind, of his struggles, his temptations, the causes of his falls, his sources of happiness, his incitements to action, his hopes and his fears, his loves and his hatreds, his aspiring but indefinite wishes, his swelling, but unspeakable imaginations,—would be the only true picture of human life. Not that each man should write his own biography. Every Savage should have his Johnson; every idiot should be described by his

Wordsworth. But such a book, of course, is not to be looked for in this world. I apprehend there will be something like it in one of those volumes of knowledge that are to be opened on the growing soul in another state of being.

There is one particularly strong reason why we could wish the Repository to continue its present style of Obituary Notices, viz. the running testimonials thereby furnished to the worth and efficacy of Unitarian principles. After making all allowances for the fond exaggerations of surviving friendship, enough of unquestionable truth yet remains to convince the most prejudiced, that a race of as high-minded, virtuous, sagacious and religious Christians as belong to the human family, find something in our vilified system to attach them to it with chains of adamant through life, and to inspire them with all joy and peace in believing, when their hour of death is inevitable.

City Road,

December 19, 1825.

SIR,

HAVING been a great reader of biography in my day, the practice has occasioned me to collect a considerable number of *engraved portraits*, chiefly of persons who have most distinguished themselves in aiding and promoting the progress of human improvement. No occupation has proved more gratifying and instructive in a moral point of view; and as I advance in years, when I have a few friends around me, I find the exhibition of these physiognomies often gives rise to very agreeable and instructive conversation, and proves a source of no ordinary pleasure. Indeed, it has frequently afforded opportunities of giving an impulse to thought, and of creating reflection; and, moreover, has enabled me to point out an useful as well as interesting course of reading to some of my female acquaintance, who had been led, from education or other circumstances, to waste their time in the perusal of those jejune and frivolous productions which unfortunately constitute the too greater part of every circulating library. By this remark I would not have it inferred that I undervalue those works that are the off-

spring of a cultivated imagination ; for many of these are not only productive of delightful recreation to the mind, but must ever rank among the finest efforts of human genius. However, *well-arranged details of authentic facts* are better calculated to improve the understanding, and, in a high degree, to interest the best feelings of the heart ; to use the words of Bacon, they “ come home to men’s business and bosoms,” and often leave impressions as indelible as they are important. The anecdote related of Mr. Hume lending Plutarch’s Lives to a lady who was fond of novel-reading, and who, when she returned them, told him “ that it was the most interesting *novel* she had ever read ;” and the effect which Madame Roland states the same work to have made upon her mind, strikingly illustrate the great advantages of truth over fiction.

The circumstance that has led me to make these few remarks has been the inspection of some portraits of Dr. Priestley, George Walker and Gilbert Wakefield, recently published.* The images of these truly excellent men forcibly recalled to my mind the many noble traits in their conduct ; and induced me again to peruse the interesting “Memoirs” of “the amiable, the intrepid, and the virtuous” Gilbert Wakefield, as he was so justly and felicitously designated by his friend the late Dr. Aikin. Whilst enumerating in that work the characters of those excellent men who were his associates at Warrington Academy—he has portrayed, with a superior and masterly hand, the truly admirable one of *George Walker* ; and as Mr. Wakefield’s book is now but rarely to be met with, I have transcribed this fine piece of composition, thinking you may not deem it unworthy of a place in your columns. Such an impressive and instructive lesson to the rising generation, who may have to pursue the same career, may induce them to emulate his truly eminent example ; and to cherish the same love of truth, freedom, virtue and science.

* Portraits of Dr. Priestley, George Walker, Gilbert Wakefield and Mary Wollstonecraft Godwin, published by D. Eaton, High Holborn.

“ The *last* whom I shall mention of this laudable fraternity, but not the *least* in *love*, is the Rev. George Walker, Dissenting Minister at Nottingham, and F. R. S. This gentleman, take him all in all, possesses the greatest variety of knowledge with the most masculine understanding I ever knew. He is in particular a *mathematician* of singular accomplishment. His treatise on the Sphere, long since published, and one upon the *Conic Sections*, preparing for the press, are the vouchers of my assertion. His two volumes of Sermons are pregnant with the *celestial fire* of genius, and the vigour of noble sentiments. His *Appeal to the People of England upon the Subject of the Test Laws*, would not be much honoured by my testimony in its favour, as the best pamphlet published on that occasion, were not this judgment coincident with the decision of Charles James Fox, who has declared to a friend of mine the same opinion of its excellence.

“ But these qualifications, great and estimable as they are, constitute but a mean portion of his praise. Art thou looking, reader ! like Æsop in the fable, for a MAN ? Dost thou want an intrepid spirit in the cause of truth, liberty and virtue ; an undeviating rectitude of action ; a boundless hospitality ; a mind infinitely superior to every sensation of malice and resentment ; a breast susceptible of the truest friendship, and overflowing with the milk of human kindness ; an ardour, an enthusiasm in laudable pursuits, characteristic of magnanimity ; an unwearied assiduity, even to his own hindrance, in public services ? My experience can assure thee that thy pursuit may cease, thy doubts be banished, and thy hope be realized : for this is the man.”

In the above are omitted a few phrases which appeared to me irrelevant, but in other respects the transcript is faithful to the very letter.

W. MATTHEWS.

SIR,

IN looking over my last communication, (XX. 729,) I find that I have committed an error in transcribing the Latin version of the passage quoted from Philostratus. Instead of writing *serpentibus concreti*, I have

written *serpentibus cincti*. I can account for this mistake only by supposing that Virgil's *cinctam serpentibus Hydram* was indistinctly present to my mind. Had I thought of the Greek at the time, or recollected that the Giants (to speak with Apollodorus) εἶχον τὰς βάσεις φολιδὰς δρακόντων, association would not have got the better of my eye sight. A curious instance of the power of association is produced by a late eminent critic in the *Classical Journal*, No. XVII. p. 49. "A letter," says he, "is inserted in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1798, (p. 839,) with the following title: *An Original Letter from Dr. Thomas Moore, of Norwich*. This letter is signed *Tho. Browne*, and appears to have been written by the celebrated Sir Thomas Browne. There is no resemblance between Browne and Moore, but the transition from *Sir Thomas Browne* to *Sir Thomas More* is extremely easy."

On the Homeric γεγτο spoken of by Dr. Jones, p. 727, see Heyne's *Hommer*, Vol. V. p. 421.

E. COGAN.

SIR,
THE Three Letters addressed by me to the Editor of the *Quarterly Review* are noticed in the last Number. In this notice the Reviewer declines entering on the argument for the genuineness of the text. I regret this much, especially as no man living is better qualified to do justice to his side of the question or to refute my views, if not founded in truth. "The world," he says, "will conclude that he (Ben David) has ventured far into the region of paradox." I observed that by proving the genuineness of the verse, "the orthodox faith will receive a shock which shall shatter its very foundations, and bring it at no distant period completely to the ground." The Reviewer in reply to this writes, "The orthodox faith does not rest on a spurious or disputed verse: it is built, and well built, upon the genuine word of God, and thus secured, it will endure for ever."

The discussion of the controverted text being thus excluded from the *Quarterly Review*, a Journal the most ably conducted, the most widely circulated, and the most powerfully influential of any that has ever ap-

peared in the republic of letters, I purpose communicating to the *Monthly Repository* a brief statement of the arguments which shall put an end for ever to all doubts respecting the authenticity of 1 John v. 7. These arguments are comprehended in the following propositions:

1. The context supposes the genuineness of the disputed verse, and is even a dead letter without it.

2. The supposed spurious verse is a summary of the evidence of Christianity; and though John wrote it, Jesus Christ is virtually its author.

3. It is written by the Apostle in direct opposition to men who asserted the divinity of Christ, and could not therefore be the forgery of those in after ages who perverted it in support of the Trinity.

4. The circumstances under which John wrote his Epistle being known and retained in the memories of men during the first three centuries, the orthodox were unable to conceal the true meaning of the verse without concealing the verse itself. They therefore erased it from the manuscripts and copies in general use, omitted it in their versions, and carefully avoided to quote it in their writings. Their conduct in this respect is the cause of its absence from the Greek manuscripts and versions which have descended to our days.

5. As the controverted passage, containing, as it does, the sum and substance of Christianity, presents a triangular figure corresponding in shape to the base of the orthodox faith, it was diverted from its original object and made the foundation of the Trinity. The Greek and Latin Fathers with this view mutilated the verse, mystified it, transposed it, and always accompanied it with their own interpretation, and thus left to future ages unequivocal proofs of its being in the manuscripts which they possessed.

6. Though the verse is not found in the Greek manuscripts now known, there is evidence to conclude that it existed in all those which descended from the Apostolic age to the fifth century.

7. In the fifth century Unitarianism was extinguished, and Orthodoxy triumphed over Arianism, and the supporters of the Trinity thought they

might restore the text to the copies of the New Testament in general, and quote it without fear of detection in favour of orthodoxy. This was the opinion of at least one, by far the most eminent among them. A violent dispute thence ensued, in which the contending parties abused each other. The individual I allude to, however, prevailed, and triumphantly restored the verse on the authority of the Greek manuscripts, laying against his adversaries the very charge which I point out from their own writings, namely, their excluding the text from their editions and supplying its place by a mystification of the eighth verse.

These propositions are so involved in one another, that they cannot be supported by independent evidence in the order here stated, but I hope the arguments which I shall briefly adduce, will be sufficient to satisfy every competent judge of their truth.

8. The verse with its context is the following: "And the spirit is that which beareth testimony, because the spirit is the truth: for there are three in heaven which bear testimony, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one. And there are three on the earth who bear testimony, the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood: and these three agree in one."

According to the law of Moses two or three witnesses were sufficient to verify the thing attested by them. In allusion to this maxim, it is here said, that three witnesses in heaven bear testimony, the Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit, and that these three are one, that is, one in testimony or consent. The subject of this testimony is, that Jesus is the Christ or the Son of God. This indeed is not mentioned, but it is obvious, from the whole Epistle, where it is repeatedly stated, and stated even in the verses preceding the disputed text. Besides, the subject alluded to must have been frequently discussed by the people to whom John addressed his Epistle, and therefore well known to and understood by them, even in circumstances where it is not distinctly expressed. Farther, the proposition that Jesus is the Christ, the Apostle grounds on these three testimonies in opposition to the Gnostics, who maintained that *Jesus was not* the Christ; but that

the Christ was a God, dwelling for a season in the man Jesus, or an empty phantom assuming the form of the man Jesus. That men existed in the days of the Apostles and afterwards, who pretended to believe these absurd notions, is a fact beyond all controversy; as the English reader may satisfy himself by consulting the accounts which Mosheim, Lardner and Priestley have given of the Gnostics.

If it be true that the Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit bear their joint testimony, that Jesus is the Christ, or the Son of God, it must be found in the records of his ministry; and the truth thus ascertained will go to prove the genuineness of the disputed verse, in which the same truth is asserted. While his forerunner was proclaiming the approach of the kingdom of heaven, when surrounded by an immense concourse from Judea, Jerusalem and all the country round about, many of the Pharisees and Sadducees also being in the number, on this public occasion Jesus came to be baptized. A scene, solemn, sudden and surprising, ensued. High in the heaven, beyond the reach of all human power or imposture, the clouds, which had hitherto darkened the sky, dispersed: a commission from the Sovereign of the universe, assuming a visible appearance, descended on the man Jesus, at the same time accompanied with an audible voice, saying, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." Thus it is proved true, that the Father bore testimony in heaven that the man Jesus is the Son of God.

Again, in the beginning of his Gospel, John relates that the Logos of God incorporated with the man Jesus. This Logos, whom God sent, as the Apostle Peter farther says, preached peace through Jesus Christ to the children of Israel, enabling him to go about doing good, and to heal all manner of diseases among the people, and thus proving him to be the Son of God. Accordingly, the Evangelist, after stating in the commencement that the Logos became flesh, states also at the close, that his object in writing was to prove Jesus to be the Christ or the Son of God. Finally, Jesus, according to his promise before he yet had suffered, sent the Holy Spirit on his apostles, enabling them

to speak with unknown tongues, and to work miracles in attestation of the doctrine which they taught, the fundamental principle of which was, that Jesus is the Christ or the Son of God.

Thus it appears, from the Evangelical records, that the Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit, bear one and the same testimony, namely, that Jesus is the Son of God. All the evidences which attest his divine mission are resolvable into one or other of these three testimonies. These testimonies, indeed, form the sum and substance of the gospel, and are so interwoven with its foundations, as the roots with the tree which grows out of them. The disputed verse then, as it alleges these testimonies, and these testimonies alone, is as genuine and solid as that rock on which Christianity itself is founded, and against which the gates of hell shall not prevail.

That the Apostle wrote the disputed verse, in opposition to certain impostors who denied the simple humanity of the Saviour, and maintained his divinity, appears from the Epistle in which it stands. One or two passages will decide the question: "Who is the liar, but he who denieth that Jesus is the Christ? This is Antichrist, who denieth the Father and the Son. Every one who denieth the Son, hath not even the Father. Let that then remain in you, which you have heard from the beginning. If that remain in you, which ye have heard at the beginning, you, too, will remain in the Father and the Son. These things I write, concern those who deceive you. The effusion of the Spirit, which ye have received from him, remains in you, and ye have no need that any one should teach you. And as that very effusion which teacheth you concerning all things, is true, and there is no falsehood in it—as, *I say*, it hath taught you, so do you remain in it."

Had the Apostle not informed us that he has here in view certain impostors who opposed Christianity under the pretext of teaching it, we might fairly infer it. But his own words exclude all conjecture, all doubt on the subject: "The things I write, concern those who deceive you." But how did they attempt to deceive those whom the Apostle addresses? *By denying the Father and the Son.* They

denied the Father, because they stripped him of his Logos—of his perfections, as the Creator of the universe, as the benevolent Parent of mankind, —representing him an imperfect, malignant being, and pretending to reveal a supreme God of their own. The Apostle endeavours to set aside this malignant artifice by calling on the converts to adhere to that which they heard *at the beginning*; manifestly alluding to the testimony which God himself bore to Jesus as his beloved Son, when baptized, at the commencement of his ministry. The testimony which the Almighty bore to him on that occasion was most important, as demonstrative of the source whence our Lord derived his authority. John was sensible of this; and he places it in the disputed verse in direct opposition to the deceivers who denied it.

The Antichristian teachers denied the Son as well as the Father, that is, they denied that Christ derived his authority from the Creator of the world—he, as being a God, having wrought his miracles by virtue of his own power, and appeared after death by virtue of his own nature. What argument did the Apostle use to set aside this doctrine? In the beginning of his Gospel he represents Jesus as endued with the Logos of God, as having derived his power from that Supreme Intelligence and Goodness which first created, and still governs, the universe. The Logos of God thus proved him to be the Messiah or the Son of God; which, stripped of its figure, means that Jesus, in his official capacity, exhibited full proof of his divine delegation. This is the substance of the whole Gospel: and the Apostle has embodied it in the controverted text.

The impostors prided in their superior wisdom, and stigmatized the faithful disciples of Jesus as illiterate men. When they entered the Christian church, they, therefore, pretended to unfold sublime mysteries unknown to the apostles. Their pretensions, in this respect, were very specious, as coming from men of rank and education, such as the Gnostics for the most part were. To their pretensions as superior teachers of the gospel, John thus pointedly alludes: "These things I write, concern those who deceive you." The effusion of the Spirit which

ye have received from him remaineth in you; and ye have no need that any one should teach you. And as that very effusion which hath taught you concerning all things, is true, and there is no falsehood in it—as, *I say*, it hath taught you, so do you remain in it.” These, nearly, are the words of Jesus in his last address to the desponding disciples; and they receive a flash of light from the application here made of them by the Apostle: “These things I have spoken to you while remaining yet with you. But the Comforter,” (the Paraclete,) “the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things.” John xiv. 25. “When he, the spirit of truth, shall come, he will lead you to all the truth,” xvi. 13. Before I point to the light which is reflected on this passage, I must quote another from the Epistle of John: “Beloved, do not believe every spirit, but probe the spirits, if they be of God, because many false prophets are come into the world. Know by this the Spirit of God: every spirit which confesseth Jesus to be the Christ, and to have come in the flesh, is of God: and every spirit which confesseth not Jesus to be the Christ, and to have come in the flesh, is not of God; and this is the spirit of Antichrist, which ye have learnt that it will come, and even now is in the world.”

The belief that the gods or demons occasionally assumed a human form, and so appeared unto men, prevailed not only in heathen countries, but also in Judea: and when our Lord, newly risen, shewed himself to his disciples, they were forced upon the supposition, that it was some demon in his well-known shape. This superstition was general: and the current of public opinion ran so strong in its favour, that the enemies of Christ laid hold of it as a happy expedient to overturn the gospel. They said that Jesus who had suffered did not appear, but the Christ within him, who being a God in an empty form, without flesh and blood, was, in consequence of his divine nature, incapable of suffering. By thus superseding the resurrection of the man Jesus, they superseded the resurrection of mankind, and thereby precluded all hope of a future state. It is this subterfuge that he meets, when in the

following emphatical manner he asserts the resurrection of Christ, as a proof and a pledge of eternal life to the human race: “What was in the beginning, what we have heard, what we have seen with our eyes, what we explored, and our hands have handled, concerning the logos of life—and *this principle* of life shewed itself to us; and we saw it, and we are witnesses of it; and we declare it to you as that eternal life which was with the Father, and which shewed itself to us—what, *I say*, we have seen and heard, declare we unto you, that you may have communion with us: and our communion is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ. These things write we unto you, that our joy—our joyful hope of a future state—might be complete.”

In an age when a belief in many gods was almost universal, and the knowledge of God and of the laws of nature was very imperfect, it must appear difficult to defeat the artifices of the Gnostics: and the wisdom of Heaven alone could suggest to our Lord the only effectual way to accomplish this end. His last address to his disciples contains matter to this effect: “My enemies, like wolves in sheep’s clothing, will come in among you, under pretence of teaching my gospel, but in reality to destroy it. For they will endeavour, by a false philosophy, to set aside my resurrection, by saying that it was not the man Jesus, but a God within him, or a God in his shape, that appeared to his followers after death. I will frustrate this doctrine by not delegating to you *now*, before I leave you, the miraculous power necessary to ensure your success in the propagation of my gospel; but will defer it for some time, till I rise from the grave and ascend to my heavenly Father. I will then cause it to descend upon you: and you must consider its descent as a pledge of three things—that, like a letter received from a friend departed to a distant land, I, agreeably to my promise, have actually reached my destination in safety—that the person who will send the Holy Spirit to you is identically the same with him that now promises to send it—that at some distant period I shall again return to raise the dead and reward my faithful followers.” We are, then, to regard

the descent of the Holy Spirit on the Apostles as the last seal which the hand of God put not only to the divine mission of Jesus, but to the simple humanity of Jesus, and that in direct opposition to certain impostors who sought to undermine his religion by teaching his divinity. This is the reason why every miracle which the apostles ever wrought, was wrought in *the name* of the man Jesus. Hence the propriety of such language as the following: "By this ye know the Spirit of God: every spirit that confesseth Jesus *to be* the Christ, *and* to have come in the flesh, is of God; and every spirit which confesseth not Jesus to be the Christ, and to have come in the flesh, is not of God. And this is that spirit of Antichrist," &c. It was allowed on all hands that Jesus was a man, and simply a man. The Apostle, therefore, in maintaining the Christ to be Jesus, and to have come in the flesh, maintains that the Christ was a real man, and simply a man. To this the Spirit of God bears testimony, and he who believes it, is born of God. The Antichristian teachers, on the contrary, in maintaining the Christ to be God, maintained that he was not Jesus; him, as being really and simply a man, they rejected with execration.

The divinity of Christ was one of those mysteries which the impostors pretended to have discovered by their superior wisdom, but which the Spirit of God withheld from the apostles as men of no education. Accordingly they pretended to be more competent teachers than those simple, illiterate men. To this John alludes, when he tells the believers "they had no need that any should teach them, because they had been taught by the Holy Spirit shed upon them." The language of John here is that of Jesus, John xvi. 13, where he assured his disciples, that the Comforter, the Holy Spirit, the spirit of truth, would lead them to the whole truth, would leave nothing unrevealed, which might be necessary for them to know or to teach, and that consequently the men who affected to reveal certain mysteries, hitherto unknown to the apostles, were liars and impostors.

To conclude: the proposition that Jesus is the Christ, or that Jesus is the Son of God, implies that the

Christ is a real man, and simply a man, endued with extraordinary power and wisdom from God. Throughout the whole of his Epistle, and even his Gospel, the object of John is to establish the truth of this proposition, against men who denied it, under the specious plea of maintaining his divinity. He grounds the evidence of it on three testimonies—the testimony of the Father, the testimony of the Word, the testimony of the Holy Spirit. These three are one testimony, or are testimonies to one and the same object. They announce the divine mission of Jesus, appear in his ministry, lie dispersed in the Gospel, and concentrated on the disputed text. They are the sole pillars on which Christianity rests. Remove them as spurious, and the whole edifice falls to the ground.

This sense of the verse shews that, though John wrote it, Christ is virtually the author of it. The materials of it are scattered throughout his Gospel and the larger Epistle, and the Apostle has collected them, and placed them together here in one concise view. The last words of Jesus to his apostles, of themselves prove this to be a fact: "Go ye and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, of the Son and the Holy Spirit;" which is to this effect: "Go and convert the nations, initiating them in the knowledge of a new religion, and alleging for its truth the authority and testimony of the Father, the testimony of the Son, and the testimony of the Holy Spirit." Now, it might be expected that, if the three heavenly Witnesses, in the supposed spurious verse, be, as I have proved, a formula against the Gnostics, the original formula formed and used by our Lord must have been drawn up for the same purpose. And this is a fact demonstrable from the words of Irenæus on this very subject. That father, p. 91, says, "They (the Gnostics) lead the disciple to the water, and, on baptizing him, they thus say,—Unto the name of the Unknown Father of all; unto Truth, the mother of all; unto him which came down on Jesus." Here the formula of Christ and that of the Gnostics stand in direct opposition to each other, the object of the one being to establish the truth of the Gospel against its ene-

mies, the object of the other being to subvert it by similar views. For the universal Father, the impostors substituted the Supreme Unknown God, which they pretended to have revealed; for the man Jesus or the Son of God, they held forth as an object of faith the God that had descended upon him; and in the room of the Holy Spirit, which attested his simple humanity, they placed a fictitious being, which in mockery they called *Truth* or mother of all.

I have said that the context without the seventh verse, is a dead letter. The next verse, which is allowed to be genuine, is a demonstration of this: "There are three which bear testimony on the earth, the Spirit, the Water and the Blood." The water and the blood bear testimony; as having proceeded from the region of the heart pierced by the spear, they prove that the sufferer, being really a man possessing flesh and blood, actually died: and the Spirit bears testimony, because, being communicated to Jesus at his baptism, it enabled him to foresee and to foretell his death. But what does this testimony prove? Taken in itself, nothing to the purpose. Every man has flesh and blood; every man dies. But take Jesus in the character of the Logos, alive, and in heaven at the time the Apostle was writing, as it is asserted in the preceding, disputed verse, the circumstance of his having died proves every thing. It places on a solid foundation the grand principles of Christianity, the actual death, resurrection and exaltation to the right hand of God, of the man Jesus Christ; whence, according to his own solemn promise, he will one day return in the power of his Father to raise the dead and judge the world in righteousness. The Gnostics allowed that the Christ, after the crucifixion of Jesus, was still alive, as having neither died nor suffered. In order to set aside this, it was necessary for the apostles to assert *his death*, whenever they had occasion to speak of him as being alive. See Rev. i. 18; also, ch. ii. 8.

The conclusion, then, infallibly is, that the text of the Three Heavenly Witnesses, 1 John v. 7, is genuine: for is it morally impossible that a verse which attests the simple humanity of Christ, and sets aside his divi-

nity, should be the forgery of men who, in after ages, perverted it to prove the Trinity.

BEN DAVID.

SIR,

I AM happy to see that the question regarding the interpretation of the proem of John's Gospel has engaged the attention of several of your ablest correspondents. From the opinions that they have expressed, I am led to hope that this good at least will arise, that when another edition of the Improved Version shall be given to the public, the Socinian interpretation will no longer be allowed to maintain its place exclusively of the other—I mean that of Lardner and Priestley; but that, at least, both will be so introduced as to afford a fair alternative to the reader's judgment. I see with satisfaction that the mode of interpretation for which I contend is adopted in the continental versions, which are therein at variance with the received English text. The Geneva version of 1802 renders the passage thus: "Au commencement étoit la parole, la parole étoit avec Dieu et la parole étoit Dieu. *Elle* étoit au commencement avec Dieu. Toutes choses ont été faites par *elle*," &c. Harmonizing with this we find the Italian version: "Nel principio la parola era, e la parola era appo Iddio, et la parola era Dio. *Essa* era nel principio appo Dio. Ogni cosa è stata fatta per *essa*," &c. And to do justice to all opinions and to the original itself, the English rendering ought to be similar to these; and I trust in the next edition of the Improved Version we shall see it so. It would run thus: "In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God. This was in the beginning with God. All things were made (*or* done) by it, and without it no one thing was made (*or* done) which has been made (*or* done)." Such a translation is in itself neutral; it favours no opinion particularly, and is therefore such as all parties may use with satisfaction: whereas the present text of the Improved Version has such a peculiarity as to be altogether intolerable to those who view the subject in any degree differently from its authors. Surely it is a matter of the greatest

importance, for those with whom the decision of this and other similar points will rest, that they endeavour to provide us with an edition of the New Testament of a truly valuable and *unobjectionable* character. But such an edition must not be a party book; the Scriptures are the common ground of all parties; we ought to use a version which, while it does us justice, does our opponents justice also. Such a version ought to preserve, as far as possible, even the ambiguities of the original; it ought in short to know nothing about contending dogmas, and to aim at nothing more than to place the English reader, as nearly as possible, in the same position for forming his judgment which would be enjoyed by one who was reading the original. Another very important principle I conceive to be, that of not departing, without some *considerable* reason, from the text commonly received, the reasons of which principle are too obvious to need enforcement.

I must now say something in reply to my candid and scholar-like opponent Mr. Cogan. After considering carefully all the quotations which he has transcribed in order to illustrate the use of the word *γενεσθαι*, I cannot concede to him that any one of them is such as to justify us in translating *ὁ λογος σαρξ εγενετο* — “the word *was* flesh.” It is a very just remark, assuredly, that *γενεσθαι* is frequently used as an aorist to *εἶναι*. If proof were wanting of this, the passages quoted by Mr. C. would afford that proof. But the aorist is very different from the *imperfect*, and if the imperfect is the tense which the proposed rendering expresses, as I conceive it is, to prove that *γενεσθαι* is used for the aorist is very little to the purpose. *Γιγνεσθαι*, as Mr. C. observes, expresses properly the *commencement* of a state of being; it signifies to come into some state or mode of existence, to become, or *to come to be*, if I may use such an expression. And the aorist of this verb, *εγενετο*, asserts simply, that a thing has come into such and such a state of being, that *it has come to be* this or that. An aorist of *εἶναι*, had there been such a tense to that verb, would assert the naked fact of past existence, without implying its commencement; but as in all cases of which we

have commonly to speak, such existence must needs have had a commencement; and as, on the other hand, the sense of *γενεσθαι*, viz. to commence or come into some mode of existence, necessarily implies the fact of such existence, it follows that the signification of *γενεσθαι* is so very nearly equivalent to that of an aorist of *εἶναι*, that it may with great propriety be used to supply the place of such a tense, and in any case in which such an aorist would have been proper, we have no reason to question the propriety of using the word *γενεσθαι*.

But, I repeat it, the present does not appear to me to be such a case. An aorist of *εἶναι*, had such a tense been used in this place, would have expressed rather the sense of, *the word has been flesh*. The word's being flesh, not being, according to the Socinian interpretation, a contingent or accidental circumstance befalling the *λογος*, but a description of its permanent nature, the mode of expression should be couched in the imperfect tense, *ὁ λογος ἦν σαρξ*, just as it was said before *ὁ λογος ἦν Θεος*. Mr. C. will observe, that the quotations he has made refer to *the contingent circumstances* which happen to persons or things in the course of their existence, and, consequently, it can always with equal propriety be said, that such persons or things *became*, or *came to be* such, as that they *were* such. A commencing, or entering into, such circumstances is implied. *Ψιλοι οὐκ εγενοντο εν τῇ πολει* — “Such sort of soldiers had not *come to be*, had not come into existence, or been introduced into the city.” The aorist, moreover, is continually used in the sense of what we call in English the preter-pluperfect; there is commonly no other way of expressing this tense of ours in Greek, as what is called in Greek Grammar the plusquam perfectum has a very different and much more limited sense. *Εγενετο ἡ αρχὴ ἡ Οδρυσῶν*, &c. — “The government of the Odrysians *had become*, in extent, such as to reach the sea,” &c. So *Αισωπος Ιαδμωνος εγενετο* — “Æsop *came to be*, or *had come to be*, the slave of Iadmon.” The passage from the Septuagint, *υἱος γαρ εγενομην κἀγὼ πατρι ὑπηκοος*, &c., differs from *ὁ λογος σαρξ εγενετο*, because *ὑπηκοος* and *εργαπυμενος* express circumstances into which the

writer came, not the constitution of his nature: but the phrase, the "word *was* flesh," describes the *nature* of the *λογος*.

However, after all that may be said on either side, there is a better judge, at least as far as regards every man's own satisfaction, than all the citations and reasons that can possibly be produced. After we have obtained a little familiarity with a language, we judge of the meaning of its expressions *at once* by that sense of their import which experience has given us. According to this criterion, I, for my own part, feel it impossible to think that the words *ὁ λογος σαρξ εγενετο*, can properly be rendered "the word *was* flesh," nearly as impossible as I do think that a former passage can properly be rendered "the word *was* a God."—I conclude where I began, that I am happy to see discussion of this subject excited, and solicit from Mr. Cogan's candour that fair appreciation of my arguments which his critical acuteness is so able to bestow.

T. F. B.

SIR,
THE preface to John's Gospel presents difficulties to our Unitarian and many of our Unitarian brethren. To the former, from their preconceived opinion, that Christ is one of the three persons of their Trinity; to the latter, from the low and inadequate ideas they entertain of our Saviour's character. I cannot agree with Dr. Jones, that we are to enter into the labyrinth of the Gnostic controversy for the solution of these difficulties. A due attention to the language of Scripture, and some important facts related in it, will, I am convinced, be sufficient to render the whole satisfactory to the commonest reader. John, indeed, has given us a clue to the explanation; for at the close of his memoir he explicitly informs us of his intention in writing it, namely, to convince us that Jesus is the Son of God; and it would be very extraordinary that a writer, with such an end in view, should commence his history with a preface declaratory, not of his being the Son of God, but of his being God himself. It must be shewn, that the beginning and the end are in conformity with each other; and this I think will appear, when the

discussion on this subject, which has been so well begun in your Repository, is brought to a conclusion.

There is a remarkable event in our Saviour's life, which appears to me to deserve particular attention. John was one of the apostles present on the Mount when the three greatest characters that have ever met in this world were surrounded with the effulgence of the Divine glory—Moses, Elijah and our Saviour. A voice at the same time proclaimed, This is my beloved Son; hear ye him. In these words the superiority of our Saviour to either of the other two great characters is evident. But in what does this superiority consist? To me it appears traceable in the beginning of John's Gospel, and in the difference of the manifestation of the word, with respect to the head of the law, the head of the prophets, and the head of the gospel dispensation.

The difference in the style of John's Gospel, from that of the three other historians, cannot have escaped the notice of any attentive reader. The latter have given us a detail of events, written in a clear, plain and impartial manner. John was the beloved disciple of Jesus, and the affection was, I doubt not, reciprocal. John had witnessed the glory of his beloved Master on the Mount; he was present with him in public and in private; he had treasured up in his mind, more than any other, the discourses of his Lord. It was impossible, with such impressions on his mind, that John could write like the other Evangelists. They detail events; he enters fully into the sentiments of his Master, introduces us to all the excellencies of his character; he felt more, and therefore he makes us feel the more. The beginning of his Gospel corresponds with the conceptions I have of his character, and he appears to me to have acted strictly under the Horatian precept,

Servetur ad imum,
Qualis ab incepto processerit, et sibi constet.

There are three epochs of time in the preface to John's Gospel. The first denoted by the words, "In the beginning." The second, when it came to pass, that "there was a man sent from God whose name was John." The third, when "the word became

flesh." On the second epoch there is no difference of opinion among Christians; on the first and last they are by no means agreed. To me it appears that the third epoch is more clearly and decisively laid down in Scripture than the second, and that the events which immediately followed this epoch, lead us naturally to a plain interpretation of some parts which have been considered so very intricate in the preface; but I should be glad to hear the opinions of others on this subject, being well persuaded, that, if we are agreed in the two last epochs, we shall find little or no difficulty in ascertaining the first.

About two years ago I drew up a paper stating the different ways in which *εϑερεο* was translated in the authorized version. I have it not at hand, nor would it be easy for me to find it, if it exists. Would it be too much to request the favour of the young gentlemen of York College to do the same thing for us? Schmidt's Concordance will make it very easy for them, and if they would take a book or two of Herodotus, and compare it with any English translation, and write down the translation of *εϑερεο* in as many passages as occur in the Greek Testament, the result may lead us to some useful remarks.

W. FRIEND.

King William and Queen Mary, as connected with the Revolution of 1688.

O! ne'er may the fruit of that *landing*
 be lost,
 And long may BRITANNIA with gratitude
 own,
 The views of her enemies ne'er were so
 crost
 AS when WILLIAM and MARY ascended
 the throne.
 May the *throne* long endure,
 And its virtues ensure
 That *union* which only these realms
 can secure;
 While the Shamrock, the Rose and | the
 Thistle entwine
 Peace, Commerce and Plenty round LI-
 BERTY'S shrine!

Islington,
 Nov. 4, 1825.

SIR,
 THE Revolution of 1688, which always impresses my mind at this season of the year, must be pronounced one of the most distinguished events in the annals of Great Britain.

Immediately preceding it was a period of oppression and of tyranny. The Protestant Dissenters were almost crushed by the strong arm of power, suffering for their religious principles every species of persecution and obloquy. The ejection of *two thousand* clergymen from their livings, reducing them and their families to beggary, was followed by other acts of cruelty which will ever mark the reign of the Stuarts with indelible infamy. The Revolution of 1688 (imperfect as it was in many respects) rose upon this benighted realm with all the splendour of a heavenly luminary, which has been *growing brighter and brighter unto the perfect day!*

The commencement, progress and completion of this wonderful Revolution are detailed in every History of England. The object of the present paper is to draw the attention of the reader to the instruments by which, under Heaven, it was accomplished. These were King William and Queen Mary. Who they were, indeed, is generally known. But certain particulars may be enumerated which will illustrate the great event, and render us Britons more grateful for this memorable blessing. "The Revolution of 1688 was in the highest degree temperate and sober. It was imperfect, says a venerable Reformer, amongst us. Yet mark how effectual it has been; the *family* it gently let down from the throne has never returned. It is now extinct. The Revolution has not been changed in any one of its essential dispositions. It is, at this moment, *the living source* of our freedom and happiness, and every good Englishman has nothing to pray for—for the Government is established—than in the words of father Paul, when his dying, faltering lips adverted to his country, *Esto perpetua!*"

But we proceed to William and Mary. No biography is intended, but a few particulars illustrative of this grand national event.

In the History of the British Revolution, 1688, by George Moore, Esq., William and Mary are thus noticed: "Heaven in mercy to these favoured islands had raised up a man who, though by birth a foreigner and at the head of a foreign state, was by connexion and alliance an *English* Prince, and had many a national and

domestic title to interfere in the affairs of this nation. His circumstances were so nicely adjusted by a directing and superintending Providence, that he had the means of employing a large foreign force without breaking in on the system of national freedom and independence. This man was William of Orange and Nassau, hereditary stadtholder of Holland. To this quarter of the political horizon was every eye directed—on William was the eager gaze of men fixed and riveted. Never existed a man so qualified by nature and fortune for a great and beneficial enterprise. By birth he was a *liberatorum genus*, a family of deliverers. He received his first lessons in the school of adversity. He was born when his family had sunk beneath an adverse faction in his country, and instead of enjoying that situation of dignity and command to which his birth had designed him, he saw himself in a private state, in some measure depending on his enemies. But his public enemies were his private friends. The head of it, Pensionary de Witt, was a virtuous man, and he was educated under his personal inspection. From him, his éalm, sober, reflecting understanding derived those comprehensive views of the state of Europe and the interests of its component parts which guided his conduct in a maturer age. Called upon to defend and save the commonwealth which the valour of his ancestors had founded against the unprincipled invasion of the French, 1672, he displayed courage and firmness, not inadequate to the arduous duty which had devolved upon him. A saying of his amidst the difficulties which encompassed him on every side is one of the noblest and most heroic recorded in history. Being asked whether he did not see that his country was ruined, ‘There is one certain way,’ he replied, ‘of never seeing the ruin of my country—I will die in its last dyke!’ His title of an English Prince, which could alone enable him to interpose effectually and with perfect safety to England, arose from circumstances so extraordinary that the historian is not afraid of the imputation of superstition in representing them as combined by the special interposition of Providence for the purposes of mercy!”

On the 23rd of October, 1677,

William was married to the Princess Mary, eldest daughter of James, Duke of York, afterwards James II. Her joining with her husband to dethrone her father at the Revolution appears to have been the effect of religious duty. It was a costly sacrifice to Protestantism, which was at that period in England on the eve of extinction.

On Nov. 4, 1668, William landed at Torbay, after having once been driven back by a storm to Holland. This was a period of intense anxiety, and especially to his Royal Consort Mary. She had remained at the Hague. “Her behaviour,” says a modern historian, “is finely drawn by Burnet. The usual coarseness and meanness of his style assumes a character of pleasing simplicity.” His words are these: “Mary behaved herself suitably to what was expected from her. She ordered prayers *four* times a day, and assisted at them with great devotion. She spoke to nobody of affairs, but was calm and silent. The states ordered some of their body to give her an account of all their proceedings. She indeed answered little, but in that little she gave them cause often to admire her judgment.” The modern historian then adds, “If there be any who regard the memory of the dethroned King with fondness of partiality, they will interrupt this narrative by maliciously observing, that amidst all this solemn and devout composure the Princess was meditating the downfall of an aged father, and they will call upon the sentiments of nature against the interest which Burnet would excite. The historian who traces these pages has not learnt his morality in a school which teaches any predilection for what are called public and severe virtues. He will certainly not expatiate upon them at the expense of the softer and more endearing duties and charities of private life. He does not regard with any fondness or complacency of attention those extraordinary exertions which extraordinary exigences demand; he would rather paint with the love of an artist the more subdued image of virtue as it displays itself in the common course of human conduct, where nothing glaring offers itself to the eye, where there is more of shade than light in the whole execution. Yet he will confess, he partici-

pates in some of Burnet's enthusiasm for the Princess. The Revolution of 1688 was one of those few occasions in which public good was the paramount consideration. The Princess had great public duties to perform. She had to rescue from evident destruction that religion which she had been accustomed to revere and cherish as the perfection of Christianity, and with which the religious and civil liberties of mankind were at that time interwoven. Yet I would not render this homage to her memory if I could allow myself to believe that any thing of a decisive, much less ferocious, spirit was predominant in her mind. I persuade myself there was much of a tender melancholy, of a soft dejection in her sentiments, that the feelings of a daughter maintained a struggle in her bosom, and abated whatever was harsh and rugged in the public character she had to assume. I am confirmed in this persuasion by the account the same Burnet gives of her when he went to take his leave: "She seemed," says he, "to have a great load on her spirits, but to have no scruple as to the lawfulness of the design: she was very solemn and serious, and prayed God earnestly to bless and direct us!"

But the reader must be informed, that the feelings of Mary were put to the test, not only previously, but after the Revolution. When William was called to Ireland, his beloved consort followed him with unremitting anxiety. Here he incurred imminent danger. The Irish Papists would have gladly assassinated him. At the battle of the Boyne, where success crowned his arms, and where he was wounded; the enemy, conceiving it to be fatal, raised the shout of joy! He was, however, preserved to enjoy the fruits of his valour, and to uphold the Protestant religion throughout the three kingdoms.

The nonjurors of that day were constantly traducing the character of Mary, as utterly devoid of feeling and affection towards her unfortunate father, *James the Second*, which had no foundation in fact. On the intelligence of the victorious battle of the Boyne, July 1, 1690, Queen Mary immediately thus writes to William in Ireland: "How to begin this letter I do not know—how ever to render

God thanks enough for his mercies. Indeed, they are too great if we look on our deserts, but, as you say, it is his own cause, and since it is for the glory of his great name, we have no reason to fear but he will perfect what he has begun. When I heard the joyful news from Mr. Butler, (the messenger,) I was in pain to know what was become of the late King, and durst not ask him. But when Lord Nottingham came I did venture to do it, and had the satisfaction to know he was safe. I know I need not beg you to let him be taken care of, for I am confident you will for your own sake; yet add that to all your kindness, and for my sake let people know you would have no hurt come to his person!" And, August 5th, she says, "We have received many mercies; God send us grace to value them as we ought! But nothing touches people's hearts here enough to make them agree—that would be too much for our much happiness." August 19th, she also thus expresses herself: "Holland has really spoiled me, in being so kind to me; that they are so kind to you is no wonder: would to God it were the same here!" Lastly, August 26th, longing for William's return from Ireland, the Queen writes, "I am in greater fears than can be imagined by any one who loves less than myself. I count the hours and moments, and have only reason enough left to think that as long as I have no letters all is well! Yet I must see company upon my set days; I must play twice a-week; nay, I must laugh and talk, though never so against my will. I believe I dissemble very ill, yet I must endure it. All my motions are so watched, and all I do so observed, that if I eat less, or speak less, or look more grave, all is lost in the opinion of the world." Indeed, it is said that King William told Lord Carmarthen before his departure for Ireland, that "he must be very cautious of saying any thing before the Queen that looked like disrespect to her father, which she never forgave, and that the Marquis of Halifax had lost all manner of credit with her, for his unseasonable jesting on the subject." Once more. It was this illustrious Queen Mary, asking the cause of her father's resentment against *M. Jurieu*, was told by Bishop Burnet, that it

was on account of some indecencies spoken of Mary Queen of Scots! On which she replied, "*Jurieu* must support the cause he defends in the best way he can. If what he says of the Queen of Scots be true, he is not to be blamed for the use he makes of it. If princes will do ill things, they must expect the world will take revenge on their memories, since they cannot reach their persons." This shewed her knowledge of mankind.

But this great and good woman was soon to be taken away, an irreparable loss to the King and to the Nation. "In Dec., 1694, the Queen was attacked with what appeared a transient indisposition, from which she soon in a great degree recovered. But the disorder returning with more serious symptoms, the physicians of the household were called in, who pronounced it to be the measles, and very improper remedies were applied, for it was soon ascertained to be the *small-pox*, of the confluent and most malignant sort. She probably thought herself in danger from the first, as in an early stage of the illness she shut herself up in her closet for many hours, and, burning many papers, put the rest in order. The new Archbishop (Tillotson) attended her, and when no hope of recovery remained, he, with the King's approbation, communicated to her the true state of her condition. She received the intelligence with the most perfect composure, and said, 'She thanked God she had always carried this in her mind, that *nothing* was to be left till the *last hour*; she had nothing then to do but to look up to God, and submit to his will!' and continued to the last uniformly calm and resigned. She gave orders to look carefully for a small *escrutoire* to be delivered to the King. The day before she died, she received the sacrament; all the Bishops who were attending being admitted to receive it with her; afterwards she had her last interview with the King, to whom she addressed a few broken sentences imperfectly understood. Cordials were administered, but in vain. She lay silent for some hours, and from a few words which then dropped from her lips, it was perceived that her thoughts were wandering. She died on the 28th December, 1694, about one in the morning,

in the 33d year of her age, and sixth of her reign! She was buried at Westminster, with unusual honours, both Houses of Parliament assisting at the solemnity, and her memory was consecrated by the tears of the nation. All distinctions of party seemed for a moment to be forgotten, and absorbed in one general sentiment of affectionate and grateful admiration. The King was justly inconsolable for her loss. During her illness he had given way to the most passionate bursts of grief, and after her death, he seemed for many weeks and months plunged into the deepest melancholy. The necessity of attending to the great affairs of government at length roused him in some measure from his lethargy, and he gradually recovered his composure of mind, but to the last moment of his life he retained the tenderest affection for her memory."

But we now proceed to *William*, by the delineation of whose character we need not be long detained. It is better known to the public than that of *Mary*, and has been fully ascertained. History tells us, that the *Bill of Rights* being duly prepared on Feb. 12, 1689, the very next day being Wednesday, the two Houses went in solemn procession to the Banqueting House at Whitehall, where, with no other pomp than what arose from the greatness of the occasion, and the names of the illustrious magistrates who assisted, they tendered the *crown of these realms* to the great national deliverer William, and joined to him in form and title his consort Mary, the eldest Protestant issue of the late Sovereign James. The Parliamentary declaration of the *Bill of Rights* was first read with a loud voice by the Clerk of the Crown. Then the Marquis of Halifax, who had acted as Speaker of the House of Lords throughout all the discussions, on his knees made a tender of the crown. William answered for himself and his consort. He made the rights of the nation, as declared in the *Bill*, the foundation of his acceptance. "This," says the Monarch, meaning the *Bill of Rights*, "is certainly the greatest proof of the trust you have in us that can be given, that is the thing which makes us value it the more, and we thankfully accept what you have offered to

us. And as I had no other intention in coming hither than to preserve your *religion, laws and liberties*, so you may be sure that I shall endeavour to support them, and shall be willing to concur in any thing that shall be for *the good of the kingdom*, and do all that is in my power to advance the welfare and glory of the nation!"

From the Banqueting House we are told that the Lords and Commons went in the same solemn procession to different parts of the city, and proclaimed William and Mary King and Queen of Great Britain and Ireland.

A curious letter has lately appeared, giving an account of the joy manifested on this memorable occasion. It was written by an eye-witness, and, though brief, merits attention. It was written by Lady Cavendish, daughter of the patriotic Lord Russel, who was beheaded; the scenes witnessed were on the evening of the Proclamation of William and Mary, February, 1689: "There were wonderful acclamations of joy, which, though they were very pleasing to me, yet they frightened me, for I could not but think what a dreadful thing it is to fall into the hands of the rabble, they are such a strange sort of people! At night I went to Court with my Lady Devonshire, and kissed the Queen's hand, and the King's also, both proclaimed King and Queen of England in the room of King James, my father's murderer. There was a world of bonfires, and candles almost in every house, which looked extremely pretty. The King applies himself mightily to business, and is wonderfully admired for his great wisdom and prudence in ordering all things. He is a man of no presence, but looks very homely at first sight, but if one looks long on him, he has something in his face, both *wise and good*. But as for the Queen, she is really altogether very handsome; her face is very agreeable, and her shape and motions extremely graceful and fine; she is tall, but not so tall as the late Queen. Her room, as you may guess, was mighty full of company."

The *Protestant Dissenting Ministers* in and about the city of London were foremost in their congratulations to William. The silver-tongued Dr. Bates drew up and read the Address on the occasion. It thus commenced:

"May it please your Majesty. The series of successful events which have attended your glorious enterprise for the saving of *these kingdoms* from so imminent and destructive evils, has been so eminent and extraordinary, that it may force an acknowledgment of the Divine Providence from those who deny it, and cause admiration in all who believe and reverence it. The beauty and speed of this happy work, are bright signatures of his hand who creates deliverance for his people—the less of human power, the more of Divine wisdom and goodness has been conspicuous in it. If the deliverance had been obtained by fierce and bloody battles, victory itself had been dejected and sad, and our joy had been mixed with afflicting bitterness; but as the sun, ascending the horizon, dispels without noise the darkness of the night, so your serene presence has, without tumult and disorder, chased away the darkness that invaded us. In the sense of this astonishing deliverance we desire, with all possible ardency of affection, to magnify the glorious name of God, the Author by whose entire efficacy the means have been successful, and we cannot, without warm rapture of thankfulness, recount our obligations to your Majesty, the happy instrument of it. Your illustrious greatness of mind in an undertaking of such vast extent, your heroic zeal in exposing your most precious life in such an adventurous expedition, your wise conduct and unshaken resolution in prosecuting your great ends, are above the loftiest flight of language, exceed all praise!" Such were the sentiments of the Protestant Dissenters on this memorable occasion, without disguise or reservation.

The Mayor, Aldermen and Common Councilmen of the city of London, also made William the following short but impressive Address, delivered by Sir George Treby, Recorder, December 20, 1688: "Great Sir, when we look back to the last month, and contemplate the swiftness and fulness of our present deliverance, astonished, we think it miraculous! Your Highness, led by the hand of Heaven, and called by the voice of the people, has preserved our dearest interest, *the Protestant religion*, which is primitive Christianity restored. Our

laws are our ancient title to our lives, liberties and estates, without which this world were a wilderness. But what retribution can we make to your Highness? Our thoughts are full charged with gratitude. Your Highness has a lasting monument in the hearts, in the prayers, in the praise of all good men amongst us. And late posterity will celebrate your ever-glorious name, till time shall be no more!" Once more, when the body of lawyers addressed the King, his Majesty asked the aged and the truly venerable Serjeant Maynard, who read the Address, if he were not the oldest of his brethren. "Yes," replied the veteran, "I have lived longer than *all* my brethren, and had not your Majesty come amongst us, I should have outlived *law* itself!" A finer compliment could not be paid to the Revolution.

But to come down to the present day, it must be mentioned that the Centenary Anniversary of the Revolution was kept Nov. 4, 1788, by a religious service, held at the Old Jewry, introduced by Dr. Abraham Rees, who devoutly prayed, when Dr. Andrew Kippis preached an admirable sermon, and a numerous company dined together at the London Tavern. The Committee and Stewards had on blue coats, the Dutch uniform, with buttons exhibiting the head of William, and the room was embellished with the identical Dutch colours which William bore at Torbay. It was the honour and felicity of the writer to be present on that occasion. The character of William has been traduced by the Jacobite Smollett, but Mr. William Belsham, in his *Memoir of Great Britain*, has thus done ample justice to his memory:

"William the Third, King of Great Britain and Stadtholder of Holland, was a monarch on whose great actions and illustrious character history delights to dwell. In his person he was not above the middle size, pale, thin and valetudinary. He had a Roman nose, bright eagle eyes, a large front, and a countenance composed to gravity and authority. All his senses were critical and exquisite. His words came from him with caution and deliberation, and his manners, excepting to his intimate friends, reserved. He spoke Dutch, French, English and

German, equally well, and he understood Latin, Spanish and Italian. His memory was exact and tenacious, and he was a profound observer of men and things. He perfectly understood and possessed a most extensive influence over the political concerns and interests of Europe. Though far above vanity or flattery, he was pertinacious in his opinions, and from a clear perception or persuasion of their rectitude was too impatient of censure or controul. He attained not to the praise of habitual generosity from his frequently and apparently capricious deviations into the extremes of profusion and parsimony. His love of secrecy was perhaps too nearly allied to dissimulation and suspicion, and his fidelity in friendship to partiality and prejudice. Though resentful and irritable by nature, he harboured no malice, and disdained the meanness of revenge. He believed firmly in the truth of religion, and entertained a high sense of its importance. But his tolerant spirit and his indifference to the forms of church government made him very obnoxious to the great body of the clergy. He appeared born for the purpose of opposing tyranny, persecution and oppression, and for the space of thirty years it is not too much to affirm, that he sustained the most glorious character of any prince whose name is recorded in history. In his days and by his means, the first firm and solid foundations were laid of all that is most valuable to civil society. Every vindication of the natural and unalienable rights of mankind was, till he ascended the throne of Great Britain, penal and criminal. To him we owe the assertion and final establishment of our constitutional privileges. To him the intellectual world is indebted for the full freedom of discussion and the unrestrained avowal of these sentiments on the subjects of the highest magnitude and importance. To sum up all his character—he was distinguished for virtues rarely found amongst princes—moderation, integrity, simplicity, beneficence, magnanimity. *Time*, which has cast a veil over his imperfections, has added lustre to his many great and admirable qualities. His political views were in the highest degree laudable and upright. He had true ideas of the na-

ture and ends of government, and the beneficial effects of his noble and heroic actions will probably descend to the latest generations, rendering his name justly dear to the friends of civil and religious liberty, and his memory glorious and immortal!"

To this just and elaborate delineation of the character of William, shall be subjoined some *elegiac stanzas* by Dr. Isaac Watts, taken from his *Lyric Poems*. The poet's family had suffered grievously from the tyranny of the Stuarts. His father, a layman of great worth and piety, lay incarcerated in the common gaol at Southampton for his Nonconformity. His wife, with *young Isaac* at her breast, had sat on a stone many a cold morning during the wintry season close to the prison, awaiting the opening of its doors to visit her husband shut up within the dreary walls! The poet was fifteen years of age at the Revolution. Visions of bliss must have broken in upon his soul when he beheld his parents and suffering brethren brought forth into day-light and liberty! On the decease of the great Deliverer, the muse takes fire at his hallowed name, overwhelmed with admiration and gratitude.

Fair *Liberty* in sables drest,
Write his lov'd name upon his urn—
William, the scourge of tyrants past,
And awe of princes yet unborn.
Sweet *Peace* his sacred relics keep,
With olives blooming round his head,
And stretch her wings across the deep,
To bless the nations with the shade.
Stand on the pile, immortal *Fame*,
Broad stars adorn thy brightest robe,
Thy thousand voices sound his name
In silver accents round the globe.
Flattery shall faint beneath the sound,
While hoary TRUTH inspires the song,
Envy grow pale and bite the ground,
And *Slander* gnaw her forked tongue.
Night and the Grave, remove your gloom,
Darkness becomes the vulgar dead,
But *glory* bids the royal tomb,
Disdain the honours of a shade.
GLORY with all her lamps shall burn,
And watch the warrior's sleeping clay,
Till the last trumpet rouse his urn,
To aid the triumphs of the day!

William was born Nov. 4, 1650, married Nov. 4, 1677, landed in England Nov. 4, 1688, died March 8, 1702, having reigned 13 years and 23 days. His chief residence in this country was Hampton Court, now a

deserted palace, the present family having long ago exchanged it for Windsor Castle. I have lately visited it. Even to its present forlorn condition relics of greatness are attached. The ghost of royalty stalks throughout its domains. The continued presence of his Majesty George the Fourth, resembling the touch of Ithuriel's spear, would consecrate afresh the architectural grandeur of this *national edifice*, rearing its magnificent front on the banks of the Thames—

Strong without rage, without o'erflowing,
full.

Thus the splendour of Hampton Court, (the abode of the *Belgic Hero*,) though enveloped in gloom and seeming to lie more heavily on its foundations, would emerge with renovated lustre to set at a more distant period and with an accumulated glory.

J. EVANS.

Birmingham,
Jan. 9, 1826.

SIR,

IN writing about a year ago to Mr. Adam, of Calcutta, I mentioned to him some of the reasons which I thought rendered the Unitarians in this country tardy in furnishing the aid which he has looked for towards the support of his and their cause at Calcutta. I have recently received from him the inclosed letter, which contains his answers to my remarks, or rather what I believed were the remarks of others. He also wishes me to make the contents of it known among my friends, which is sufficient to authorize me to publish it. I therefore submit it to you for insertion in the Repository, if you think that step advisable.

JAMES YATES.

Rev. James Yates, Birmingham.

Dear Sir,

The arrival of the Bengal, put me in possession of your letter of the 8th of January, which was delivered to me by Mr. Bakewell Cumberland, and I only regret that you did not furnish me with an earlier opportunity of offering you an explanation of the estimated expense of our Chapel and the objects contemplated in its erection.

With regard to the *expense* of the Chapel, the only place where I have

seen it estimated at 4000*l.* is on the cover of the Monthly Repository—an estimate which was, I suppose, calculated from one contained in the First Number of the Unitarian Repository, published in Calcutta in October 1823, in which it is stated that “the estimated expense is Sa. Rs. 30,000, but on account of the increased and increasing value of landed property it is probable that Sa. Rs. 40,000 may be ultimately required.” But the former of these sums, at the exchange of 1*s.* 10*d.* per Rupee, then and till very lately current, amounts only to 2750*l.*, and the latter to 3666*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*, either of which forms a very considerable deduction from the amount stated in the Monthly Repository, and consequently removes, in some measure at least, the appearance of extravagance in our plans. The rate of exchange has very recently become more favourable for remittances to England than it was at the above-mentioned date, which it is not improbable may occasion a change less favourable for remittances to India. In this event the amount stated in the Monthly Repository will approach nearer the truth, as the same amount in pounds sterling will then produce a smaller amount in Sicca Rupees. From these remarks you will perceive that any given sum in English currency is not a fair criterion of the expense actually incurred, or estimated to be incurred, in Bengal currency, unless with express reference to the rates of exchange prevailing between the two countries. Confining my remarks, therefore, to the estimate contained in the Unitarian Repository, I think I can shew by actual experiment that it was formed upon a just consideration of the circumstances of the case. Within the last five years two Dissenting Chapels have been built in Calcutta, the one by the Baptists, the other by the Independents; the one capable of containing a congregation of about 200, the other of 400 persons; the one having a vestry, a baptistery, a range of offices for carriages and palankeens, but no school-room; the other having a vestry and a school-room, but no baptistery nor any accommodation for carriages and palankeens; the one without, the other with, punkahs; and both built in the

very plainest and least expensive style, and furnished with the same regard to economy. Now, according to printed reports lying before me, the Baptist Chapel cost altogether upwards of Sa. Rs. 24,000, and the Independent Chapel, exclusive of school-room and vestry, nearly Sa. Rs. 33,000, and, inclusive of school-room and vestry, upwards of Sa. Rs. 36,000; but in comparing the actual cost of these two chapels with the estimated cost of the Unitarian Chapel, I beg your attention to the three following particulars. First, we have allowed ourselves a considerable latitude by estimating the probable expense of the Unitarian Chapel at from 30 to 40,000 Rupees: if our funds enable us to build a vestry, a school-room, out-offices for carriages and palankeens, a printing-office, and a dwelling-house for the minister, all of which are contemplated as desirable, the ultimate cost cannot be less than the last-mentioned sum; if *only* a Chapel be built, the ultimate cost will not be more than the first-mentioned sum. Secondly, it seems desirable (to avoid a diminutive appearance on the one hand, and to prevent on the other a striking disproportion between the usual number of attendants and the number it is capable of accommodating) that the Unitarian Chapel should be larger than the Baptist and not so large as the Independent one; and also that the furniture, such as seats, railings, &c., should be executed in a somewhat superior manner to that belonging to the other two chapels: if, according to these views, it be furnished somewhat more tastefully than both of the other chapels, and be built larger than the smallest of them, the ultimate cost will be proportionately affected. Thirdly, one important item of the ultimate cost is the price of the ground, and in this particular we have laboured under great disadvantages in consequence of the unprecedented increase in the value of land during the last few years. At present, indeed, and for the last two months, money has become very scarce, purchasers fewer, and land less valuable, but we had purchased our Chapel ground several months before the change was even thought of by the best-informed in these matters, and were consequently

obliged to pay very high for it. The ground on which the Baptist Chapel stands measures 1 biggah 12 cottahs, and cost less than 2000 Rupees—that on which the Independent Chapel stands measures 1 biggah 8 cottahs, and cost 10,000 Rupees exactly—that which has been purchased for the Unitarian Chapel measures 1 biggah 4 cottahs, and cost upwards of 12,000 Rupees. It is true that the Independent Chapel is more eligibly situated than the Baptist one, and the Unitarian Chapel, when built, will be more eligibly situated than even the Independent one; but eligibility of situation, although it may in some measure account and compensate for the difference, does not enter into the present question, which is not one of *cui bono*. Viewing the question merely as a pecuniary one, you will at once perceive that the high price we have paid for the ground—which we were induced to give from the fear, occasioned by a long-continued and till then fruitless search, that we should not be able to get ground at all—gives an appearance of extravagance to our plans which they do not really possess. The fact is, that we will go as far as our funds will enable us in what we consider will serve any one purpose of practical utility, but as far as my influence extends we will not incur a single farthing of debt to serve even such a purpose, much less to spend it on what is either superfluous or useless. I hope I shall be found to have afforded you satisfaction on this point; if not, I shall willingly afford you whatever other explanation you may consider necessary or desirable.

The *objects* contemplated in the erection of a Unitarian Chapel in Calcutta are two-fold, consisting, *first*, in the diffusion of correct views of the gospel among professing Christians; and, *secondly*, in the diffusion of correct views of religion in general among Hindoos and Mussulmans. Now, although each of these objects, when both are combined, will prove greatly auxiliary to the other, yet each is also capable of being considered on its own independent merits. Waving, then, all reference to the natives, I would ask those who, considering the obstacles to *their* conversion and improvement, “object to distant schemes of

benevolence,” whether it is not a matter of vast importance to raise the standard of pure Christianity among the 900,000 professing Christians who have been calculated to reside on the Continent of India and its contiguous islands, and whether the word of God can be sounded forth with greater advantage from any other place than Calcutta, where it is now proposed to erect a Unitarian Chapel with that object especially in view? I hold that the single object of evangelizing the Christians residing in this quarter of the world, would fully justify the establishment of a Unitarian Mission on a much more extensive scale than is now contemplated, for that and another object at least equally important. Such a Mission may be considered an “experiment,” inasmuch as it has never been tried before, and, like every other first attempt, may fail from causes which no prudence could foresee and no wisdom avert. But in such matters, where human nature is the subject of experiment, an absolute certainty of success can never be held out; a probability of success, proportioned in degree to the nature of the work to be done, and the amount of means employed, is all that can reasonably be expected, and such a probability of success, I have no hesitation to affirm, exists in the present instance, even if we extend our views to the natives, and much more if we limit them to professing Christians. Among professing Christians it is those born in Europe that give a tone to society, whether as officers in the army, as civil servants of the Company, as lawyers, or as merchants and traders. Of these different classes there is a respectable proportion sincerely and zealously attached to the popular system of belief; there is also a respectable proportion firmly attached to that system merely because it is popular and established; there is a certain proportion smaller, but also respectable, conscientiously attached to the doctrines of Unitarianism; there is at least an equal proportion open and avowed unbelievers, i. e. persons who would ridicule Christianity, or profess their unbelief of it in conversation, but who would not perhaps permit themselves to be published as unbelievers to the world; and there is a greater proportion than

all these put together of persons who care for none of these things, who do not consider religion a subject worthy of their attention. Among all these different descriptions of persons is there not ample scope for exertion and usefulness? The *very* orthodox would be perhaps the last to be benefited, but the honest inquirer might be enlightened, the wandering Christian might be reclaimed, the unbeliever might be convinced, the indifferent might be awakened, and the profligate might be reformed. Would **all** this be nothing? Considering what pure gospel truth has wrought in similar circumstances, have you not committed a mistake in speaking of an attempt to accomplish these objects as a mere "experiment"? The human mind is operated on in the same way in India as in Europe. Let the means be furnished to exhibit truth—pure truth—to exhibit it clearly, fully, constantly—and he who doubts its success must doubt its existence—must doubt that there is such a thing as truth. I am a firm believer in the omnipotence of truth. Its progress in the world has been retarded by two causes—by its mixture with error, and by its not being permitted to shew itself. Let it be separated from error, and exhibited in all its native beauty and excellence, and it must make its way into the mind of man. Assuming that Unitarian Christianity is *the* truth, if we do not succeed in our present attempt to spread it, this will be not because truth is not adapted to the mind, or because the mind is not adapted to truth, but because *the means are not possessed* to bring the one fairly and fully into operation upon the other.

Accept my sincere thanks for your sympathy, and the interest which you take in our plans. I look to you and others to convey just ideas of them to the Unitarian public.

I have conveyed your good wishes to Rammohun Roy.

* * * * *
W. ADAM.

SIR,
I COPY the following sensible passage from a sermon, composed originally "for the use of a country parish," and "occasionally delivered in *York Cathedral*," entitled, "The

Necessary Knowledge of the Lord's Supper, and the necessary Preparation for it, shewn from the Words of its Institution, in a Sermon preached at the Cathedral of York, March 29, 1727. 4th edition. By Thomas Sharp, M. A., Archdeacon of Northumberland, and Prebendary of York." The copy from which I transcribe (ed. 1766) was given by Mr. Granville Sharp, a relative of the author, to the friend to whom I am indebted for the loan of it.

"Now, truly, whatever you may think of this matter, there is so little of nicety or curiosity in it, that a man of the meanest capacity, and dullest understanding, may comprehend the notion. It is not required that every ordinary communicant should be able to give an account of the several opinions and disputes which have been held about this Sacrament; it is not required that he should be able to determine the questions about the real presence of Christ, or give an account of the points about the Sacrament, which are maintained and defended, by the *Papists* on one side, and the *Lutherans* on another, and the *Soci-nians* on another, &c. God be thanked, neither Transubstantiation, *nor* *Consubstantiation*, nor any other of the controverted points, are made necessary to be known either by Christ or his apostles. The Sacrament which our Lord hath commanded *all* disciples to observe till his coming again, and which he has appointed as a means generally necessary to our salvation, must needs be such a thing, as *all men*, the meanest of men, may understand, if they will, and carry in their minds."

I have been much interested in examining, lately, a little work, by C. Baring, Esq., of Exmouth, entitled, "Thoughts on Final Universal Restoration," 2nd edition, 1823. The same gentleman, under the assumed name of John Smith, Gent., (which he has since replaced with his own name,) had published several interesting works; on Prophecies, the Person of Christ, &c., which clearly exhibit a manly love of religious truth, and no inconsiderable pains in the search after it. The present little book professes to be a compilation from the most judicious writers, on the subject

of Universal Restoration, viz. Petitpierre, J. Simpson, Dr. Estlin, Dr. Hartley, &c. The Compiler's preliminary attestation to the value of the doctrine, well deserves a place in the Repository.

"More than thirty years have passed since my attention was first attracted to the consideration of Final Universal Restoration. The firm belief, that this pleasing doctrine is in perfect unison with every thing we find in the Sacred Scriptures, has carried me with more than ordinary composure and resignation through some of the most trying events of life; and now in the *eighty-second year of my age*, has determined me to select and bring together passages from sundry publications, such as have appeared to me abundantly sufficient to establish it."

I observe that Dr. Carpenter in his *third* and much improved edition of "Unitarianism the Doctrine of the Gospel," while of opinion that the Christian revelation was not intended to disclose at first the final issue of all, expresses his conviction, that "it accords best with the nature of Christianity to suppose that it contains principles undeveloped when first preached, expanding as the minds of men are fitted to receive them."—"Christianity," says Dr. Channing, "has never shrunk as intellect has opened; but has always kept in advance of men's faculties, and unfolded nobler views, in proportion as they have ascended."

I think it will be found that the late Gilbert Wakefield, in one of his works, advocated the same reasonable opinion.

A CATHOLIC.

Yarmouth,

January 7, 1826.

SIR,

I DID not find the paper of which the inclosed is a copy before I had sent you Emlyn's Letter of Dec. 23d. [XX. 705—709.] If I had, the inscription at the beginning would have rendered any remarks on the genuineness of that letter unnecessary.—I have now sent you all the letters of Emlyn which I can find. Those of April 8th, 1704, and of March 21st, 1705, form a regular series with the one already published. That of June 8th must, I suppose, have been written after his return to England in 1706.

H. R. BOWLES.

VOL. XXI.

F

Mr. Manning to Mr. Emlyn, headed "A Copy of the Sum of my Return to Mr. Emlyn, his Letter to me, Decr. 23. 1703."

SIR,

Yours I received; when also the Answer to your Enquiry* came to my hands, which I was willing to see. Some few remarks of mine upon either I would give you, as well as now I can. I count that it might have been for the better, if you had reserved to yourself your thoughts coincident with Arius, till drawn out in a defence of what you first only undertook when put to it. You have now cut out more work for yourself to attend. All your arguments, in the main, against the supream deity of Jesus Christ, are of force, but ad homines; they conclude nothing against a Nestorian (a great part of the Orient). You grant to them the præexistence and personality of the *Word*, the Logos, John i., his distinct, previous *filiation*, his agency of old, his style of *God*, his personal *omnipotence*, viz. his creation of all things, angels and archangels; yea, and of the H. Ghost, (according to you,) if a *person*, out of *nothing*, Col. i. 16. His being alone with the *Father* before all worlds, having made or produced no being in nature by his immediate efficiency, never, save him only his begotten Son. The hypostatical union of the Logos and Son of Mary you also own, and that begotten of her to be no person. Now those hold two *subsistent* natures, i. e. *persons* in a *relative* unity only, and conjunct energy one Christ so, in a *metonymical* communication of properties, (as the agreement now speaks too, as to that,) but refuse the hypostatical union, whence it remains to you distinctly to prove against them, that the *Logos* or Son of God, a person by himself, as owned with them by you, was not *very* God, the Son of the Supream Essence, (supream is

* By Mr. Boyse, with whom Mr. Emlyn had divided the pastoral care of the congregation in Wood Street, Dublin. The Answer was called a "Vindication of the Deity of Jesus Christ." It was published by Mr. Boyse, and presented to the Lord Chief Justice, while the prosecution was depending, and the trial expected to come on very soon.

H. R. B.

redundant if of the *essence*,) of God the Father. The idea of *substance*, the substrate to the *faculties* of the *form*, or formal essence of a spirit, none pretend to conception of, not of our own soul, whose powers we certainly know. Of that will be the question touching your Logos præ-existent. And a king's son may be of the same *supream essence* in specie with his father; and is so a *man*, tho' as originated from him, and in other respects he has not the same *supremacy*, but no argument from the man Christ Jesus reaches them. Your adversary, most inconsistently with himself, takes his hold of that handle, for having espoused the common doctrine of the hypostatic union and a *God-man*, and making the term *God*, Acts xx. 28, Son, Heb. i. 1, and man, 1 Tim. ii. 5, yea, and the Son of Man, John vi. 62, to be *concrete* terms, denoting the *person* of Christ by either name, *whole* Christ, tho' not *wholly* either of them alone the Christ; but when your allegations pen'd him, then the *Son* absolutely put, and Son of Man shall be *abstract* natures, Mark xiii. 32, John v. 29, 1 Cor. xv. 28, &c., no more concrete names, with him expressly two Sons, the one the Son of *God* himself, and the other the Son of Man. He, himself, (like as with him, God is but one of more, the *Father* only, 1 Tim. ii. 5, Heb. ix. 24; and the *Father* only, Matt. xxiv. 36, shall not be exclusive of the Son, Mark xiii. 32); but the distinction comes in too late for him an Athanasian.

Then, again, you have yet to refute both the Arian opinion mostly, and the Socinian, touching the person of Christ, however these accord with you as to the *unity* of God, and denial of the *deity* of the Son of Man, as having no God above him. Your hypothesis, I take it in its connection, proceeds on these principles—(1.) That the Logos or Son of God præexisting before the world, was the Messiah (not yet incarnate), a person, not a derivative, dependent Being, finite and of a created capacity, but that *He*, God by him, or under God, could give being to all things out of *nothing*, lay the foundations of the earth, &c., Job xxxviii. 4. Such capacity no Socinian will grant communicable to any created being, no more than a Trini-

tarian. (2.) That the same Logos, Christ preexistent, was of the same *species* of being with all human spirits, (if those be distinct from the angelic nature or not, Heb. xii. 22, 23,) who likely may, for all that appears to the contrary, *preexist* likewise. However, the *word* an human soul or spirit, you take for the soul of the man Christ Jesus, and that he has no other *nature* of which the Christ consists but the human, like to his brethren, Heb. ii. 17. (He is no *God-angel-man* with Mr. Sterry, to reconcile all texts and parties.) The Logos is his *soul* (and *passible*, John xii. 27. 'Tis not the flesh itself that feels or is grieved, Matt. xxvi. 38). The Arians, who make the *Logos* a *super angelic*, or *angelic spirit* at least, appearing to the *patriarchs* of old, will not agree to all that. (3.) That consequently the preexistent *Logos* (the Son of God) *assumed* no *manhood*, but a corpse or *inanimate* flesh only, into a *vital* unity of person with him. All that was *begotten* of the Virgin Mary, Luke i. 35, that *holy thing*, was *flesh* only, but what was *born* of her was her *Maker*. (4.) That the union of these two natures, *flesh* and *spirit*, was truly *hypostatical*. Such as that a communication of properties belonging to either nature apart, are really and truly predicable of the *concrete* person, (not metonymically or verbally only; so as *omnipotence*, yea, and as well eternity and immensity may be also predicated of a *finite* being, interpreted not of that *being*, but of God specially in him, no, but) so as that things acted and *done* by either *nature*, as the immediate *subject* or principle *a quò* may be verified of the person, the *suppositum ut quod*: yea, tho' done of old by a part before, such *union* you say is peculiar to the *human* nature, supposing the soul's *pre-existence*; but of the latter you can give no parallel instance of any one, that a man should be said to do this or that before he was born, or was a man, or to have done it, in an after predication of him existent, at which the Socinian sticks,* denying as well the *pre-existence* too of the Son of

* To *stick* at any thing seems to have been an usual method with Mr. Manning of expressing a difficulty. So in his notes on Emlyn's letter of Dec. 23, when

Man's soul, or of any nature of his at all.

I think that I do not mistake your notion, but the subject is too large for me in so little room to give you my further thoughts to every particular matter, or reasoning of yours, only to hint something that may possibly serve to forelay and facilitate your meditations, if you should be further engaged in that controversy. The preexistence of the man Christ Jesus, I told you, is the *radical stick* with me, all our divisions deriving from it. But to the matter; I urged you with the constant assertion in Scripture, of *whole* Christ being by descent of human race, seminally in the loins of David, Acts ii. 30; and of Abraham, as Levi was, Heb. vii. 5, 14, made of his seed, Rom. i. 3. To that you answer, that it speaks of his flesh only. Now, I know not but that possibly that interposition, (according to the flesh,) in this case, might be with provision against some that took him to have but an aerial body only, or to notify his *substance* to derive from the fathers, with precaution against the disbelief of his singular miraculous conception, having no *Father* as to that but God. But that distinction followed in your sense, (contrary to the common import of the word, speaking of man, Deut. v. 26, Matt. xxiv. 22, &c.,) will oblige you to make good the *preexistence*, as well of all *souls* as of Christ's. For, that the Apostle affirms the *alliance* of Christ to the patriarchs, of whom he was, Rom. ix. 5, to be the same with his own to the same stock, ver. 1, both *κατὰ σάρκα* alike. I have not read *Glanvil*, but have others, particularly Mr. Baxter, treating of the traduction of original pravity, with whom I am satisfied that man begets his species, (as well as even every animal else,) according to the institution of nature, Gen. i. 22, 27, 28, &c., and that (with the Divine concurrence) he begets the *soul*, or nothing at all. *Anima generat animam, mens mentem*, with re-

he says, "Here is nothing stuck at of the common doctrines but only the co-eternity," &c. &c., he means that these were the only points of the common doctrine with which he supposed Emlyn could not agree according to the line of argument he had taken. H. R. B.

spect to which 'tis, that any one is said to be in the loins of another, Acts xiii. 23; or such a *soul* to come out of them, Gen. xlvi. 26. Subsistent *spirits* were created before the body of Adam, but not his *soul*, Gen. ii. 7. Eve was of God made of *animated* matter, and we read of no *soul* created for her, or breathed into her, ch. ii. 22. So was *Jesus* the Son of God (having no other father) *made* of a woman, Gal. iv. 4; all of him I take it, that is the Son. Whose *soul* grew in *wisdom* (no Platonic reminiscence) as his body did in stature, Luke ii. 52; the *Logos*, according to you, having lost all. You further grant to me that no proof can be made *à priori*, of the *preexistence* of the *soul* of Christ, (nothing of it is recorded in the history of his generation or conception,) but to that 'tis sufficient you say, that by consequence and implication *à posteriori*, it is provable, *viz.* from the acts and deeds of him the Son of Man ascribed to him to be done before *born* of a woman. For his coming down from *heaven*, (his very flesh too, John vi. 50, 51,) you know my sense of such texts. John xvi. 28, 30, seems to import no more than ch. xvii. 8, xviii. 37, where to be *sent* and to be *born* are exegetically put for same with coming out *from* God and into the *world*. So ch. viii. 23, from above, and how it may be true *literally* too; tho' such *metaphorical* speech was the common use of the Jews in all their teaching, and so of Christ's. But your main instance of fact predicated of Christ is that of his creation of all things. Your Answerer has prevented me in what I would say to that. If you can't refute him (which I can't do in that point), the Socinian notion only remaining, or what amounts to it, will, for all the difficulties attending it, remain firm; but a little more to that. That *Creator* and *creature* divide all *being*, is what not only the light of nature dictateth, but is grounded on that of the Apostle, Rom. i. 25; (whence your adversary might, by the way, have found his own hypothesis subverted of a *God-man*, one being subsistent, since that *unity* of *being* transcends that of *operation*;) but withall, a *creative* power is the *incommunicable* property of the *Supream* God, and is made the demonstration of his eternal *Godhead*,

knowable by the exertion of that his power, ver. 20; as characteristic of him, Isa. xlv. 24, xlviii. 12, 13, Job xxxviii. 4. The builder of all things is very *God*, Heb. iii. 4. Let him that challenges to himself a *Godhead* make another world, and it will be granted him, Jer. x. 11, 12; are there *Gods* one *supream*, another *ministering*, that made the heavens and the earth, allowed of in that context? Isa. xl. 28, Mal. ii. 10. So as that the *efficiency* thereof shall be attributable to *God Almighty* no otherwise than as the faculty or *power* thereof was *originally* from him, and *dependently* upon him still, (like as Judg. xvi. 28, 29, Acts xxviii. 8,) but *subjected* in the *soul* of Christ, the *immediate* efficient, having the power thereof in *sese*, as John v. 26, 28, tho' not *a se*, ver. 19, in the exertion whereof he himself, (and so God by him,) out of nothing caused to pass into *being* and existence the whole system of the *universe*, *intelligible* and *sensible*, the throne and footstool of God, angels and man. How is that God alone? How the capacity of a *derivative* being? Surely 'tis the peculiar of *God* by himself alone, not of any *Son of Man*, Acts xiv. 15; no, not of Christ, who then could not need that supply neither of his creature, Luke xxii. 43; another to raise him from the dead, 1 Pet. i. 21; nor to have his *headship* over angels founded on his obedience, Phil. ii. 9, Eph. i. 21; while he had a title paramount to it in *nature*, if their *Creator*, as being the work of his hands, Heb. ii. 7; neither needed you to have laboured so much in proof of his capacity of *inspection*, &c., when after you can make good this, that one text alone, Psa. xciv. 8, 9, will perstringe your adversary: Isa. xxix. 16, wont more.

To make or *generate* a Creator and immediate Father of all things, is to me an inferior *God* (if that can be). It will drive to a God by *nature*, Gal. iv. 8, and issue in the *Nicene* belief for ought that you have said, at last. In which sentiment is Dr. *Fowler** (in nothing of yours, but of the *inferiority* of the Son, in which the fathers with one mouth, centred with you). However, Dr. Cudworth* goes by him-

* Undoubtedly Cudworth and Fowler were the names intended in the last

self, who with the former, owning the eternity and *consubstantiality*, will have the *word* the Son to be *infinite*, *omnipotent*, &c., but only *ad extra* from the Father's concurrence to all his operations without, as of creation, &c. A paradox, indeed! a God Almighty from without, to have the same *specific nature*, the like, (as Father and Son,) viz. the same *natural* faculties of life, understanding and will, but not in actu exercito the like or the same at all. But still the matter sticks about John i. 1, 3. All the fathers after Justin, (the Second Epistle of Clemens Rom. was never admitted for authentic,) you add, agree in attributing to the Logos the *old* creation (with Philo, cotemporary with St. John). True! so doth St. Peter, 2 Pet. iii. 5, 7; there 'tis *λόγος*, no person the same with *ῥήματι*, Heb. xi. 3, and the very same with that Ps. xxxiii. 6, Job. xxvi. 13, and Prov. iii. 19, allegorically expatiated on chap. viii. 24, all relating to God's *fiat*, Gen. i. And Christ never taught his own creation of that world, Matt. xix. 4, 6, but whence John took up that term, (not by immediate inspiration,) in his *allusive* application thereof to the person of Christ, God's mouth to us, 1 Cor. i. 24, who never spake by him of old, Heb. i. 1, I shall not define. While yet all the *Platonic* theology of the next fathers after Justin I find bottomed on that *term*, used only by John, whence 'tis not unlike but that those might in the title of the Revelations give to him the style of John του Θεολογος, but you know my sense of that context. I don't believe that any Jew of old did believe the *preexistence* of the Messiah, (having no ground for it,) or his being an instrument in the *creation*, neither did Philo* nor any Christian of the *circumcision*, nor yet St. John. His words, "In the beginning," &c.,

letter which I sent. But the abridgement of the name Dr. Cudw. had an accidental stroke on the last part of the *w*, which gave it the appearance of *is*.

H. R. B.

* It appears by this that Mr. Manning entertained the opinion which has been so powerfully advocated by Dr. Jones, that Philo was a Christian.

H. R. B.

are applicable to the *first* creation, "and God was the *word*," some read it. And our old translations render the following verses "IT," *impersonally*. But John going on in the allegorical way of teaching common with the Jews, (such as Rom. v. 14, 1 Cor. iv. 6, x. 4, Gal. iv. 24, 1 Pet. iii. 21, &c.,) he *metaleptically* carrieth it all over to the person of *Christ*, Rev. xix. 13, and his renovation of all things and a new parallel *ἐξ ἀρχῆς* or *beginning*, (ch. xvi. 14,) the very same that he refers to, 1 John i. 1, ii. 24, &c. In which the Son of Man was the *life* and the light too, John xii. 35, 46, not meaning to give us an history of the old creation, such as was never brought to light before; but of that Heb. ii. 5. The *ages* formed by him, ch. i. 2, opposed to the former of *old*, Tit. i. 2, the same word, so Heb. vi. 5. You have read Mr. N. of the *Logos*, and Plato Unveiled, (now Englished,) and I can say no more. (Is. lxxv. 17.)

Something noted by me in the reading of your Answerer, I might further hint, had I room for it. He wisely prefaces his confession of ignorance about the *distinction* in God, but should have said of the *unity* of him. For when he has told of the Father's *voluntary* parting with his right of rule, and devolving it on his Son, and his voluntary condescension to stoupe down to undertake his incarnation (an operation *ad extra* too) and ministration in his offices, &c., surely no reader or hearer of his can be ignorant but that is two wills and two intelligent beings. But beyond all, in the matter touching the *mediation* and *object* of worship, he is perfectly lost. To the Heathen there were "*Gods many*," yea *supream* to the vulgar, so currant that such as Plato and Seneca durst not teach against it (the former owns it) for the fear of Socrates his fate, and to the learned lords or demon mediators many, Acts xvii. 19, 1 Cor. viii. 5, but to us but one of each, ver. 6, to the latter (not ascribing neither the *creation*) they paid only *subordinate* homage. But will the author deny any religious worship at all to be due to the Son of Man, an object of *sense*? John ix. 37, 38, Luke xxiv. 50, 52. If so he is not of the Christian reli-

gion!* But if he worships Creator and creature (God-man) in one conjunct idea of the *ultimate* object inclusively, he first *deifies* a creature, an hypostatical conjunction being (if possible) the *ultimum quod sit* of a *deification* beyond an *apotheosis*. What else can *humanify* the *brute* nature but such an *unity* with the *mental*? And then to pay to it *ultimate* worship was repudiated by all the wiser Heathen, as not due to any creature, but to God alone. Who then is it that his reflections will fall upon of blasphemy, &c., if *Christ* be not the *Supream* God? If the *manner* of the Scripture writings be not attended, (wherein in forty instances of the rendering of Christ's own words out of the Syriac language into the Greek the evangelists differ,) and some fundamental *rules* of *interpretation* be not forelaid to regulate the same, on all hands occasion may be taken to charge each other with subterfuges, harsh or forced construction, &c., possibly such as yet no man could avoid. But the truth itself will never be found out or be agreed on in difficult points. You and I are at our ne plus ultra. Your adversary bespeaks a *candid* answer, (and one is needful,) but will he obtain for you a *lycence* to do it? He would have none to *read* you without an *antidote*, but does he think that your *suffering* for your essay might not have been antidote enough if he had wrote nothing? Your circumstances are grievous to me, but I don't despair of your release in time. I wish you had a few pages of mine on another subject to peruse, but it can't now be.

I remain yours cordially.

Thus far the letter. The remainder of the paper is filled with remarks, which appear by the writing to have been noted down afterwards, they are as follow :

* So thought Socinus when he concurred in the shameful treatment of Davides. Alas! that ever such disciples of a meek and humble Master should forget even for a moment the spirit that actuated their instructor.

H. R. B.

John i. 1, accords not with Gen. i. 1; no such instrument is *there* noted all along, ch. ii. 2, and the word only in John. But if we have two *Creators*, the one primary or supream, the other immediate, secondary and subordinate, by whom, &c. — how comes it to pass that our translators stuck at it, when in so many texts (according to the Hebrew idiom) we read in the original (tho' joyned with a verb singular mostly) of *Gods* creating the heaven and the earth, Gen. i. 1, 27, and *Gods* our *Makers*, Job xxxv. 10, Ps. cxlix. 2, and *Creators*, Eccles. xii. 1, &c., all *plural*; that they render such texts in the singular number, (as in the Apostle's Creed too,) if indeed we are to own more than one Creator or common parent, as being the immediate offspring of Christ? Acts xvii. 26, 28. Where by the way it appears, that the assertion of *Gods* more than *one* were more defensible from the phrase of Scripture-writing, than that of divine *persons* more than *one*, for that not only we find it no where so written as of the former, but for as much as the latter exegetically added serves to ascertain and compleat the notion or idea of distinct *Gods* being the same thing in plainer terms. Three all-knowing, all-mighty persons, are every such divine person, a *God*. If one such make a *God*, more such make *Gods*. A Father and a begotten Son, either of them God Almighty, is plain enough, but each of them a *person* by himself and to be God and Lord, speaks more out.

The Sabellians of old, adhering to the numerical unity of God, (as our nominal Trinitarians now,) denied the proper personality of the Son as a distinct intelligent being and agent. The Arian and Semi-arian party firmly asserted it, and became the most prevalent. Those again touching the substance and nature and essential propertys of the person of the Son, fell into three divisions, the Mono, the Homoi, and the Hetero-usion parties. The two former of the Nicene Council were at length forced to a verbal accord centering in the *Homousios*, an ambiguous term that might be construed to either of their senses, (one substance in number or one in *kind* only the *like*,) and so

their forces united, they together over-numbered the strict *Arian* party and there condemned them. Who soon after did as much for those in diverse greater following councils. But the Homousians afterward again getting up, and running down the Arians, quite divided between themselves, the greater part of them to this day are real Trinitarians, (as all the vulgar,) i. e. for three divine all-knowing persons, whereof the *Logos* or Son is one. But then again owning the consubstantiality, both of them; the greater number of them, in a subdivision, are for the coeternity and coequality of the Father and Son; the other, holding both to be very God Almighty, and each a person by himself, affirm the coeternity of Father and Son, to that end explaining the procession of the Son from the Father, by the way of necessary natural emanation, as light, &c., but denying the *equality* with the ancient fathers, neither did those of Nice at all assert it. This way goes Dr. Cudworth and of late Dr. Fowler, not asserting with the former the omnipotence of the Son to be ab extra only, or the Father's concurse at pleasure. My friend to whom this is directed, goes the Arian way in the main. He denies the consubstantiality, eternity, and coequality of the Son, as also the hypostatical unity with the Divine Being of the man Christ Jesus. But affirming the *preexistence* of the one nature of his person and his instrumentality therein, in the creation of all beings and things under God, efficiently causing them to spring out of nothing; he centers in a God of God, a begotten God, however produced, (tho' a creature too,) made *omnipotent* and *omniscient* potentially, (as Dr. Cudw.,) the former de facto exerted in the *creation*, the latter when God pleases to concur with him. In short, God can make an infinite secondary cause, i. e. that may or can know, effect and do, all that ever himself (without him) ever did or can do to make another world. Nothing of immediate efficiency being his peculiar, besides the causation of an instrument, (if the Holy Spirit be not such another as Christ too,) a God Almighty from without, as to his capacity ever potent to all things

possible to be. Now, however, I would not derogate from Christ, as yet I can't see thro' all that. What has followed on it?

SIR,

YOUR correspondent's remarks on the abolition of the sacramental test in our Inns of Court, [XX. 738,] contain a striking evidence of the growing liberality of the age, and I would hail this liberality as a proof of more correct views of the nature of this test than what have formerly prevailed. In the examination of the history of the Sacrament or Supper of our Lord at its commencement, we find in it no act of worship, no ceremonial of a religious nature otherwise than the gratitude and thankfulness of our Divine Master for his food, and according to his uniform custom upon other occasions. We will not now stay to inquire whether this repast was the Passover with a new designation imperative on the Jewish proselytes to Christianity only, or whether it was intended for universal adoption. Its history, its mystery, and its sacredness, (the last a term, in Dr. Johnson's opinion, that ought to be exclusively applied to the Supreme Being,) form altogether one of the most lamentable proofs of the imbecility of the human understanding, to which the Christian Church in all its periods has been too prone. Avoiding, therefore, the adoration of the host adopted by the Catholic Church, the creeds and confessions of faith attached unto the Supper of our Lord by many of the modern and reformed sects, and "the order of the holy communion," as by law established, I would briefly inquire into that view of the subject which seems now to limit its celebration to the professed members of a particular society, as an avowal of the tenets there propagated, or a test of church membership therewith connected.

The universal prevalence of this rite is by some adduced as a perpetual and standing evidence of the origin of Christianity. Does not the adoption of it, by all Christian communities, apart from "its shewing forth the Lord's death until he come," demonstrate the importance that has ever been attached unto it as a *badge of Christian fellowship*? But in the

latter sense, and perhaps the only feasible one, does it prove any doctrine, develope any opinion, illustrate any argument, or lessen the influence of any error connected with our common profession of Christianity? If it is of practical importance only, it derives its efficacy, as all other motives to virtuous conduct must do, from fitness, propriety, or the obligation of obedience enforced by a divine commandment. Allowing, therefore, the authority of the lawgiver of the church for its institution, and apart from its idolatrous perversion, may not all Christian communities adopt, with equal propriety, their own form of celebration? But still farther, may not any sincere Christian, if equally well-informed, join with equal satisfaction, or with equal propriety, any other denomination of the Christian community into which the great body of the Church is divided, in the accustomed form of the administration of this rite belonging to each? Does participating with a Calvinist make me a disciple of Calvin, or with the Church of England make me a Trinitarian? On the contrary, does not my participation prove that I am ready to acknowledge the members of one or the other church as my brethren? In this point of view, the Supper of our Lord amongst his real followers is analogous to the pipe of peace smoked in the wigwam of the North American savages. Far from requiring any uniformity of opinion or declaration of faith peculiar to a class, its requisites are brotherhood, benevolence and peace.

This mode of consideration, I am glad to learn, is not greatly at variance with that of Milton's, developed in his "Treatise of Christian Doctrine," respecting this ordinance. It may likewise be alleged as an apology for the test required by law for eligibility to offices of civil trust or emolument. Supposing such a test necessary, could the legislature in a Christian community have ordained one less objectionable? The homogeneity of the term Christian is claimed by all the various classes under which man has been arranged and identified as a follower of our Lord. In all these classes the ordinance of his Supper has been perpetuated. Could a badge of Christian fellowship be de-

vised equally common to the great family of the Church? And if common to all, where is the intolerable grievance of substituting it on admission to offices of trust? It is not my intention to vindicate, much less to support the measures of our governors in this case of arbitrary enactment; it is only to submit, that one of less encroachment to a liberally-informed mind could not well have been devised.

We have often had to witness and deplore the taunt and reviling manifested when gentlemen of true Dissenting principles and education have found it necessary, as a qualification for magisterial or other public duties, to submit to this test of Christianity. I so denominate it, because common to all the Christian world; instituted without any prescribed rule or form, and therefore, as discretion may point out, liable to the regulation and form best adapted to its usefulness and perpetuity. Did our Lord sit with the Pharisee at meat, and shall we refuse to sit down with any of his followers at his table? When will sectarianism manifest its strength without schism to support it? When will Christianity so far prevail that men shall only recognize them as a friend and a brother? If this rite has practical influence, does it consist in the brotherhood of participation, or in the form in which it is administered? If in the former, how subordinate and insignificant the form of its celebration; if in the latter, to what importance * is the rite itself diminished!

W. H.

Thoughts on some Difficulties in the Christian Ministry.

ALL real Christians must hail with satisfaction the increase among their ministers of a disposition to regard with great seriousness the difficulties which present themselves in connexion with the important office they have taken upon them. For their own sakes and for the sake of the congregations to which they minister, it may be wished that their individual responsibility should not

* Our correspondent means, we presume, *how little importance.* ED.

be over-rated; yet it is easy to see that they are little likely to do good in the world unless themselves deeply impressed by a sense of what they have to do and what they ought to be. We have no hope of the minister who is not in youth zealous, perhaps enthusiastic, in his notions of the important part he has to perform. Let him also have a quick, perhaps exaggerated notion of the difficulties before him. It is of some consequence, however, that he should neither be misled by other people nor blind, himself, to the real nature of the principal among those difficulties. If his vigilance be turned into a wrong channel; if he hears, for instance, chiefly of the enmity, bigotry and intolerance with which he will be regarded by other sects, where it is his business as a young man and a minister of the gospel of peace, to begin his career with kindness in his heart and conciliation on his tongue, he will not be likely to give himself the opportunity of forming correct notions respecting the characters of individuals with whom he will be brought too soon, perhaps, by the very nature of his office, into a state of polemical warfare. If he comes rather with the feelings of a soldier than a shepherd, an appointed leader destined to head his people in a contest with other sects, the principal difficulty will still be kept out of view. He may fight well—nay, may conquer—but he will not have advanced in that knowledge of human nature, in a variety of situations and under the influence of a variety of opinions, which is essential to his being an effective preacher for the people. It must ever be lamented that the general expediency of choosing a profession early in life, tends to multiply the number of young men who enter the ministry without having had any previous opportunity of acquiring that branch of knowledge of which we have just spoken. We know not how it should be otherwise; but so it is. Let not, however, so completely optional an evil as *wilful* prejudice and blindness be added to this original disadvantage. Let the world, by all means, be viewed in a *just* light by the young minister. We wish not to see him imbued with any poetical ideas of the victories he will achieve, the benevolence with

which he will be received, the power of truth to the overcoming of prejudice and error; but what we do wish him to feel is, that he has many things to learn *from and of* his fellow-Christians before he can be qualified to enter into their feelings; that the question is not simply one of truth and error, because early associations and habits take so fast a hold on the minds of men that many *cannot* discern or distinguish between them; and that, of course, the most hopeful way of proceeding is to make one's self intimately acquainted with *these*. To attack the majority of Calvinistic believers with no more knowledge of them than can be gained from their creeds and confessions and a few controversial books, savours but little of the spirit of sound philosophy. But, it may be asked, how, after all, can Unitarian ministers become intimately conversant with orthodox believers? And that it is difficult we have admitted;—difficult, but not impossible. One great impediment arises from the Calvinistic persuasion that Unitarians, while they remain such, cannot be saved: another, from the feelings of pride and resentment which this opinion arouses in our minds. Till this last impediment be removed, however, nothing can be done: that it *should* be expelled from our breasts is plain, not only from the general scope of that law which commands us to return good for evil, but from the consideration that we are resenting, not a feeling, but an opinion—not a movement of malice against ourselves, but, in a large proportion of cases, a deep-rooted dread of our opinions arising out of misconceptions as to our doctrines and their tendencies. With every allowance for original intolerance of spirit, fearing, as we see too much reason, that some doctrines abet and encourage this spirit—with *the opinion*, the simple opinion itself, we have nothing to do but to refute it, if we can. To suppose that because a man thinks he sees in the Bible that persons holding my sentiments cannot be saved, is therefore evilly and unkindly disposed towards me, would be monstrous injustice. “But it is galling to be placed by our fellow-creatures on a footing of inferiority to those whom we know to be beneath ourselves both in talent and

information!” It is so; but this and many other humiliating things will be supportable to him who has learned to love his fellow-creatures with a Christian's love, who has so read the book of God as to understand the nature of his obligations to his Maker, and so studied the hearts and minds of men as to feel the incalculable blessings which a knowledge of the truth “as it is in Jesus,” is calculated to convey. Such a man will not simply regard his differing brethren with a distant and philosophic candour; he will put his kind feelings in action; he will endeavour, by every possible means, to meet those with whom he cannot meet in the house of prayer, on common and undisputed ground, in works of mercy and love, in the offices of a neighbour and friend; and he will not be baffled by those failures of attention to him, those marks of favouritism shown to the holders of the popular creed, which may and often do spring from a mistaken principle, not a bad state of the affections. A Unitarian should be willing to allow that a Calvinist cannot regard *him* as so fitting an agent in any good work as the person whom that Calvinist believes to be in a better state with regard to the prospect of final salvation. What is there in this that should offend the Unitarian or turn him from any clear duty? If a form of trial like this cannot be borne, if we are driven from the discharge of our duties because another man has an intolerant creed and is too much governed by it, it looks ill for our Christianity and our cause.

To him, however, who is not thus easily disconcerted, but strives to know other Christians in “a more excellent way,” there will be difficulties of another kind, perhaps, and not less trying. There will be conflicts with his own spirit and the spirits of other men; there will probably be times when he will feel it difficult to resist the *kindness* of those whose bigotry and cruelty he once dreaded. The desire to advance his spiritual interests may sometimes subject him to importunity, while in some cases, perhaps, silence may be sufficiently trying. The admiration he cannot fail to feel, if he puts aside prejudice, for self-denying and patient workers

in what they believe to be the cause of God, will be seducing too. But, if strong in the love of truth, these temptations will not overpower him. And what will be the result of his trial? A heart imbued with feelings of Christian tenderness towards other men, a knowledge, an intimate knowledge of their feelings, their prejudices, their habits of judging; no cold abstraction, but a genuine living picture of what his fellow-creatures are. Instead of a vague, general desire to spread the truth, he will have attained a personal insight into its value; a sense of its adaptation to the purposes for which it was originally promulgated; a facility in communicating his ideas in such language as experience has taught him will most effectually accomplish the end he has in view; in fine, a determination to become "all things to all men," if by any means he may save some.

There is nothing visionary or romantic in all this: imagination is exercised about what is *partially*, rather than what is *wholly*, known. When we accustom ourselves to speak of or preach to differing Christians without accurate knowledge of their peculiarities, we are very liable to exercise our fancy rather than a sound judgment. Experience and "integrity of attention" to the various forms under which human nature presents itself, correct this propensity, and give a character of solidity to our reasonings, which procures them a degree of respect from those who differ from us, never yielded to the individuals by whom they feel they are not understood.

There is another difficulty connected with the ministerial office which it is worth mentioning. The knowledge of human nature derived from metaphysical studies is very valuable, but is apt to stand in the way of a young minister's success with the people for a considerable time after he commences his active ministry. Few proceed to that perfection of philosophical attainment at which all the previous steps of the process are scarcely to be perceived or detected, to that point at which, a certain *result* being obtained, there exists no longer in the mind a perpetual reference to parts of the long process by which

it was led into its present state. While the studies themselves are going on, the student is apt to forget that the multitude must have a shorter road to truth. He loses time in proving to them by the light of philosophy what they believed before by the light of revelation; they want to be impressed, and he labours chiefly to inform. It is not easy, besides, for one accustomed to close argument and reading to descend to the easy and popular style. Neither can a mind which has for some time had its best powers turned into this channel, readily allow the subordinate importance of what, if a pursuit at all, is generally a favourite, and, therefore, seducing pursuit. It seems ungrateful to say to philosophy, "We will borrow all your lights, make use of all the aids you bring us, but you yourself shall be unseen, unfelt—your aid unacknowledged: we must use you as if we used you not, and have you as if we had you not;" and yet how can a Christian minister hope for great or general success but by this entire subordination of mental attainment to the purposes of his ministry?

His is indeed a difficult office. We expect from him much, too much. We call him from his retired studies to fill the station of a leader, a teacher, a guide to our young men and old men, and we blame him for failures in things which have formed no part of his education, which he has therefore to acquire after the period of his settling with a congregation. Still the acquisition is very attainable, "if there be first a willing mind," and if the various ways and means of spoiling or discouraging him be not put into action in too unsparing a manner. If there be any truth in the old maxim, "Defend a man from his friends," &c., it is a truth that particularly applies here. The lessons he may learn from those he too easily calls "adversaries" and "opponents," are to the full as useful, and are less dangerous, than those he may gain among friends and partizans. There is a species of injustice also, to which Unitarians are but too prone. They talk of their ministers as if they were not liable to the same influences as themselves. They blame them for not rising very

much beyond the spirit of their age or people. Here truth ought to be spoken. If a high tone of piety, if particular strictness in manners, if a certain quantity of attention to the private interests of members of their congregations were absolutely REQUIRED, were made a *point of* by those congregations, who can doubt that the demand would be answered? Not, perhaps, immediately, but surely eventually. If, on the contrary, talent and eloquence are more in demand than Christian zeal and religious usefulness, then Unitarians themselves are settling the character of their ministry, and, far as we may be from wishing to shelter indolence, we must admit that censures which often fall so heavily upon ministers, should at least be shared by the people, to whom, in a great measure, are attributable their prevailing deficiencies.

Clapton,

Dec. 22, 1825.

SIR,
YOUR transatlantic critic (XX. 549, col. 1) is, I dare say, unacquainted with Wakefield's "Observations on Pope," published in 1796, or he had not failed to remark that the author has there exposed his own attempts "to comment" on the "Song by a Person of Quality," (which, however, extended no further than to two notes on the first stanza,) as freely as any foe might desire, or at least any foe less "gross and ill-natured" than a "Blackwood's Magazine."

Wakefield had published in 1794 a first volume of "the Works of Alexander Pope, Esq., with Remarks and Illustrations," then expecting such encouragement as would have allowed him to proceed. Disappointed in these expectations, he formed his further collections on Pope into the *Observations*, and thus concluded his address to the reader: "Some verses of my friend Mr. W. Toulmin, bantering a mistake committed by me, at p. 326 of my former volume, will form an agreeable termination of this preface." The verses are thus entitled: "By a Person of no Quality, on reading Mr. Wakefield's Criticisms on Pope's Song, *Flutt'ring spread thy purple pinions.*" The following is the first of the seven stanzas:

Watchful Wakefield, late and early,
Slumb'ring o'er the page of Pope!
Wit has catch'd her Critic fairly,
Twisting sand into a rope.

Your correspondent T. F. B. (XX. 678) appears not to have seen, or he could have scarcely omitted to notice, the Review of Dr. Chalmers's *Astronomical Discourses* in your XIIth Volume (pp. 418—426).

I wish it were in my power fully to satisfy H. W. (XX. 681) as to an inquiry which a subscriber to Priestley's Works might, perhaps, with more propriety have addressed immediately to the Editor. The XXIVth Volume, containing the Lectures on History, from the enlarged American edition, will, I have no doubt, be through the press before the end of February. In the mean time, I must request every subscriber, with whom I am not already in correspondence, to forward a letter to my friend Mr. Eaton, 187, High Holborn, containing his full address, what volumes he has received, and where, in London, the rest which are printed may be sent, with an order for payment on delivery. Circumstances which I have been under the unpleasant necessity of detailing in your work on a former occasion, constrain me to add, that without such communication no volume will be delivered.

H. W. must excuse me, if I cannot inform him how soon the labour which I, perhaps unadvisedly, encountered when ten years younger than at present, will be at an end. I can assure him that the delay of "more than twelve months" is not more than prudence fully justified; and that strict prudence would rather have further detained me amidst literary engagements which, except as to one of them soon to appear before the public, were less inviting, though not so unproductive. I trust, notwithstanding the unfavourable appearance of a plan left incomplete, that no subscriber will be materially injured by possessing, on the terms of the subscription, nearly the whole of Dr. Priestley's *Theological and Miscellaneous Works*, (several of which cannot now be procured on any terms,) in a correct and connected form, and with additions intended to illustrate them, and thus to subserve the author's favourite and truly honourable designs.

I am, however, happy to inform H. W. and the rest of the Subscribers, that the 25th Volume will contain every remaining article of the works included in my edition; and that I have now reason to promise myself, should life and health be granted me, that the present year will not pass without my having made considerable advances in preparation for the First Volume. I beg leave, on this occasion, to repeat my request to those among your readers who can thus favour me, for the prompt communication of letters or any information calculated to assist in the execution of my design. The trite *his dat, qui cito dat*, they will give me leave to say, is peculiarly suited to the present application. J. T. RUTT.

January 3, 1826.

P. S. My excellent friend Dr. Carpenter, (XX. 740,) whose early patronage of my design, and his uniformly punctual attention to the Editor's convenience, have been most exemplary, will, I trust, accept the above explanation, which was designed to appear in your last Volume. I wish I could feel what his kind partiality prompts him to express, on the subject of *labour*. I must, rather, confess a serious truth, that the delay, and my frequent occupation among the writings of Dr. Priestley, have served greatly to enhance my apprehension as to the satisfactory performance of the arduous duty I have ventured to undertake.

Collections at Boston, United States, for the Sufferers at Miramichi.

[Extract of a letter from Mr. Goodacre, Astronomical Lecturer, to Rev. Dr. J. Evans, dated Philadelphia, Nov. 19, 1825.]

OF all the letters of introduction which you did me the kindness to supply, that to the Rev. Mr. Parkman, of Boston, produced me the greatest source of pleasure. He is an excellent man. The Unitarians of Boston are a noble race. I never thought before that the world contained such men. They are after my own heart. At no very distant day I may enjoy, I hope, the pleasure of reading you some notes of sermons, taken by me, that I heard preached by some of their

leaders when I was at Boston. Boston is indeed a spiritual place, not according to Calvinistic cant, but according to the true evangelical sense of the word. To spend a Sunday in Boston, if a man has any religious feeling, must warm his heart. But it is not in words that they excel merely. Take an example: you will, before you receive this, hear of the dreadful fires in and about Miramichi in the British province of New Brunswick. But you will not hear of Boston "doings" (as the Americans call it) perhaps. The news reached Boston late in the week, ending Nov. 6th, and on Sunday last, Nov. 13, sermons in behalf of the sufferers were made at the following churches:

	Dol.	Cents,	
Rev. Dr. Channing's.....	529	64	
Rev. Mr. Palfray's.....	352	0	
Rev. Mr. Young's.....	320	0	
Rev. Dr. Powell's.....	260	0	
Rev. Mr. Pierpont's.....	212	20	
Rev. Mr. Frothingham's....	207	0	
Rev. Mr. Barrett's.....	201	57	
Rev. Mr. Ware's.....	179	45	
Rev. Mr. Green's.....	150	0	
<hr/>			
All Congregational Unitarian	2411	96	
Unitarian Episcopal.....	182	0	
<hr/>			
	2593	96	
Rev. Mr. Wisner's 301 73			} Con. Trib.
Rev. Mr. Dwight's 262 64			
St. Paul's Church 205 67			} Episcopalian.
Rev. Mr. Wayland's 121 0			
Rev. Mr. Sharp's 131 50			} Cal. Bapt.
Rev. Mr. Ballou's 80 0			
Rev. Mr. Streeter's 92 0			} Universal.
Methodist Churches 136 0			
Roman Catholic 120 0			
<hr/>			
	1450	54	Trinitarian.
	2593	96	Unitarian.
<hr/>			
Total	4044	50	

Several churches not heard from. Upwards of 3000 dollars have been subscribed at Merchants' Hall. And this is a town of 45,000 inhabitants, and the sufferers are neither in their own state nor in their own government, but the colonial subjects of that kingdom which was so recently their enemy! Can this be matched in the civilized world? Can the piety, talent, public spirit and wealth of Boston be matched, by any city of 45,000 inhabitants, in the civilized world? I think not.

POETRY.

HYMN TO LIBERTY.

SWEET Liberty, wake thee! too long hast thou slumbered—
 Can thy dreams be so dear, that they tempt to sleep on?
 Cast away thy gilt chains, and the voices unnumbered
 Of a glad world shall tell that thy thraldom is done!
 Oh shall not, ere long, that soiled mirror be shivered,
 Which is dim with the sighs of pale glory for thee—
 And the bright Sabbath dawn, in which millions delivered
 Shall lift their first hymn to the God of the Free?
 Take the wings of the morning, fly over the world—
 There is many a land, where the tyrant is lord;—
 Yet, oh shall not in *all* thy proud flag be unfurled,
 And the tree of life girt by thy cherubim-sword?
 The Persian, who dared with the scourge and the fetter
 Insult the free waves of the Hellespont-sea,
 Did he do, sacred Freedom! aught wiser or better
 Than those who lay scourges and fetters on *thee*?
 No, thy tides will yet rise in their strength and their scorn,
 To wash every vestige of slavery away;
 And the thrones will grow pale in the light of thy morn,
 As the night-stars are drowned in the gold waves of day!
 One flood of redemption will sweep o'er the earth,
 That thy own victor-ark on the deluge may ride;
 And the peace-hallowed olive will be the first birth
 Of the world, when at length the proud waters subside.
 Then, oh then, shall arise, in its splendour millennial,
 The sun of free Truth o'er the mountains of time;
 And Earth shall again wear the verdure perennial,
 And the amaranth * she wore in her paradise-prime.
 Then at length in the wilderness fresh springs shall murmur,
 Then at length in the desert strange roses shall bloom,
 While each year, as it passes, will rivet yet firmer
 Every bond of the rights which the nations resume.
 Say not, think not, the Age, which the poets call Golden,
 Has passed from this bleak world for ever away—
 That no sunburst of promise will ever embolden
 The eagle to mount to the throne of the day!
 Already—already—the irons are starting
 From the hands of the myriads they pinioned so long;
 Already the beams of young Freedom are darting
 On the statue † they warm till it hails them in song!
 In the World of the West the bright ensign of Union
 Is floating o'er nations enlightened and free;
 And soon will all join in the splendid communion
 From the heart of the land to the isle of the sea!

* Immortal amaranth, a flower which once
 In paradise, fast by the tree of life,
 Began to bloom, &c.

Milton, P. L. II.

† An allusion to the celebrated statue of Memnon, which was said to yield music
 when it felt the first rays of the morning sun.—C. Tac. Ann. III. 61.

The pure laurels of Washington yet will be green
 In the realms where the Inca and Spaniard have reigned;
 And the Andes will look down on one happy scene
 Of glory redeemed, and of freedom regained.

And Hellas—dear Hellas!—the same brilliant standard
 From Eurotas to Dirce ere long will be thrown
 Abroad in those winds, which for ages have squandered
 Their sweet breath on the flag of the despot alone.

No more shall the Greek, in degenerate terror,
 Brook the scourge and the chain from the fear of the sword;
 No more shall the free wave of Salamis mirror
 The colours that tell of an Ottoman lord!

In vain may the bands of the Orient environ
 The hosts of a nation with glory on fire;—
 No slave will unhallow the death-land of Byron,
 No freeman forget the last notes of his lyre!

And thou too, Riego! how fond was the dream,
 That thy blood would cement up a half-fallen throne—
 That the hearts of the race thou didst rise to redeem
 Only caught the proud pulses of hope from thy own!

Thy patriot-sword may be sheathed for a while,
 But it yet will be drawn by a patriot's hand,
 And the spirit of Freedom will look down and smile,
 As she waves her bright wing o'er a tyrantless land!

Over Spain's hundred hills, and her beautiful valleys,
 The cry of Deliverance yet will be heard;
 And the serf in her huts, and the slave in her galleys,
 Will feel their hearts leap at the paradise-word.

Forbid it, that any unhallowed Alliance
 Should hold the crushed nations for ever in thrall—
 That *the few* should long bid their imperial defiance
 To the reason, the faith, and the glory of *all*!

No, Mankind will yet wake to a loftier duty,
 Than that which enjoins them to sink into slaves;
 And their eyes will be opened, though late, to the beauty
 Of Truth that ennobles, of Freedom that saves!

Thy first steps, lovely Liberty! sometimes may falter—
 But thy march will not cease, nor thy banner be furled,
 Till thy conquering hand shall have reared a proud altar
 To the God of the Free, o'er the thrones of a world!

Crediton, 1826.

TO THE AUTHOR OF THE CRITICAL SYNOPSIS OF THE
 MONTHLY REPOSITORY FOR JULY, 1824.

SIR,

IN noticing my Sonnet, written in Burbage Wood,* you were pleased to make a kind of inquiry, whether I might not be a “a direct descendant of” Dare, (my namesake,) “the quick-witted patriot of olden time.” †

WHY not? If a mind that all knowledge would know
 Of ages elapsed and of ages to come;
 If thoughts that with freedom and liberty glow,
 That man may be one, and the wide earth a home:

* Vide Mon. Repos. XIX. 423.

† Vide Mon. Repos. XX. 393.

If hopes—that are bright as the glories that gild,
The themes of the prophet—the songs of the bard;
Those themes, that a view of eternity yield;
Those songs that on earth give to virtue reward:
If pride—that self-thought and philosophy nurse,
Uplifting the mind above fashion's mad rules;
That mocks at the power that is placed in the purse,
The pomp of the proud, and the custom of fools:
If feeling—that Nature still holds in her train,
That sighs with the weeper, that smiles with the gay;
That curses the tyrant wherever he reign,
And quits superstition for Truth's heavenly ray:
If mind—hope—thought—feeling, like these are allied
To those who have flourished, the good and the brave,
Then he was my *sire* who crouched not to pride,
And he is of *kindred* who dwells o'er the wave.
O! long as that wave shall beat free on thy land,
So long may Columbia be chainless and free;
My hope is in her,—for the world by her hand
Its freedom shall gain,—shall as fetterless be!

JOSEPH DARE.

Hinckley, December 24, 1825.

HYMN.

ALL nature sings the bounteous Power
From which its beauties flow;
The rolling wave, the cooling show'r,
The lofty oak, the humble flow'r,
Alike their Author own, their mighty Maker show.
They tell of him whose pow'ful hand
From nothing all things made;
He stretch'd the skies, he spread the land,
Obedient to his high command
That sun majestic rose, whose glories never fade.
Let the glad sound of song arise
To him who all has given—
Oh, Thou who reign'st above the skies,
Accept the praise, the sacrifice,
Of man, thy noblest work, the destin'd heir of heav'n.
To him alone thy goodness gave
To bear thine image here,
Oh let thy mercy from the grave
His reason, thy true image, save,
And love correct the faults which dimm'd that image here.

HYMN,

Sung after Sermon, in the Old Meeting-House, Birmingham, on New-Year's Day, 1826.

THE year has pass'd away,
Swift as the gliding stream;
And all its scenes appear
Like relics of a dream!
Spent are its griefs,
Its joys are flown,
And mem'ry holds
Their trace alone!

Thee, God of endless days,
 Our grateful souls shall bless,
 Whose love prolongs our lives,
 And soothes each past distress ;
 An op'ning year
 Thy gifts renews ;
 Let not our hearts
 Their praise refuse !

Frail, fleeting life ! how soon
 May thy probation close ;
 And they who prize thee most,
 In the still grave repose !
 Thy joys are brief,
 Not made to last ;
 And change comes o'er
 Thy seasons fast.

Then, mortal ! pause, and trace
 Time's progress, and thine own !
 Shall earth thy cares engage,
 When better things are known ?
 Oh, fix thy love
 On heav'nly bliss ;
 All other good
 Shall fail, but this.

Time's measur'd term shall end !
 Then dawns th' eternal day,
 Whose sun shall never set,
 Nor shine with clouded ray :
 When virtue's sons
 To heav'n shall rise,
 With glory crown'd,
 That never dies.

Then, let thy zeal be strong,
 Life's purpose to fulfil ;
 And work, with all thy pow'rs,
 Thy righteous Father's will :
 So shall thy deeds
 Be truly bless'd,
 And death conduct
 To endless rest.

H. H.

 STANZAS

Is life a dream ? Then let me slumber still,
 And let earth's visions float before mine eyes,
 Clad in the semblance of reality.
 If they suffice the yearning heart to fill,
 To exercise its joys, its hopes, its fears,
 Thro' all th' uncertain measure of our years,
 Why are not men content ? perverse of will !
 They change, they fade, and life itself exhales
 Like morning dew upon the tender flower,
 Or incense breath'd from rose-encircled bower.
 It passes like a song—like passionate tales
 Told into beauty's ever-listening ear ;
 Or, drawing the close circle yet more near,
 As spirit-stirring scenes stand forth in words of power.

Well! let life pass, and melt in air away!
 Let change come after change in rapid motion
 As wave succeedeth wave upon the ocean!
 Gaze we upon the visions of the day
 In such a mood, that they shall ever bring
 Peace: or, of sorrow's wild harp strike the string
 Calmly, with mingled notes of deep devotion.

E.

OBITUARY.

1825. November 21, at his son's residence in *Tooting*, Mr. WILLIAM BICKNELL, in the 77th year of his age. This venerable and excellent individual was formerly master of an academy at Ponder's End, and which was afterwards removed to *Tooting*. He was at no period of his life ambitious of public notice, and he passed the evening of his life in tranquil retirement with one of the elder branches of his own family. A firm believer in the truth of the Holy Scriptures, and a diligent and fearless inquirer into the meaning of the sacred text, he exemplified, as well in his domestic relations as in his converse with the world, the benign spirit of the Christian religion; and having endeavoured to do the will of his heavenly Father, and to submit to it with patience, he experienced the consolations of the gospel, and met death without the slightest manifestation of fear. Such a happy termination is fitly likened to "falling asleep." Mr. Bicknell was born August 12, 1749, in the borough of Southwark, where his father carried on business as a worsted-maker, but his family were originally from Somersetshire. When the subject of this memoir was only five years of age, his father died, leaving a young widow and five infant children. She was, however, a female of very superior powers of mind, and of industrious and active habits, which enabled her very successfully to carry on the business, and to bring up her family. When her son was eight years of age, she sent him to Mr. Wesley's school at Kingswood, near Bristol, which at that time was conducted as a general boarding-school, though it has since been appropriated to the sons of the Methodist preachers only. The school was then under the superintendence of a Mr. Parkinson, whose care and assiduity as a tutor made a strong impression on the mind of his young pupil, and of which he always retained a grateful remembrance. From a letter of this worthy man, it appears that he greatly distinguished himself by the progress which he made in the usual branches of an English education, together with the Latin and Greek lan-

guages. Although he continued for several years at this school, yet on the whole he does not appear to have been very comfortable. In a manuscript memoir of his life he remarks, that "the plan of the school as laid down by Mr. Wesley was well calculated for improvement; but in the practical part there was great defect. We rose at four in the morning, summer and winter, and were closely confined nearly the whole day. No fire was ever allowed in the school-room, nor any childish games of recreation permitted. I have experienced," he adds, "the ill effects of studying so much by candle-light whilst at Kingswood, through my whole life." He always, however, considered himself under great obligations to this school. Here the foundation of those active habits, which never left him, were laid, and his mind also became permanently impressed with the importance of religion. "But above all," he remarks, "I was instructed in the knowledge of God and the Christian religion. Here I first received my serious impressions, and these were then so deeply engraven on my mind, that they have never been erased, and I trust they never will. I have reason to be thankful that the kind providence of God ever cast my lot to be placed under the care of so good and valuable a man as Mr. Parkinson."

After leaving Kingswood in 1760, he prosecuted his studies under Mr. Lee, a clergyman of the Church of England, and at that time head Master of Queen Elizabeth's Grammar School, in St. Olave's, Southwark. Here also his progress was very considerable, and he secured the confidence and respect of his tutor. He was withdrawn from school at an early period, though very desirous of continuing for some time longer, and assisted his mother in her business. Of his mother he thus speaks: "She was a woman of a very benevolent, charitable and humane temper. She always rose early. All who knew her admired her uncommon activity, as well in her domestic concerns as in her shop and factory." The confinement to which he was now subject

was very great, and after a short time the whole weight of the business lay upon him. His active mind, notwithstanding, soared above every difficulty, and for several years he prosecuted a plan of study with diligence and success. Of this he writes as follows: "I rose at or before five in the morning, and applied myself first to my classical studies and to the Hebrew language, afterwards to the different branches of mathematics and natural philosophy. I also practised music, with which I have occasionally amused myself for forty-six years." His attention, however, was not confined to subjects of science. He devoted some portions of his time to the study of theology, both controversial and practical. He had attended the preaching of the Methodists with his mother, and Mr. Wesley being a frequent visitor in the family, he became decidedly attached to the doctrines of Christianity as taught by that extraordinary man and the liturgy of the Church of England. He closely studied the Calvinistic and Arminian writers, particularly Mr. Toplady and Mr. Fletcher, the amiable incumbent of Madely. The Checks to Antinomianism which were penned by the latter writer, so confirmed him in the doctrine of General Redemption that he never afterwards had the least doubt on the subject. At an early period he received the communion at the Established Church and at Mr. Wesley's Chapels. He, however, never became a member of the Methodist Society. About the time that Mr. Bicknell reached the age of puberty a most unhappy circumstance had nearly separated him from his mother. The remembrance of it gave him pain as long as he lived. He relates this as follows: "A neighbour was very desirous to obtain a lease from my mother of a large piece of ground behind our house, and which I greatly valued for the recreation it afforded in the summer as a garden. My mother consulted me—I objected, and the applicant was positively refused again and again. I supposed the matter was ended. He, however, applied to Mr. Wesley to interfere. He did so, and though I adhered to my former objection, my mother, unknown to me, granted a lease, at a small rent, for the whole term of the original lease." This imprudent step, it appears, was a serious injury to the family many years afterwards, and strongly points out the great impropriety of ministers of the gospel using any undue influence with those that they may visit. Mr. Bicknell, though he always venerated Mr. Wesley's character, yet in this affair justly thought him greatly to blame. "This," continues Mr. Bicknell, "had so powerful an effect on my

mind, that I at first determined to quit her house: it, however, so far separated us, that for a long time after, although living under the same roof, we had not that harmonious intercourse with each other which had hitherto subsisted. I separated myself from my mother in her religious exercises with the family, and continued to act this undutiful part for some time, though I often regretted that I had so done, being unhappy in my mind when I seriously reflected on the impropriety, I may say the sinfulness, of my conduct; but my proud heart was unwilling to acknowledge my fault." "This absence was at length removed by my mother earnestly inviting me to return to my duty, and which offer I gladly accepted, after a painful absence of more than a year. I have often reflected on this wilful act of disobedience to God and my dear parent, the best of mothers. I have always considered this as the greatest sin I ever committed in my life, and how many tears have I shed since that time, when I have considered the long suffering of my heavenly Father during the period of my sinful obstinacy, in not cutting me off from the face of the earth, thus making me a dreadful example of his displeasure for my rebellion!" This quotation may have appeared long, but it so well shews what Mr. Bicknell was as a son, and what he was likely to become as a father and master of a family, that I could not persuade myself to abridge it.

A confident dependence upon Divine Providence was always a strong feature in Mr. Bicknell's faith and practice. If ordinary events are as really brought about by Divine agency as the more striking and uncommon, it becomes our duty to be habitually grateful for ordinary blessings, and to be specially regardful of signal favours and extraordinary deliverances. He remarks in his memoirs, that in three memorable instances God's providence had protected him when his life was in the utmost jeopardy. The first instance was, when he was an infant he fell into the fire through the absence of his nurse; in the second, he was taken up by a bell-rope twisting about his neck; and in the third, he was dragged for a considerable distance on the ground, having been thrown by a spirited horse. "Oh that I may ever remember," he observes, "the goodness of God in thus preserving my life through these three dangerous calamities!" The death of his mother, which happened in 1775, greatly afflicted him. She was carried to the grave by a lingering and painful disorder, which she bore with that exemplary patience which distinguishes the Christian character.

Towards the end of the year 1777, Mr. Bicknell married Miss Elizabeth Randall, by whom he had a numerous family. The character of this excellent woman as a wife, a mother, and a mistress of a family, is beyond all praise. Those who best knew her will not think the following words a higher eulogy than she deserved: "Her children arise up and call her blessed; her husband also, and he praiseth her. Many daughters have done virtuously, but thou excellest them all."* Soon after this time, also, Mr. Bicknell appears to have entertained doubts of the truth of the doctrine of endless misery. He perceived some difficulties on this subject, and being naturally of an inquiring and speculative turn of mind, he became very solicitous for farther information. He formed an acquaintance with Mr. John Cue, and the late Mr. Leicester, a clergyman of the Established Church, who, I believe, were both, at this time, Universalists, and from whom he received some information on the doctrine of universal restitution. He also perused the writings of White and Stonehouse on this doctrine. Nothing very particular, however, transpired till the year 1787, when the late Mr. Elhanan Winchester landed in England from America. This gentleman was introduced to Mr. Bicknell soon after his arrival, and a friendship was formed which continued as long as he remained in England. His opinion of Mr. Winchester will be seen by the following extract from his memoirs: "Although not a literary character, his eloquence, amazing memory and natural genius, with his extensive knowledge in biblical learning, formed him one of the greatest orators that I ever heard in the pulpit, and the most animating and pleasing preacher I ever did or ever expect to hear. He wrote five Dialogues on the Universal Restoration, which I perused in manuscript, and with which I was so charmed that I offered to publish them at my own expense." It appears from private papers in the possession of Mr. Bicknell's family, that he not only published the dialogues at his own risk, but also gave Mr. Winchester the sum of twenty guineas for the copy-right. This work was first published in 1788, and in a very short time the whole edition of a thousand copies was sold. When Mr. Winchester published a second edition the copy-right had been returned to him by Mr. Bicknell; the letter which contained this surrender is prefixed to the dialogues. Nothing, indeed, could exceed the intimacy which subsisted between the subject of this memoir and

Mr. Winchester. He was always received as a member of the family; and whenever his finances ran low they were supplied by the purse of his friend, although he was himself by no means in affluent circumstances. I have heard a very near relation to Mr. Bicknell assert, that such was the confidence which Mr. Winchester had in his friendship, that he has been known, when he wanted change, to go into the shop of his friend and help himself to money from the till. I must, however, mention, to the honour of this American stranger, that when he afterwards became a popular preacher and a man of influence, that he used his utmost endeavours to serve his friend, and in many instances did it very successfully.

But an important change was now about to take place in the situation and employment of Mr. Bicknell. He thus affectingly mentions it: "I had now four children, my wife in a feeble state of health, and my business, from various causes, fast declining. This caused me many serious thoughts, and I was sometimes ready to despond. I remembered that the same kind Providence which had hitherto supported me under every difficulty would not forsake me, and which eventually I found to be the case. I acknowledge this with gratitude to my heavenly Father. After many painful struggles of mind, and by the advice and encouragement of a few friends, I agreed to take a boarding-school which had been offered me." This important step Mr. Winchester greatly promoted. He perceived that Mr. Bicknell was much better fitted for the important duties of a schoolmaster than those of a tradesman. At Michaelmas, 1789, he finally left London, and, under considerable discouragements, began his new career at Ponder's End, near Enfield. At first he was much annoyed by the noise and turbulence of a set of rude boys; but in a short time he succeeded in establishing good order, and in gaining the respect and affection of his pupils. It is by no means necessary to enter into a minute detail of his school plans. Suffice it, therefore, to say, that such was his activity and diligence, that he infused a vigour into all around him. The health, comfort, and even the amusements of his pupils, were alike the object of his attention. I have often seen him joining in the sports of the play-ground; but it was never done with the least diminution of his authority as a tutor. The moment the hour of business arrived he expected seriousness and attention. If he erred, it was rather as a rigid disciplinarian than the contrary; but he always considered that the great secret

* Prov. xxx. 28, 29.

in the management of children, whether with their parents or not, consisted in having their wills under proper restraint. The longer he remained a schoolmaster the more fully was he persuaded of this truth. Often has he been heard to say, that the great difficulty in education arose from the folly of parents in not properly directing the will of their children whilst at home. His punctual and serious manner in the performance of the religious duties of the family will be long remembered. From the earliest period of his being a schoolmaster, he had been accustomed to meet his pupils on a Sunday evening for the purpose of religious instruction. Many will recollect the paternal affection and importunate earnestness with which, from a family Bible, he was accustomed to address them. He laboured to direct them to moral and religious principles. These services, however, were never tedious. His lectures and prayers were always short. Mr. Winchester frequently visited Ponder's End; but his visits were not those of ceremony. I well remember the interest which he took in the school. Singing was always a part of the family devotion, accompanied by the organ. The hymns, however, in general, were but ill suited to young people. Mr. Winchester, at the desire of his friend, composed a number of hymns for young people, and which Mr. Bicknell afterwards printed for the use of the school. Mr. Winchester was also an occasional correspondent of Mr. Bicknell's. I transcribe part of a letter from him dated the 3d of September, 1793: "We (himself and Mrs. Winchester) returned home last Friday, after an absence of four weeks from London. Mr. Vidler, of Battle, in Sussex, supplied my place two Sundays during my absence, and gave universal satisfaction. He and his church have lately been cast out of their connexion for holding the doctrine of the universal restoration, of which he is a most able defender. I have just reprinted the *Outcasts Comforted*, chiefly on his account, and have dedicated this third edition to him, and to his people." In 1794 Mr. Winchester left England, and was succeeded by Mr. Vidler.

Soon after this, some alteration began to take place in the religious views of Mr. Bicknell. He had read Bishop Law's works, and entertained doubts as to the truth of a conscious state between death and the resurrection. He also sometimes attended the preaching of Mr. Vidler, whose sentiments, soon after he had settled in London, underwent a considerable change. Mr. Vidler, also, was an occasional visitor at Mr. Bicknell's house; and shortly after this time, he

made an engagement to preach at Ponder's End every other Thursday evening. Mr. Bicknell accordingly opened his house for preaching, the neighbourhood was invited to attend, and Mr. Vidler continued this for two or three years. The conversations which Mr. Bicknell now had with Mr. Vidler tended very much to unsettle his mind in what he had hitherto received as the orthodox faith. He was, however, at this time, unfriendly to the tenets of modern Unitarians. He still continued a diligent reader of the New Testament, as he considered that that alone was a sufficient guide in all matters of revealed religion. He was very desirous of knowing the truth, but was not very solicitous to read many books on controversial subjects. I should also mention, that during these visits of Mr. Vidler the publication of a Magazine was first projected. Mr. Bicknell readily promised his assistance. I well remember that a number of Mr. Vidler's friends met by appointment in the Strand, at the house of Mr. Nathaniel Scarlett, the Editor of a New Translation of the New Testament. Here the plan was matured, and the first number, under the title of the *Universalists' Miscellany*, was published in 1797. Of this work the *Monthly Repository* is a continuation. To both these, as well as to other periodical journals, Mr. Bicknell was an occasional contributor.

The serious and practical regard which Mr. Bicknell had for the doctrine of Divine Providence, joined with his unremitting attention to the health of his pupils, may be well learnt from the following extract from his memoirs: "The next year (1802) was remarkable for the prevalency of the typhus fever. The schools around London were in general infected, and in my neighbourhood not one escaped. Many died, and I believe there was not another school besides my own from which the pupils were not sent home. I had eight or ten slightly infected, who all recovered excepting one: he was not worse than the rest; but his friends removed him, and placed him under the care of a medical man, who immediately began by administering red port in plenty, and within a week he died. I do not, however, say that he died by improper treatment. My method was the same in this as at the commencement of any fever: a gentle emetic, followed by some opening draught, and, if thirsty, plenty of weak liquor, as toast and water, apple-water, or any weak acidulated liquor." How little do they know about bringing up a family who cannot resort to means as safe and effectual as these! "My being thus preserved," adds Mr. Bicknell, "from so dangerous a disease, I impute

to the kind protection of that Almighty Being who in so many instances has manifested his goodness, and in this was pleased to bless the means made use of. I consider this the more remarkable as I was much exposed to the infection, from many of the diseased poor applying to me for relief, being at that time overseer of the poor."

"The year 1804," says Mr. Bicknell, "was another remarkable year. I had lived at Ponder's End fourteen years, and had no desire of making any change, my school being in a prosperous state, and my circumstances comfortable, when a cloud at once burst over me. A neighbour clandestinely purchased the premises which I occupied, and though I could have retained possession of them for some time longer, yet, fearing some litigation, I determined immediately to quit. I purchased suitable premises at Tooting, and removed hither at Christmas of this year. I am thankful to my heavenly Father for having provided me with so comfortable a habitation, without fear in future of an overbearing landlord or a covetous neighbour.—I continued," adds Mr. Bicknell, "in the same round of assiduous duty for several years, without any material interruption, and I trust not only to the improvement of my pupils in natural science, but also to their spiritual welfare, in their duty to God and man. May the Almighty be pleased to water the good seed which has thus been sown!" Under the year 1806, Mr. Bicknell remarks—"The evening shades were approaching and my strength abating. I found it necessary in some degree to lessen my former labours in the school. I found my son's assistance very useful, and I took him into partnership." This comparative leisure enabled him to pursue his favourite science of Theology more closely. Mr. Bicknell had indeed for some years been gradually receding from the paths of reputed Orthodoxy, but about this time he became, if not a decided *simple humanitarian*, something very nearly akin to it. With whatever reluctance the writer of this article may record this fact, yet he considers that he should injure the memory of the dead if he withheld it. "I profess myself," says he, "to be neither Calvinist, or Arminian, or Arian, or Socinian, or the disciple of any man whatever; yet I desire to be a disciple of the blessed Redeemer, to imitate him in all his heavenly virtues; and if in any respect I err in judgment, I humbly trust that my mind may be illuminated by the Divine Spirit, so as to know and understand the truth as it is in Jesus. May the Almighty pardon my every defect!" In 1811, continues Mr. Bicknell, "I removed with my wife and daughters to

Mitcham, leaving my son to conduct the school. I, however, though at a distance of two miles, continued to take some part in the school business almost daily. I experienced, indeed, occasional interruptions from increasing debility." In the course of this year, Mr. Drummond, an artist of the first rank, published a portrait of Mr. Bicknell, from an approved likeness by himself, and which he respectfully dedicated to Mr. Bicknell's late pupils. In 1818, Mr. Bicknell remarks—"I removed to Richmond, and relinquished my assistance in the school altogether. By the blessing of God, I am still in possession of my health and of a quiet habitation. I praise God for all his favours!" About this time he had an attack of dysentery, which continued at times to the end of his life. On his birth-day of the next year he makes the following remark—"I am this day seventy years of age, and though subject to those infirmities incident to old age, yet I still possess, to a considerable degree, all my corporeal faculties, and retain full possession of my intellectual powers, which I humbly pray my heavenly Father may be continued to me the residue of my days." His health and strength were now fast declining, yet his habitual activity and cheerfulness never forsook him: these seem to have been innate in his constitution. Though now exempted from all business, yet every day brought its employment. I never saw the least disposition in him to indolence during his whole life. Cheerfulness also formed a prominent feature in his character. He was much in the habit of calling upon some of his neighbours in the course of his daily walks, for the purpose of friendly conversation. These visits were always acceptable and interesting. Slanders or offensive inquiries never appeared. If he found his friends dull, he entered upon some cheerful detail calculated to cheer—some pleasing anecdote—some narrative from a modern voyage or travels—some exemplification of the kindness of Divine Providence—some useful advice to the young—some important or amusing hints to the aged. Young people loved his society, and the old admired it. Can it be wondered that when these visits were discontinued by death, the visitor should be deplored as a lost father and a friend?

In 1820, a lovely daughter, his youngest child, died, and was buried on the very day which had been appointed for her marriage. This greatly afflicted him; but in the beginning of the next year a still heavier wave came over him in the death of his beloved wife. "On Friday, Jan. 12th," he observes, "my beloved wife, and the affectionate mother of my children, took her flight to the land of rest,

leaving a disconsolate widower, six children, and twenty-five grandchildren, to lament the loss of so valuable a woman. We had lived happily together for forty-three years and eight weeks." This bereavement, however, did not affect him as might have been expected. He felt, but he felt as a man and as a Christian. Indeed, the strong feelings of humanity appear to sober by old age, and the death even of beloved relatives happens as a matter of course. Amongst Mr. Bicknell's private papers, an epitaph was found which he had written on the death of his wife, and which I am permitted to copy:

"Oh! lost and mourn'd, admir'd and
lov'd through life,
Thou best of women, and thou faithful
wife,
Farewell! 'Tis mine thy absence to de-
plore,
To linger here—and feel thy aid no
more.
'Tis mine to wait, till my remains are
laid
In the dark tomb, where rests thy tran-
quil head;
Then shall thy husband, from all sorrow
free,
Lament no more, but rest in peace with
thee."

Soon after this bereavement he gave up house-keeping, and returned to his favourite residence at Tooting.—"Yesterday," he remarks, "I was seventy-two years of age. My life is still prolonged, and a measure of health still continues; but infirmities are increasing, the pillars of my earthly tabernacle are trembling, and I am now left, as it were, alone." He continued, however, to enjoy a considerable share of health, and took his accustomed exercise till within a few days of his death. His mind never appeared to lose any of its vigour. One of the last things which he wrote was the solution of a problem in the more difficult parts of algebra. During the latter months of his life, also, he drew up, at the request of an esteemed relative, an epitome of Christian doctrine, which is most decidedly *Unitarian*. About three days before his death, he was seized with a kind of general paralysis. A professional friend, who had been accustomed to attend him, was promptly sent for; but though he watched over him with the skill of an able practitioner, and with the anxiety and affection of a son, yet the decree of Heaven was irrevocable, and without any pain, struggle, or other distressing symptom, he resigned his breath to *Him* who had given it. His death, like his life, was one of resignation, thankfulness and peace. He quitted the scenes of time without any desire for a protracted stay,

or any mistrust as to the future. "Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace!"

B. I. W.

HANNAH BARNARD.

This ancient and venerable female, who for many years past has justly supported the character of a *practical preacher of righteousness*, has now ceased from her labours of love, and quietly, without a sigh or a groan, closed her eventful life, on the morning of the 27th ultimo, at her residence in the City of Hudson, State of New York, she having been a sojourner on this earth for more than threescore and ten years, during which period she had travelled through England, Wales, Scotland, Ireland and the Scilly Isles. She followed the example and promulgated the peaceful precept of Jesus, by going about doing good, not only to the souls but bodies of the sons of tribulation and daughters of affliction. She visited the sick and administered to their medical aid. She poured the wine and oil of consolation into the wounded mind, and sympathised with them in the hour of affliction. She bore a pointed testimony against the popular delusions of the day, and strove boldly to tear asunder the veil of hypocrisy and to expose the sad effects of ecclesiastical tyranny, intolerance and superstition in all its deformities. Her noble mind was enriched with wisdom and stored with useful knowledge, which, operating upon the reasonable faculties of her soul, produced the united virtues of piety, benevolence, fortitude and integrity. Yet, notwithstanding all these Christian virtues and real marks of discipleship, she was calumniated and persecuted, (by formal professors,) as all the righteous who have gone before her have suffered. The person who traces these lines, from an intimate acquaintance with her, deems them but a humble and just tribute to her useful and memorable life. Her works of mercy and labours of love are at an end, her tranquil spirit, which long animated an enfeebled tenement, has returned to him who gave it, and, we are firm in the belief, sweetly reposes "where trouble ceaseth and the weary soul is at rest." Go, gentle reader, and emulate her virtues.—*From the United States' Gazette, printed in Philadelphia.*

12 Mo. 9th, 1825.

Dec. 8, at *Fermoy*, in the county of Cork, in the 84th year of his age, the Rev. THOMAS HALLIDAY. This gentleman was the son of a farmer in Yorkshire, who by industry and economy acquired a considerable property. Having made re-

spectable proficiency in classical literature, he was sent to the Academy at Daventry, then under the care of Dr. Ashworth; and having finished a course of four years, he was by Mr. Coward's Trustees appointed the Classical Tutor, an office for which he was eminently qualified. In this situation he continued four years, when, in consequence of some disagreement between him and the Principal, he found it necessary to remove. Soon afterwards, he became Domestic Chaplain to Hans Busk, Esq., of Bull-house, in Yorkshire, the father of the late celebrated Mrs. Milnes, of Piccadilly, and of the present Mrs. Milnes, of Fryston, in Yorkshire, the relict of the late Richard Milnes, Esq., M. P. for York—a lady of distinguished virtues and accomplishments. From Bull-house Mr. Halliday soon removed to Keighley, from whence he was shortly after invited to Norton Hall, as Chaplain to Samuel Shore, Esq., in whose house he preached every Lord's-day to a crowded congregation; for Mr. Halliday's compositions and delivery were both original and eloquent. Here he married an excellent woman, who lived not many years. His residence at Norton was the happiest period of Mr. Halliday's life, and had he consulted his own reputation and comfort, he never would have dissolved that truly respectable connexion. But Mr. Halliday was a man of a speculative and mechanical turn, and nothing would suit him but he must enter into business. He left off preaching and became a cotton-spinner, and was soon involved in troubles and losses, to the injury of his reputation. After Mr. Halliday had been thus reduced in his circumstances, many who had known him in his better days were disposed to subscribe to his subsistence. But he seems rather to have chosen to lead an unsettled life; sometimes appearing in public, as at Diss, at Bury St. Edmunds, Kidderminster and other places, for months together, in the character of a most able and eloquent preacher, to congregations who would have been happy by their utmost exertions to have secured his permanent services. At other times he disappeared, and nobody could tell what was become of him. At last, about thirty years ago, he was heard of in Cheshire and in Wales, and a rumour was current that he was gone over to Ireland, and though many inquiries were made after him, nothing certain could be learned, and the opinion generally prevailed that he was dead, till the notice which appeared in the Monthly Repository of a letter received from Mr. Dewdney, of Cork, which gave an account of his uncomfortable situation in the family of the O'Learys. Means were immediately used by Mr. Halliday's friends

to render his situation more comfortable. And the O'Learys having removed to Fermoy, took Mr. Halliday with them; and Mr. Jones, the minister of Fermoy, having been written to for that purpose by Mr. Halliday's friends, occasionally visited him, and was never obstructed in his visits by the O'Learys, who, to say the truth, appeared to treat Mr. Halliday very well; nor was he at all disposed to make any complaint. It is said that he had nothing to live upon but an annuity derived from his wife, which expired at his death, and that he has left nothing behind him but some manuscript sermons in short-hand.

B.

Dec. 17, at *Chichester*, Mr. THOMAS WILMSHURST, a member of the Unitarian Chapel in that city. Mr. W. was born at Brighton, of pious parents, holding the sentiments of the Calvinistic Baptists, in which religious principles he was brought up. When arrived at man's estate, he saw reason, from a careful examination of the Scriptures, to alter his theological opinions. His mind then settled in the conviction of the truth of the Unitarian creed, which faith solaced and supported him through successive periods of ill health, some of which were of no short duration. Under the influence of the sublime hopes inspired by the gospel, he was enabled, with a composure greatly to be envied, to contemplate his own dissolution, which event, his emaciated and weakened frame warned him, though in the meridian of his days, not to be far distant. To a friend, who not long before his death hinted a desire to discuss religious topics, with a view of reclaiming him to the path of what are called more orthodox opinions, he expressed his perfect satisfaction with his own views; and his medical attendant remarked, when his late patient had ceased to be conscious of the affairs of time, that in the course of an extensive practice, he had never witnessed a death-bed scene more tranquil and happy.

With joy the righteous man expects his end,
 Angels around befriending virtue's friend:
 While all his prospects bright'ning towards the last,
 His heaven commences, ere this world be past.

Survivors may amidst their grief remember for their consolation, that "*Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints;*" and indulge the animating hope, through the Christian covenant, of renewing their intercourse with their removed husband, parent and friend, in scenes of bliss, far surpassing any they enjoyed on earth.

Dec. 28, at *Dr. Williams's Library, Red-Cross Street*, RICHARD HOLT, Esq., of *King's Road, Gray's Inn*, aged 74 years, son of the late Rev. Richard Holt, Presbyterian Minister of Dover, in Kent. As one of the Trustees of Dr. Williams's Fund, he was in attendance at their Quarterly Meeting, and, after having joined in the usual business of the day with even more than his accustomed animation, sat down to dinner, apparently in good health, and had just commenced his meal, when he suddenly fell back in his chair and expired without a groan or a sigh, almost on the very spot where his friend and fellow-trustee, the late excellent Dr. Lindsay breathed his last in a similar manner. Every expedient that esteem and friendship could devise was made use of by those around him to rekindle the spark of life, but in vain. Thus sudden was the death of this truly estimable man. To those to whom he was dear, the shock could not but be great. Now that it is over, however, they find more than comfort in the belief that what was to them the unexpected stroke of affliction and bereavement, was to him a change as blessed as it was instantaneous, a translation in a moment and without pain into that peaceful and happy country "where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest." The modest and retiring character of one who never wished to leave the sequestered vale of life, and who, it is believed, was always guided in his conduct by far higher principles than the love of human approbation, forbids a long and laboured eulogium. It may not, however, be unprofitable to survivors to learn in few words, what friendship cannot but rejoice to record, that sincere piety, strict integrity, punctual exactness in the discharge of duty, were combined in the deceased with a tenderness of heart which age had no power to chill, and a liberality as modest as it was generous, which found its full reward in the gratification of kind and benevolent feeling, and seemed reluctant to receive even the bare return of thanks for favours conferred without solicitation. With no small degree of natural shrewdness, sound common sense, and knowledge of the world, Mr. Holt possessed at the same time the greatest simplicity and purity of character, nor did his acquaintance with the errors and frailties of our species in the least degree abate his pity and compassion for the erring and the frail. The outward signs of feeling, though he almost always endeavoured to suppress them, would frequently appear in spite of himself to mark the deep interest which he took in every thing human. He was a just and

a good man; and the writer of this short tribute to his memory can form no better wish for himself or for any of the genuine mourners whom he has left behind him, than that they may resemble him in the virtues of their lives, and be united to him after death. To the readers of the *Monthly Repository* it may be pleasing to know that he who was thus a Christian in practice, was a Unitarian in creed, a warm friend and well-wisher to the sacred cause of civil and religious liberty in every quarter of the globe.

J. H.

Dec. 29, at *Newport, Isle of Wight*, aged 48, ELIZABETH, wife of Thomas, LININGTON. There are some who would confine the records of the departed to those only who were possessed of extraordinary endowments, and in this feeling we should participate if in order to render a memoir of persons less gifted interesting, it were necessary to deviate at all from the strictest regard to truth; but the principal object of an obituary is to awaken the virtuous and pious imitation of survivors, and if the record of those not so highly distinguished should produce this effect, its most valuable end will be answered. Of this latter description of persons was the individual whose loss it is now our painful duty to record. At an early age she appears to have been solemnly impressed with a deep sense of the value and importance of religion. During a considerable portion of her life, however, being strongly tinctured with a belief in the doctrines of Calvinism, she experienced little real enjoyment from her faith in the gospel. Unfortunately for her own peace, she imagined that she was not one of those individuals whom the Creator had singled out as an object of his favour; and for many years when she retired to rest she expected, if she were that night summoned to depart, to awake in a place of torment. When a beloved child was, during this period, snatched away from her by death, the anguish she endured at the apprehension that she should never again behold it, she described as almost insupportable. From the distressing state of gloom in which these sentiments involved her, and under which many a gentle and delicate spirit has sunk never to rise again, or to survive only in a state less enviable than death, her vigorous mind was enabled to emancipate itself and she ultimately, after mature deliberation, adopted more scriptural views of the dispensations of the Most High. The happiness she enjoyed when her mind was completely established in the distinguishing doctrines of Unitarianism, it was

most interesting and edifying to witness. The writer of this has heard her represent the alteration in the state of her feelings as (with respect to her) a change "from darkness to light." She described herself as enjoying almost a new existence—new in her conceptions of the character of God, new in her future expectations, new in her motives to exertion; for now she experienced the full power of the truths of the gospel unimpaired by those human additions which paralyse its force and destroy its beauty. She delighted much to dwell on the perfect benevolence of the Deity, and to picture forth the period when the pure "knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth, as the waters the channels of the deep." Her complicated disorders, which for the last four years of her life scarcely allowed her any intervals of ease from pain, had rendered her thoughts familiar with the approach of death, and made her look forward to a future world with joyful anticipation; yet she never expressed a wish for her release before that period when it should be the will of her hea-

venly Father to terminate her sufferings. Those who attended her during her illness, and who will long revere her memory, can best bear witness to the patience and resignation with which she endured her afflictions, and the pious cheerfulness which she evinced even to the close of life.

E. K.

Seldom has the awful fact, that "in the midst of life we are in death," been more strikingly exhibited than it was in the Unitarian Chapel at Chichester, on Sunday, January 1. Mr. LEGGAT, who left his home apparently in perfect health, and in the pleasurable expectation of seeing on the morrow some of his friends to hail the advent of the New Year, scarcely reached the seat he was accustomed to occupy, when he fell down, and instantly expired. On the following Sunday, some practical observations, in allusion to this event, were offered from the words of our Lord, "What I say unto you, I say unto all, WATCH."

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC. RELIGIOUS.

Opening of the New Unitarian Chapel, Biddenden.

THE new Unitarian Chapel at *Biddenden*, in Kent, was opened on Tuesday, December 27th last, when two discourses in the afternoon and evening were delivered by the Rev. Lawrence Holden and the Rev. Benjamin Mardon; and the devotional part of the services were conducted by the Rev. T. F. Thomas and the Rev. Edwin Chapman. Mr. Holden, from Acts iv. 19, 20, set forth, by various impressive remarks, the obligations upon those who embrace Unitarian views of Christianity, openly to maintain their principles, notwithstanding the obloquy which they have still to encounter from the advocates of reputed orthodoxy; and Mr. Mardon, from the first clause of Luke iv. 18, expatiated, with fluency and force, on the privilege and duty of free inquiry, on the several truths which Unitarianism includes, and on the liberal and excellent spirit which it inspires. The chapel was filled to nearly overflowing, particularly at the evening service, with attentive auditors of truly respectable appearance. The hospitable attentions of Mr. Cole were shewn both by his friendly reception of the strangers at his mansion on their arrival, and by

the comfortable accommodations and refreshments which were provided at a neighbouring Inn, in the interval of the services. He delivered a neat and animated address to the company there assembled, which consisted of about sixty persons, on the business of the day, concluding with a fervent expression of his wishes for the growing prosperity of the Society, and that Biddenden might be "inundated with the pure doctrine and spirit of Christianity." The Society was formed principally by the gratuitous labours of this gentleman, and, by his advice and liberal assistance, seconded by those of Mr. Holden, it has been enabled to adopt the measures necessary to the erection of its chapel. The contributions at the door, toward defraying the moderate debt remaining upon it, amounted to £7. 1s.; which, consisting in a great degree of the well-earned wages of rural industry, afforded a pleasing testimonial to the enlightened zeal of the contributors. The remaining arrears are, however, about £70; the reduction of its original cost to this sum, has lain heavy on the principal agents and projectors, and though it has the cordial co-operation of the members in general, yet as their pecuniary resources are circumscribed by their lowly situations in life, the contributions of the more affluent part of the Unitarian body, toward the liquidation of this debt, would at once

operate as a seasonable aid and encouragement to this interesting effort for the furtherance of genuine Christianity.

P.

Anniversary of the Unitarian Meeting-house, Green Gate, Salford, Manchester.

ON Sunday and Monday, January 1st and 2nd, was held the Anniversary of the Opening of the *Unitarian Meeting-house, Green Gate, Salford, Manchester.* The Rev. E. Higginson, of Derby, and the Rev. J. H. Bransby, of Dudley, delivered highly able and impressive discourses on the occasion. On the Monday some friends to the promotion of pure Christianity, to the amount of 140, sat down to a dinner provided in the school-room of the chapel. Richard Potter, Esq., discharged the duties of President with urbanity and judicious zeal. During the afternoon the meeting listened, with the highest gratification, to addresses from the Revs. E. Higginson, J. H. Bransby, W. Johns, W. Shepherd, J. Grundy, J. G. Robberds, J. H. Worthington, T. C. Holland, T. Howarth, and J. R. Beard (the pastor of the congregation). We regret that our limits do not permit us to give even an outline of these addresses. But among the many excellent remarks with which the Chairman prefaced the sentiments which he suggested to the meeting, there are one or two that we cannot refrain from mentioning. Mr. Potter, in proposing to the meeting the sentiment, "To the most sacred of all rights, liberty of conscience," remarked, "It was gratifying to know that this principle seemed well understood by the framers of the rising governments across the Atlantic. Two documents he had lately met with which he would read; the first was the project of a law transmitted by the Executive of Buenos Ayres to the House of Representatives, and was as follows: "The right which every man has to worship God according to his own conscience shall be inviolable in the territory of this province;" and, in a law recently before the state legislature of Maryland for removing the restrictions on the Jews, it is declared, "That no government upon the face of the earth has a right to prescribe any sect on account of their religious tenets, so long as those tenets do not interfere with or endanger its stability or permanence; as no man can be rightly held accountable to an earthly tribunal for his belief, except that belief tends to the destruction and ruin of public morals; it is to a higher tribunal that the cognizance of such things belongs; in man it is impious in the extreme to interpose his feeble and puerile efforts against the faith

of his fellow, who is just as competent to judge as himself." The meeting had also the pleasure to hear from Mr. Potter that Mr. Higginson, notwithstanding his laborious ministerial engagements, and the equally arduous and important employments of his daily avocations, had, in his zeal for the welfare of society, found time, or rather created time, to take an active and very frequently a leading part in originating and advocating all those objects and institutions which have had a tendency to elevate the character and augment the happiness of our fellow-creatures. His last public effort was an address delivered very recently at the opening of the Derby Mechanics' Institute, and since printed. "To this," said Mr. Potter, "I refer with particular gratification as perhaps the most eloquent production which has hitherto appeared in behalf of these valuable establishments."

"Nor," added the President, in proposing the health of Mr. Bransby, (the other preacher on the occasion,) "is it every individual who has the fortune to be placed in circumstances which prove the sincerity of his principles, by making his adherence to them a source of personal sacrifice. Such, however, I understand has been the fortune of our excellent friend, Mr. Bransby. He has been tried in the balance and *not* found wanting. As the steady and consistent friend of civil and religious liberty, he has claims upon the respect of the meeting which cannot fail to have been greatly strengthened by his very valuable services on the present occasion."

The meeting-house in Salford stands in the midst of a very dense population, composed chiefly of the working classes. With a view to the enlightenment of these the building was erected. It has been frequently objected to Unitarianism that its principles are not suited to the capacities and wants of the great body of the people. The only way effectually to refute this gratuitous assertion is to propose Unitarian Christianity to them in all its moral beauty and cogent evidence. This the minister and members of the Salford congregation are anxious to do. They rejoice that so many able servants of Christ are ministering to the spiritual improvement of the higher classes, while they deem it a duty to proclaim glad tidings more especially to the poor. Nor have their labours been unattended by the Divine blessing. The common people again hear gladly and believe unto righteousness. The meeting-house has only been opened one year, and already the average number of the congregation is, at the very least, 150. A Sunday-school, consisting of 100 children, and

an Adult-school have also been established. It is to be regretted that a debt of £540 still tends to cramp the efforts of the friends of the society. Towards the liquidation of this, £40 were collected at the anniversary, and it is hoped that the wanted liberality of the friends of truth will enable the society to liberate themselves from their present encumbrance. This is the more to be desired as the enlargement of the chapel is contemplated as no very distant event.

J. R. B.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Intolerance of Irish Presbyterians.

(From an Irish Correspondent who heads his communication—*Auld Lights of Ulster.*)

General Synod at Colerain, 1825.

Overtures (i. e. Motions).

1. "Mr. James Elder gave notice that he intends to move at the next General Synod, that subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith shall be required of all the initiants into the ministry of this Church."—This gentleman belongs to the sect who have fought fiercely—aye, and forcibly too—against Popish Creeds and the prelatie Thirty-nine Articles. What is the difference between a creed and a confession?

3. Overtured and agreed to—"That so soon as the Moderator of this Synod shall learn, upon any occasion, that a Professor is to be chosen in the Belfast Academical Institution, he shall immediately advise the several Presbyteries; and that each Presbytery shall thereupon appoint a Minister and Elder to meet the Moderator in Belfast; and, after examining their testimonials, to give their opinion respecting the qualifications of candidates, which opinion the Moderator shall communicate to the electors, specifying the candidates whom they consider eligible."—N. B. Faith is to be the principal qualification.

4. Overtured and agreed to—"That this Synod deeply regret that, by the appointment of some persons holding Arian sentiments to Professorships in the Belfast Academical Institution, a diminution of public confidence in that Seminary has been produced."—*Untrue as to the effect produced.*

This Synod direct their Committee, "That in all cases of elections to Professorships in the Belfast Academical Institution, they recommend to the attention of the electors none but persons of Orthodox sentiments; and do expect and trust that the managers and visitors of

the Belfast Academical Institution shall in all cases of election hold in view the opinion of the Synod respecting the necessity of electing such persons to Professorships connected with the students of the church."

"That the Synod do now appoint a Committee to negotiate with the proprietors of the Belfast Academical Institution respecting the recognition, by a by-law of the overture of Synod, relative to election to Professorships connected with the students of this church."

"Overture: That the names and testimonials of the several candidates for Professorships which may hereafter become vacant in the Institution, shall be submitted to the Moderator of the General Synod of Ulster, on his applying for the same, for the purposes mentioned in said overture."

"That when the objects of this Committee shall have been attained, they be authorized to propose their opinion of the advantages of home education for the students of this church, and recommend the Belfast Academical Institution to the favourable consideration of His Majesty's Commissioners of Education."

Thus we may perceive an attempt is making to pervert a fine establishment for education into an organ for ecclesiastical tyranny. These North-of-Ireland Presbyterians call themselves a Church, and they are in consequence aping, in their small way, the inquisitorial airs of a *real hierarchy*. "This is Anti-Pope turned Pope with a vengeance." Church domination claimed by a right from Heaven, as the Papists claim it, is a dreadful engine: usurped, even against the principles of semi-liberty which they once taught, it is injurious and contemptible in the episcopacy of the Established Church, because it is but a half measure: but in a Presbyterian Synod it takes its most odious character—the preachers of liberty the practisers of tyranny! It is true, from Charles the First's day to the present, a vacillating, time-serving character hung on Presbyterianism. They were ever "the painters who pleased every body and pleased nobody;" and now, out of the ashes of cold orthodoxy, half stifled for years by latitudinarianism, up starts this unfinished phoenix with the "kirk's alarm" for his natal hymn:

Orthodox, Orthodox, who believe in John Knox,

Let me sound an alarm to your conscience;

There's a heretic blast has been blawn in the West,

That what is no sense must be non-sense.

Dr. Mac, Dr. Mac, you should stretch on
the rack,
To strike evil doers with terror;
To join faith and sense upon any pre-
tence
Is heretic damnable error.

D'rymple mild, D'rymple mild, tho' your
heart's like a child,
And your life like the new driven
snaw—
Yet that winna save ye, auld Satan must
have ye,
For preaching that three's ane and
twa.

Calvin's sons, Calvin's sons, seize your
spiritual guns,
Ammunition you never can need,
&c. &c.

I conclude by saying, what will, I think,
be generally admitted, that when Protes-
tants, who have dissented from prelacy
that they might be more Protestant, take
to themselves that Popish engine, perse-
cution for conscience' sake, they act as
inconsistently as did a Whig Minister of
a Whig Lord Lieutenant, who prosecuted
a set of personal enemies by absolute
process, called *Ex Officio*.

THE "Home Missionary Society,"
supported by the Independents, has forty
Missionaries in various parts of England,
by whose means new congregations are
perpetually rising up in villages where
Dissenters were before unknown. A ma-
gazine is published monthly under the
name and in furtherance of the objects
of this Society. The Baptists have an
association for the same object. It was
a report of the former of these Societies
which threw Dr. Lushington (generally
a friend of liberty) off his guard in the
House of Commons, a year or two ago,
and betrayed him into the expression of
a wish for legislative measures to restrain
fanaticism. Notable project, to bind the
human mind with parchment!

*Inscription in Latin and English on
the Foundation Stone of the New
Independent College at Highbury.*

Ædificii.
Vsbivs.
Academiæ. Olim. Hoxtoniensis.
Causa. scilicet.
Ivvenim. pibrvm. atqve. ingenvorum.
Qvi. Meliores.
Evangelio. sancto. predicando.
Inter. Christianos. Independentes. dictos.
Adpetant. facultates.
Literis. sacris. hvmrioribvsqve.

Ac. Disciplinis.
Gratvito. imbvendorum.
Conlatis. favtorvm. pecvniis.
Dicati.

Hæc fvndamenta.
Thomas Wilson. Armiger.
Annos. plvsqvam. triginta.
Thesavrariivs. fidelis. patronvsqve. mvni-
ficvs.
Locavit.

IVNII. XXVIII. A. S. M.DCCC.XXV.
Georgio. Quarto. feliciter. regnante.

This Foundation Stone
Of a building
Erected by voluntary contributions
For the purposes of
An Academy sometime at Hoxton
Namely
For affording gratuitous Education
In sacred and useful Literature and
Science
To Young Men
Of piety and good talents
Who desire to improve their qualifications
For Preaching the Gospel
Among Christians of
The Independent Donomination
Was laid by
Thomas Wilson Esquire
For more than thirty years
The faithful Treasurer and liberal Bene-
factor

JUNE XXVIII. A. S. M.DCCC.XXV.
In the prosperous Reign of George the
Fourth.

LITERARY.

THE *Greek Professorship* at Cambridge
has been gained by the Rev. Mr. SCHOLE-
FIELD, of Trinity College. There were
six candidates.

Cambridge, January 6.—THE Hulsean
Prize for the last year has been adjudged
to Mr. ARTHUR TOZER RUSSELL, of St.
John's College, for his Dissertation on the
following subject: "*In what respect the
Law is a Schoolmaster to bring us unto
Christ.*"

The following is the subject of the
Hulsean Prize Essay for the present year:
—"A Critical Examination of our Savi-
our's Discourses, with regard to the
Evidence which they afford of his Divine
Nature."

Cambridge, January 20.—THE Prize
for the Norrisian Essay, for the year
1825, has been adjudged to H. JEREMIE,
B. A., and Scholar of Trinity College.
The subject: "No valid Argument can
be drawn from the Incredulity of the
Heathen Philosophers against the Truth
of the Christian Religion."

FOREIGN.

AMERICA.

Mr. Jefferson.

MR. JEFFERSON having been toasted at the dinner given to General La Fayette in the Rotunda of the University of Virginia, made the following affecting and eloquent remarks:

“ I will avail myself of this occasion, my beloved neighbours and friends, to thank you for the kindnesses which now, and at all times, I have received at your hands. Born and bred among your fathers, led by their partialities into the line of public life, I laboured in fellowship with them through that arduous struggle which, freeing us from foreign bondage, established us in the rights of self-government: rights which have blessed ourselves, and will bless, in their sequence, all the nations of the earth. In this contest, all did our utmost; and, as none could do more, none had pretensions to superior merit.

“ I joy, my friends, in your joy, inspired by the visit of this our ancient and distinguished leader and benefactor. His deeds in the war of independence you have heard and read. They are known to you, and embalmed in your memories, and in the pages of faithful history. His deeds in the peace which followed that war are perhaps not known to you; but I can attest them. When I was stationed in his country, for the purpose of cementing its friendship with ours, and of advancing our mutual interests, this friend of both was my most powerful auxiliary and advocate. He made our cause his own, as in truth it was that of his native country also. His influence and connexions there were great. All doors and all departments were open to him at all times; to me, only formally and at appointed times. In truth, I only held the nail; he drove it. Honour him, then, as your benefactor in peace, as well as in war.

“ My friends, I am old, long in the disuse of making speeches, and without voice to utter them. In this feeble state, the exhausted powers of life leave little within my competence for your service. If, with the aid of my younger and abler coadjutors, I can still contribute any thing to advance the institution within whose walls we are now mingling manifestations to this our guest, it will be, as it ever has been, cheerfully and zealously bestowed. And could I live to see it

once enjoy the patronage and cherishment of our public authorities with undivided voice, I should die without a doubt of the future fortunes of my native state, and in the consoling contemplation of the happy influence of this institution on its character, its virtue, its prosperity and safety.

“ To these effusions for the cradle and land of my birth, I add, for our nation at large, the aspirations of a heart warm with the love of country, whose invocations to Heaven for its indissoluble union will be fervent and unremitting while the pulse of life continues to beat; and when that ceases, it will expire in prayers for the eternal duration of its freedom and prosperity.”

4TH JULY, 1776.

Extract from a Letter to a Friend in Quincy, written by the venerable and revered Patriot JOHN ADAMS, on the Day subsequent to the adoption of the DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, by the Continental Congress:

“ PHILADELPHIA, July 5, 1776.

“ Yesterday the greatest question was decided which was ever debated in America; and greater, perhaps, never was or will be decided among men. A resolution was passed without one dissenting colony—‘ THAT THESE UNITED STATES ARE, AND OF RIGHT OUGHT TO BE, FREE AND INDEPENDENT STATES.’

“ The day is passed. The 4th of July, 1776, will be a memorable epoch in the history of America. I am apt to believe it will be celebrated by succeeding generations, as the great Anniversary Festival. It ought to be commemorated as the DAY OF DELIVERANCE, by solemn acts of devotion to Almighty God. It ought to be solemnized with *pomp, shows, games, sports, guns, bells, bonfires and illuminations*, FROM ONE END OF THE CONTINENT TO THE OTHER, *from this time forward for ever!* You will think me transported with enthusiasm; but I am not. I am well aware of the toil and blood and treasure that it will cost to maintain this declaration and support and defend these states; yet, through all the gloom, I can see the rays of light and glory—I can see, that the end is worth more than all the means, and that posterity will triumph, although you and I may rue, which I hope we shall not. I am, &c.

“ JOHN ADAMS.”

NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

Lectures on History and General Policy; to which is prefixed, An Essay on a Course of Liberal Education for Civil and Active Life. By Joseph Priestley, LL.D. F. R. S. A New Edition, with numerous Enlargements: comprising a Lecture on "The Constitution of the United States," from the Author's American Edition; and Additional Notes. By J. T. Rutt. 8vo. 9s.

The Grievances of Ireland, their Causes and their Remedies, in a Letter to Sir Francis Burdett, Bart., M. P. By Wm. Sturch, Esq. 2s.

A Letter to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, concerning the Authorship of ΕΙΚΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ. By H. J. Todd, M. A. F. S. A., &c., Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty, &c. 8vo. 7s.

The Geography of the Globe, containing a Description of its several Divisions of Land and Water: to which are added, Problems on the Terrestrial and Celestial Globes, and a Series of Questions for Examination: designed for the Use of Schools and Private Families. By John Olding Butler, Teacher of Writing, Arithmetic, and Geography. 12mo. 4s. 6d.

England Enslaved by her own Slave Colonies. An Address to the Electors and People of the United Kingdom. By James Stephen, Esq. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Greece and her Claims. By Edward Blaquiére, Esq. 1s. 6d.

Junius proved to be Burke, with an Outline of his Biography. 8vo. 3s.

The Principles on which Man is accountable for his Belief; or, Henry Brougham, Esq., defended, in a Conversation occasioned by Two Sermons lately published by Dr. Wardlaw.

Death-Bed Scenes and Pastoral Conversations. By the late John Warton, D. D. Edited by his Sons. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The Christian Sabbath; or, an Inquiry into the Religious Obligation of Keeping Holy One Day in Seven. By George Holden, A. M. 8vo. 12s.

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

The Ecclesiastical Conferences, the Synodical Discourses and Episcopal Mandates of Massillon, Bishop of Clermont, on the Principal Duties of the Clergy. Translated by C. H. Boylan. 2 Vols. 8vo. 1l. 4s.

Grant's History of the English Churches and Sects; bringing down the Narrative

to 1810, and including Discussions of the Principles maintained by the Universalists, &c. Vol. IV. 14s.

The Book of Churches and Sects; or, the Opinions of all Denominations of Christians differing from the Church of England, traced to their Source. With a Refutation of Unitarianism, &c. 8vo. 14s.

The History of the Reformation of the Church of England, during the Reign of King Henry VIII. By Henry Soames, M. A., Rector of Shelley, Essex. 2 Vols. 8vo. 1l. 10s.

A Brief Sketch of the History and Present Situation of the Valdenses, in Piedmont, commonly called Vaudois. By Hugh Dyke Acland, Esq. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

A History of the United States of America, from their Earliest Settlement to the close of the War with Great Britain in 1815. 8vo.

Memoirs of Miss Jane Taylor. By her Brother, Isaac Taylor, Jun. 2 Vols. 8vo. 16s.

The Mission from Bengal to Siam and to Hue, the Capital of Cochin China, never before visited by any European, in the Years 1821, 1822. By George Finlaison, Esq. With an Introduction and Memoir of the Author. By Sir Stamford Raffles, F. R. S. 8vo. 15s.

Sephora; a Hebrew Tale, descriptive of the Country of Palestine, and of the Manners and Customs of the Ancient Israelites. 2 Vols. Crown 8vo. 14s.

The Prospect, and other Poems. By Edward Moxen. Foolscap 8vo. 4s. 6d.

The Christian Psalmist; or, Hymns selected and original. By James Montgomery. With an Introductory Essay. 12mo. 5s. Royal 24mo. 3s. 6d.

Devotional Verses. By Bernhard Barton. 12mo. 6s.

The Last of the Mohicans, a Tale. By the Author of the Spy, &c. 3 Vols. 12mo. 1l. 1s.

The Rebel, a Tale. 2 Vols. 12mo. 14s.

Is this Religion? Or, a Page from the Book of the World. By the Author of "May you like It!" Foolscap 8vo. 7s.

Remarks on Oaths; principally shewing the Duty of Legislative Interference to Abolish some and Reform others. 2s. 6d.

Six Letters on Joint-Stock Companies. By John Wilks, Jun.

A Second Letter to the Bishop of Winchester on the Sunday-Evening Lecture

at Camberwell; with a Copy of the Author's First Letter to his Lordship; containing also Remarks upon Dissenters, particularly Roman Catholics and Unitarians. 5s.

Letters on the Church. By an Episcopalian. 8vo. 8s.

Protestant Sisters of Charity, a Letter addressed to the Bishop of London, developing a Plan for Improving the Arrangements already existing for Administering Medical Advice and Visiting the Sick Poor. 1s.

A Vindication of the Church of Scotland from the Charge of Fatalism, urged against it in the 8th No. of the Phrenological Journal.

The Philosophy of Religion: being a Sequel to the Christian Philosopher. By Thomas Dick. 12mo. 8s.

Proceedings at a Public Dinner given to Mr. James Montgomery, in approbation of his Public and Private Virtues, held at the Tontine Inn, Sheffield, Nov. 4, 1825. 12mo. 1s.

An Address to the People of the British Dominions in the Cause of Humanity and the Suffering Greeks. To which is added, an Easy Method of Paying off the National Debt. By Ricardus Incognitus. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Thoughts on the Advancement of Academical Education in England. 8vo. 5s.

Sketches in Biography, designed to shew the Influence of Literature on Character and Happiness. By John Clayton, Esq. 12mo. 7s. 6d.

The History of Colchester. By Thomas Cromwell. 2 Vols. 8vo. 1l. 12s. Royal 8vo. 2l. 2s. Proof Plates on India Paper, 4l. 4s.

Travels in Asia Minor and Greece. By the late Richard Chandler, D. D., a new Edition, with Corrections and Remarks. By Nicholas Revett, Esq. To which is prefixed, an Introductory Account of the Author. By Ralph Churton, M. A., Archdeacon of St. David's. 2 Vols. 8vo. 18s.

The Typographical Gazetteer, attempted by the Rev Henry Cotton, D. C. L., late Sub-Librarian of the Bodleian Library and Student of Christ Church, Oxford. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

A Critical Examination of Dr. MacCulloch's Work on the Highlands and Western Isles of Scotland. Post 8vo. 8s. 6d.

Essays and Sketches of Character. By the late R. Ayton, Esq., with a Memoir of his Life, and a Portrait from a Drawing by R. Westall, Esq., R. A. Post 8vo. 8s. 6d.

The Camisard; or, the Protestants of Languedoc. A Tale. 3 Vols. 12mo. 1l. 1s.

The Lottery Ticket; or, the Evils of Gaming: an American Tale. 1s.

Philip Colville, or a Covenanter's Story unfinished. By the Author of the "Decision," &c. 6s.

College Recollections. Post 8vo. 9s.

Pandurang Hari: or, Memoirs of a Hindoo. 3 Vols. 12mo. 1l. 4s.

A Letter to Thomas Fowell Buxton, Esq., M. P., containing Statements respecting the Profits of Capital employed in Working Mines in England, with an Inquiry as to the Success likely to attend similar Undertakings in Mexico. By John Taylor, Esq. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

The Ordinances of the Mines of New Spain, translated from the Original Spanish, with Observations on Mines and Mining Associations. By C. Thomson, Esq., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister at Law. 8vo. 12s.

The Influence of Interest and Prejudice upon Proceedings in Parliament stated, in matters relative to Education, Religion, the Poor, &c. &c. By Alexander Munnell. 8vo.

An Address to the Public, on the Propriety of Midwives, instead of Surgeons, practising Midwifery.

Hints to the Young Jamaica Sugar Planter. By Robert Hibbert, Jun., Esq. 12mo.

A Manual of the System of Instruction pursued at the Infant School, Meadow Street, Bristol. Illustrated by appropriate Engravings. By D. G. Goyder, late Superintendent of the Infant School, Bristol, and now of the Infant School, Hackney. Fourth Edition, enlarged. 12mo. 5s.

A Treatise on Milk, as an Article of the First Necessity to the Health and Comfort of the Community. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

The Popish Abuse, called Lay Church Government, laid open to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. By a Commissioned Advocate. Second Edition. 4s. 6d.

Oratio in Collegii Regalis Medicorum Londinensis ædibus novis habita die Dedicationis, Junii xxv., m. dccc. xxv. Ab Henrico Halford, Baronetto, Medico Regis Ordinario Præside. 4to. 2s. 6d.

A Selection of Family Prayers; intended for the Use of his Parishioners. By James Duke Coleridge, LL.D., Vicar of Kenwyn, Cornwall. 1s. 6d. Cheap Edition, 9d.

Owenism rendered consistent with our Civil and Religious Institutions, or a mode of forming Companies for Mutual Benefit without the Assistance of the Rich or borrowing One Shilling. By James Hamilton, Author of the Hamiltonian System. 6d.

A Letter to the Right Hon. G. Canning on the more General Diffusion of Knowledge among the Lower Classes of the People. By R. Nottingham, Esq. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

The Mendicity Society Unmasked.
Considerations upon the Expediency of Building a Metropolitan Palace. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Remarks by the Rev. David Thom, Minister of the Scotch Church, Rodney Street, Liverpool, on a Series of Charges preferred against him before the Rev. the Presbytery of Glasgow, by certain Individuals of the said Church, with a Copious Appendix. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Considerations upon the Game Laws. By Edward Lord Suffield.

The Slave Colonies of Great Britain; or, a Picture of Negro Slavery, drawn by the Colonists themselves. Being an Abstract of the various Papers recently laid before Parliament on that Subject. 8vo.

Notes on the Present Condition of the Negroes in Jamiaca. By H. T. de la Beche, Esq., F. R. S., &c. 8vo. 3s.

Trial of Captain Thomas Atchison, of the Royal Artillery, by a General Court Martial, at Malta; in consequence of having requested to be exonerated from Firing Patteraro Salutes, and Tolling a Roman Catholic Bell for the Church and Image Rites of Roman Catholic Priests: with an Appendix, describing those Rites of the Romish and Greek Churches, at which British Protestant Troops, Infantry as well as Artillery, were required by the Priests to attend and assist; also, the Nature of the Attendance and Assistance consequently ordered to be given; with Official Documents on the Subject. 2s. 6d.

The Advent, Kingdom and Divinity of the Messiah, demonstrated in a Plain and Scriptural Exposition of the Sacred Text. By Edward T. Cauffield, Lieut. R. N. 12mo. 4s. 6d.

The Theology of the Early Patriarchs; illustrated by an Appeal to subsequent Parts of the Holy Scriptures: in a Series of Letters to a Friend. By Thomas Bid-dulph, M. A., Minister of St. James's, Bristol. 2 Vols. 8vo. 17. 1s.

The Parish Church; or, Religion in Britain. Containing the Origin, Learning, Religion and Customs of the Britons; the Errors, &c., of Popery; the Reformation and Revolution, &c. By T. Wood, A. M. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Wesleyana; comprising an Extensive Selection of the most striking and important Passages from the Writings of the late Rev. John Wesley, A. M. Systematically arranged: with a Sketch of his Life. 18mo. Portrait. 6s.

The Turkish New Testament incapable of Defence, and the True Principles of Biblical Translation vindicated, in Answer to Professor Lee's Remarks on Dr. Henderson's Appeal to the Bible Society on the Subject of the Turkish Version of the New Testament, printed at Paris in 1819. By the Author of the Appeal. 8vo. 8s.

Sermons.

By the late very Rev. Isaac Milner, D. D. F. R. S. 2 Vols. 8vo. 17. 1s.

Occasional. By the Rev. Robert Morehead, A. B., Jun., Minister of St. Paul's Chapel, York Place, Edinburgh. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The Nature and Necessity of Preparation for Death: preached at Camberwell, on occasion of the Death of Robert Sangster, Esq. By Wm. Orme. 1s.

Preached in the Parish Church of St. Mary, Islington, Dec. 11, 1825, in aid of the National School. By Daniel Wilson, Vicar. 2s.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from Messrs. W. Evans; Noah Jones; H. Clarke, and Ivimey: also from An Unitarian Whig; A Would-be Apostolical Christian; and A Friend to Free Inquiry.

The paper entitled "Thoughts on the Punishment of Death," is designed for the next Number.

"A Well Wisher to the Cause of Unitarianism," who writes from Chelmsford, is requested to give his address to the Editor; upon doing which a printed letter shall be sent him, which will convince him that the case to which he refers has been grossly misrepresented.

The Editor has received 2*l.* from the Loughborough and Mount Sorrell Fellowship Fund for the Chapel at Middleton in Lancashire.

The Publishers have a set of the MONTHLY REPOSITORY complete in Twenty Volumes. Such of the former Volumes and Numbers as are not out of print, may also be obtained, on application to them, personally, or through the Booksellers in town or country.
