

THE Monthly Repository.

No. CCXLVI.]

JUNE, 1826.

[Vol. XXI.]

Some of the Revealed Truths of Christianity partially Incomprehensible.

SIR,

June 7, 1826.

IT is not my intention to enter into any controversy on the subject of my last communication, [pp. 191—193,] and I will merely beg leave to add one or two brief remarks respecting the answer of your correspondent *A Nonconformist*, inserted in your last number [p. 284]. What particular doctrines are actually revealed in Scripture, is a question which will of necessity be differently determined according to the interpretation affixed to its language by different parties, and hence, the difficulty attending our conception of these doctrines, must vary according to the nature of the creed adopted. Your correspondent, however, strenuously maintains, that a revelation ought to contain nothing approaching to mystery, nothing too difficult for the mind of man to understand. In this opinion he is not singular. It is well known that a numerous class of *German* divines, among whom we may name Eichhorn, Semler, Sleiermacher, Paulus, Eckerman, Ammon and Schiller, consider miracles and prophecies as partaking too much of the mysterious to admit of belief, and they accordingly regard the miraculous and prophetic parts of the New Testament in the light of fables and embellishments, or they endeavour to interpret them in such a manner as to deprive them of their supernatural character. How far *A Nonconformist* coincides with the sentiments of these *rationalizing* Christians, as they call themselves, I will not undertake to decide. But if he had read my observations with a little more attention, he would have perceived that I have described the term *mysterious* as signifying what is either wholly or *partially* beyond our comprehension; and I have no hesitation in affirming that the latter part of this definition is applicable to all the phenomena of nature and all the doctrines of revelation.

But my present object is merely to notice your correspondent's extraordinary assertion, that not one of the

doctrines to which I alluded in my last paper can be deemed *scriptural*. The two first of these, "the resurrection of the same body," and that of "conferring immortality on a material substance," were barely mentioned, and were not introduced in support of my position. With respect to the first, however, if for *the same body*, be substituted the words *same person*, and without these the doctrine itself would have no meaning, I cannot perceive that the difficulty would be at all diminished. There is not a more abstruse point in the whole range of human inquiry than that of *personal identity*. But taking the doctrine of the resurrection, stated as a simple fact, (and, perhaps, in this form it may be allowed to be *scriptural*,) did not the Athenian philosophers consider it as in the highest degree mysterious? And is not the resurrection of Christ denied by many of the German school to which I have referred, because they contend that nothing surpassing the human intellect ought to obtain our belief? Even Dr. Semler, who is in some particulars a judicious critic, calls the detail of that stupendous and leading miracle of the Christian religion, a *poetic mythus*, to be received in an allegorical sense!—"Not a word" (observes *A Nonconformist*) "is said about conferring immortality on a material substance." To this affirmation, let the language of St. Paul furnish the reply: "This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality."—Again, he denies that Scripture affords us any intimation that *few will be saved*; but he surely ought to have known that my opinion is no other than that of almost every denomination of Christians, and that there is scarcely a chapter in the New Testament which does not authorize us to believe, that the great majority of the human race will fail in obtaining the rewards of the righteous.

The last of my statements to which your correspondent has objected as

unscriptural, refers to the future destiny of the impenitent. And here there are but three doctrines which can possibly be inferred from the language of the sacred writings:—1. The absolute eternity of future punishment; 2. long-continued punishment followed by annihilation; 3. corrective punishment with final restitution. Which of these three he believes to form part of the Christian revelation, he has left the reader no means of determining; but to reconcile the Divine character, as described in the records of that revelation, with either of the two former, is in my apprehension altogether impossible. It is singular, however, that with respect to the third of these doctrines, *A Nonconformist* has studiously avoided answering my observation, that even admitting the system of corrective punishment to be fairly deduced, the strict impartiality of the Deity is not immediately obvious, and that a degree of mystery is attached to it, which our present faculties are inadequate to explain.

Of those speculatists who aver that nothing difficult of comprehension is to be discovered in the pages of revelation, the *German rationalists* are perhaps the most consistent; but still their theory is not on that account the less absurd.

CLERICUS CANTABRIGIENSIS.

Malton,

May 2, 1826.

SIR,

A SMALL pamphlet is handed about in this town, entitled, "Some Account of the past and present Management of Lady Hewley's Charities," in which it is said, "At Malton, in Yorkshire, the minister was allowed 10*l.* per annum; but when he avowed Unitarianism, the trustees advanced him to 20*l.*" Now, Sir, allow to say there is no truth in this; it is *altogether* false. I do not receive 20*l.* from that Fund.

I have also just had a sight of an 8vo. volume, entitled, "The Manchester Socinian Controversy," in which it is said, "An attempt was made to induce Mr. Bartlett to resign his charge, and an annuity of 50*l.* per annum was offered him for his life, with good security. He requested a month's time to consider, and after consulting with his Unitarian friends

gave this answer: 'I can have as much from another quarter, and I will not resign my charge.'" I protest this is false, and that I never said so, or any thing like it. In that case I acted from principle. This occurred in 1814, and since that time the exhibition allowed me from Lady Hewley's Trustees has not been augmented at all. Some of my friends here think we ought not to sit down without exposing such gross falsehoods in the *Monthly Repository*. Should you think with them, you will oblige me by publishing this direct contradiction to the statements above-quoted, part of a systematic plan for defaming Unitarians as one step towards robbing them of their places of worship.

JOHN BARTLETT.

SIR,

THE discussion respecting the authenticity of the text of the three Heavenly Witnesses, has been prolonged, perhaps, more than was necessary. I judge it, however, expedient to bestow one short paper more on the subject for recapitulating the arguments for and against its genuineness, so as to enable the reader to come to a just conclusion.

The arguments against the text are the three following: it is not contained in any Greek MS. excepting one, and that comparatively of a modern date, though the number of these MSS. exceeds one hundred. The ancient versions are all, or nearly all, without it. It is not quoted by the Greek and Latin Fathers, who had every motive for so doing, and who quote the context of the verse, while they are silent respecting the verse itself. Among the learned who have insisted on these facts against the authenticity of the text, are Newton, Bentley, Michaëlis, Griesbach, Porson, Marsh, Belsham, P. Smith, the *Quarterly Reviewer*, &c.

The arguments for the genuineness of the text are the following:

1. The text is written against certain impostors who maintained the divinity, and denied the humanity, of the Messiah. Their proposition was, that Jesus, the *man* Jesus, was not the Christ, or the Son of God, but a God within him, or a phantom in his well-known form. To set aside this

artful proposition, the Apostle reduces the evidences for the divine mission of Jesus to three heads—the testimony of the Father at his baptism, the testimony of the Logos, dwelling in him during his ministry, and the testimony of the Holy Spirit which descended on his apostles after his ascension. These three testimonies are one, because they are found, upon examination, to attest one and the same thing, namely, that Jesus is the Christ or the Son of God. This simple proposition is the substance of Christianity and a summary of its evidences: and it is hardly possible that, if Christianity be true, a verse asserting its foundations, and no more, should prove a forgery. Hence we may conclude with certainty, that a verse which, if justly interpreted, enforces the simple humanity of Christ, cannot have been the fabrication of men who taught his divinity. It is not then a forgery of the Greek and Latin Fathers, all of whom believed in that doctrine.

2. The doctrine of the divinity of Jesus was introduced into the Christian Church early in the second century, and taught *with caution*, and that only to the *initiated*. This rendered it necessary to withdraw from the copies of the New Testament, in general use, the verse which asserts his mere humanity. The introduction of this anti-apostolic doctrine with its consequences, and the exclusion of the disputed text, constituted the *disciplina arcani* adopted in the second century and afterwards. To the existence of this *disciplina arcani*, Bengelius and other learned Trinitarians bear testimony: and the reserve with which the early fathers avowed and taught the Trinity is gathered from the confession of Chrysostom, Jerome and others, and is broadly stated by Casaubon. This *disciplina arcani* then proves two things; first, that the authors of it knew the verse to be genuine; secondly, that so far from having forged the verse, they knew that it was hostile to the system which they sought to establish.

3. The text became a subject of controversy in the second century between the Unitarians and the orthodox. Praxeas connumerated the Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit, and maintained them to be *one*, taking

these names as expressive of the same Being in three different relations. For this he was branded by his adversary Tertullian as a *Patripassian*. The text, therefore, of the three Heavenly Witnesses was not only known to those disputants, but the very foundation of the dispute between them.

4. In the early part of the fourth century the controversy about the import of the verse became more direct and general. The Bishop of Alexandria, before his clergy, connumerated the Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit, and asserted the unity of this Triad. This was the text of the three Heavenly Witnesses with the orthodox interpretation of the last clause. Constantine, on hearing of the dispute, calls it “a certain passage in our law;” censures the disputants for making it public; reminds them of the danger attending the publication, and intimates that the verse, rather than be discussed before the people, should be buried in oblivion. His efforts to extinguish the flames of controversy proving unsuccessful, he assembles the Council of Nice with the view of substituting a common creed in the room of the verse; and thus, by its exclusion, of securing the peace and unity of Christendom. The text of the three Heavenly Witnesses was, therefore, the sole cause of the famous Nicene Creed. Though only three hundred and twenty bishops subscribed it, there is reason to believe, that above two thousand had assembled on that occasion. They were divided into two parties, Orthodox and Arian: the former prevailed, having invented the term *homoousion* to express the unity intended in the last clause. The extermination of the apostolic text was thus determined by the majority: and Constantine, to effect his purpose of preventing any further contention, caused copies of the New Testament to be supplied, where they were wanted for the public use, doubtless without the verse.

5. The Arian party, however, were very powerful, and a few years after, assembling at Antioch, they formed a counter-creed in which they insisted on the unity asserted in the text, as meaning unity of *consent* or of testimony, thus making it clear as the light of day, that the controversy which then

divided the whole Christian world, entirely turned on the concluding member of the apostolic verse. Now, this is a fact which of itself places the genuineness of the verse beyond all reasonable contradiction: for every church in Christendom had its representative in these councils; and though all the bishops and their clergy disputed the sense of the verse, not one appears to have had the least doubt of its authenticity, or to have thought it possible that a time should come when it would be called in question. These divines had all the best Greek MSS. from the apostles down to their own days, a space not exceeding two hundred and fifty years; in the number of these must have existed the very *autograph* of John; and we are thus led to conclude, with full confidence, that not one of those manuscripts, nor that autograph, was without the text of the three Heavenly Witnesses.

6. The verse being now entirely excluded from general use by the ascendancy of the orthodox party, the providence of God brought about such a state of things as rendered it expedient, in the views of Jerome, to restore the text, about the middle of the fifth century. Accordingly, in his revised edition of the New Testament, he inserts it as the unquestioned and unquestionable production of John. In regard to its restoration, he says, in express terms, that the text was excluded from the common editions; and that he restored it on the authority of the Greek MSS., thus making it evident that, though the MSS. which succeeded the fifth century, and are still extant, do *not* contain it, all the MSS. known to Jerome, which *preceded* that period up to the apostles, *did* contain the verse.

7. After the revision of the Vulgate by Jerome, a remarkable consequence followed, which at once proves the genuineness of the short prologue prefixed to the seven canonical epistles, and the restoration of the text as asserted in it. The Greek and Latin Fathers before Jerome quoted the text but *partially*, leaving out the parts prejudicial to their views; but the writers who succeeded him cited it *fully* and *correctly*, though they failed not to attach to it certain artifices calculated to keep out of sight its true

signification. Among these are Cassiodorus, Eucherius, Fulgentius and Vigilius Thapsensis, together with the four hundred orthodox bishops who, at the command of Hunneric, assembled at Carthage, and produced the verse in exact conformity to the original, and without any comment of their own to disguise its meaning. Hunneric was a violent Arian, and surrounded with all the bishops of that persuasion; who were both ready and able to expose their adversaries, if any unfairness were practised on their part. This state of things rendered the forgery of the verse at that period morally impossible: and supposing the hostility and jealousy of the contending parties to be out of the question, it would be in the highest degree absurd to imagine, that four hundred men of different countries, nations and tongues, all pretending at least to love and honour the truth—all leaders and guardians of the churches under their care, and therefore men who had a high character to maintain, (not to say any thing of the impracticability of bringing persons in other respects so discordant to unite in a palpable fraud,) should concur in so gross an act of imposture, and thus hazard their reputation, where exposure was unavoidable. This quoting of the text, without reserve, after its restoration by Jerome, is a remarkable proof that he had so restored it. It had hitherto been cited under the covert of the *disciplina arcani*. In spite of all, Jerome dissolved that discipline; and the unreserved quotation of the verse was the immediate consequence.

8. The writers who, from the second century and afterwards, quote the verse in part or fully are very many, notwithstanding the confident assertion to the contrary. Those I have produced (and more might be produced) are Lucian, of Samosata, Theophilus, of Antioch, Tertullian, Phœbadius, Cyprian, Marcus Celestis, Fulgentius, Cassiodorus, Vigilius Thapsensis, Origen, Clement, of Alexandria, Athanasius, Cyril, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Diodorus, Eucherius, and lastly Augustine and the venerable Bede. The case of the two last is remarkable: both of them quote the text of the three Heavenly Witnesses, though the adversaries as-

sert it as an indisputable fact, that it was unknown to them.

9. If then the Greek manuscripts now extant are without the apostolic text, all those from the first to the fifth century contained it. This important conclusion is supported by the direct authority of Jerome, by the testimony of all the bishops and clergy, Orthodox and Arian, who immediately preceded him, and by that of the four hundred who assembled about the close of his life at Carthage.

10. The arguments which prove the authenticity of the verse fully account also for those which press against it apparently with irresistible weight. Its opponents say, that it was forged to prove the Trinity, and then argue that the silence of men in ancient times respecting a text so much to their purpose is a conclusive proof that it was unknown to them. To this the proper answer is, that the text proves the very reverse, namely, the simple humanity of Christ; and that all the ancient writers to a man understood its real import. And the various artifices which they have used to disguise the true sense of the text, furnish satisfactory evidence both to its genuineness and to the object which the Apostle had in writing it. If then the Greek and Latin Fathers did not produce the passage, it is because they had the strongest motive for not producing it, because they knew that if fully and fairly produced it would for ever destroy their system. Aware of this, they passed it over, for the most part, in silence, and even excluded it from the copies in public use: and the motive which accounts for its exclusion in the second century and afterwards, accounts for its omission in the MSS. and versions taken from these in succeeding ages.

I now conclude this discussion with the paragraph which closes my *Three Letters to the Quarterly Reviewer*. The providence of God, which watches over the interests of the gospel, is singularly displayed in the history and preservation of this verse. An artful scheme, suggested by Heathenism, was formed to undermine Christianity. Its prevalence called forth the writings of John: the controverted text, containing, as it does, the sum and substance of the gospel, presents a triangular figure corresponding in shape

to the base of the orthodox church. The accidental coincidence suggested the idea of converting it into a pillar to support the Trinity. The attempt was hazardous, for the Apostle erected the verse as a column to the simple humanity of Christ; and it was found by experience impossible at the time to conceal the true meaning of the verse without concealing the verse itself. Hence the founders of orthodoxy, though they would have been happy to quote the passage, if they could have quoted it without detection, were compelled, as opportunity offered, to erase it from their copies, to omit it in their versions and writings. In more favourable circumstances they felt themselves free to allude to it or to paraphrase it, but they were still forced to have recourse to the expedients of mutilating it, transposing it, and of tacking upon it their own interpretation. But lo! a consequence ensued which was never contemplated by the pious advocates of the Trinity. The ages of darkness drew to a close. The reign of ignorance and imposture, the usurpations of priestcraft, received successive shocks by the invention of printing, the revival of learning, and the reformation from Popery, and the very means which had been adopted to disguise the verse brought it under the suspicion of forgery. Learned men in England and on the Continent for two centuries eagerly engaged in the dispute, and were divided in their opinions. The arguments against it were more and more felt. The number of its advocates daily diminished till it was abandoned, except by a few, as a gross interpolation. The pantomime, which pious fraud had for a thousand years been acting on the Christian stage, at length reached its crisis. The mask dropped, and the verse, after a long incarceration, emerged with proofs of genuineness written in letters of gold upon its forehead. The catastrophe is sudden and surprising. The verse promised to establish the Trinity, but it is found to level it in the dust for ever. The perversion of its meaning caused its concealment, and its concealment brought on the suspicion of forgery; and it is cut off as a rotten member from the very church of which it is the main pillar and ornament. It is

again restored to its primitive sense; its primitive sense accounts for its treatment, while the violence it suffered for ages confirms in return the true signification: and thus a verse which was thought to justify the orthodox in placing beyond the pale of the church those who rejected the divinity of Christ, establishes the simple humanity of Christ as a fundamental article of that faith which Christ and his apostles delivered to the saints. The riddle of the sphinx is scarcely more enigmatical, and the Œdipus of Sophocles, so famed for the complication of its plot, more unexpected in its catastrophe. The Bishop of St. David's, Mr. Nolan, and other sons of Orthodoxy, who still defend the verse, gain their cause and are defeated. On the other hand, Mr. Fox, Dr. Carpenter, with others of the same school, who insist on its forgery, are defeated—and they triumph. The former, like the frogs of Æsop in demanding a king, claim the verse to crush Unitarianism. Their demand is heard, and they receive a hydra to devour their own system. The latter repudiate it as hostile to genuine Christianity: they fail in the attempt—and the failure restores the gospel to that purity for which they contend. In a word, the contending parties, after struggling each against their own views and interests, change places. The success of the one is followed by disappointment and even mortification; the defeat of the other ends in triumph. The most respectable characters in this comic-tragedy are Michaëlis, Marsh, Griesbach, Porson, J. P. Smith and others, who, though Trinitarians, still had the candour to reject the verse. To the command of the Roman Satirist, *Vos hinc, hinc vos, mutatis discedite partibus*, they may still answer, *Volumus*, and, though defeated, retire from the stage with honour and consistency. They, however, cannot but feel mortified that the part which they have acted obliges them in retreating to leave behind their fair name as a mantle to cover the shame of the triumphant party.

The Unitarian writers of the highest character and talents have distinguished themselves by their opposition to this text: I allude to Belsham, Carpenter, Kenrick and Fox:

and it is remarkable that they have preserved silence during the whole discussion of this question. With regard to the first, he is the Nestor of Unitarianism, and may well be excused from again descending to the arena of debate: but it is hardly fair in the rest, after having used their talents and learning in vilifying a verse which comprehends the very foundations of their faith, to let the sentence against them go, as it were, by default. Is this a policy for the mitigation of punishment, or is it a scornful pride that refuses to be convinced? If the verse be really rescued from the infamy with which they have contributed to load it, candour requires that they should come forward and acknowledge their error. With regard to Mr. Fox, the year is just revolved since, on a public occasion, he asserted that no one could maintain the genuineness of the text of the three Heavenly Witnesses, unless he were either ignorant or dishonest. With the evidence which on the surface appears against its authenticity, I do not accuse him of temerity or the want of candour. This gentleman is as remarkable for modesty and Christian simplicity of character as he is for his high talents. But he must be condemned; and my sentence upon him is, that he should deliver his recantation from his own pulpit—make the text of John the subject of a discourse—announce the day in the Repository that I and others may have the pleasure of hearing him, and if he does not make his chapel ring with his usual eloquence, I will pass upon him a severer sentence the very next time I shall have an opportunity to arraign him in the high court of biblical criticism.

BEN DAVID.

Fate of Matt. xxviii. 18—20, compared with 1 John v. 7, 8.

Patron of all the luckless brains,
That to the wrong side leaning!

COWPER.

I twirl my thumbs: fall back into my
chair:

Fix on the wainscot a distressful stare:
And when I think his blunders are all
out,

Reply discreetly, "To be sure; no
doubt." Id.

SIR,
PPROMPTED and animated by a recent unique discovery, (whether hazarded in jest or earnest it is not so easy to make up one's mind,) I have since, haply in like doubtful spirit, been trying my tyro head on a twin Anti-Trinitarian text, the Baptismal Commission : amazed, and who now can be otherwise than amazed, at the ne plus ultra of Katerfeltorism itself ! at the all but incredible, yet unanimously admitted, impunity which it has so singularly met with from the whole enemy's camp, while, along with its *maltreated* colleague on all fours, bidding defiance (and probably, too, somewhat earlier in the field) to the antagonists of Unitarianism. That neither is any portion of this document an interpolation, who can doubt that does not shut his eyes against internal evidence ? That, like its concurrent authority, it cuts at once the knot which ages have in vain been endeavouring to untie, who that is not head over ears in love with paradox can have the hardihood to dispute ? How then it comes to have slept in a whole skin, while its grande tutamen has been so cruelly mutilated and even sent to Coventry by pious fraud, is the simple question. And I cannot but flatter myself that the secret of their very different fortunes was only a day or two ago whispered in my waking or dreaming ear. Humbly then and anxiously dedicating my little second nest-egg of the nineteenth century to all the worshipers of the veritably learned, and all the admirers of the too probable, lo ! here I deposit it at your feet amid the becoming pomp of strut and music of cackling.

The Messiah* having been raised by God from the grave, and now† on the point of resuming that *inherent* omnipotence which he had for a season abdicated, communicates, *it seems*, the glad tidings to his surrounding disciples in the following extraordinary manner : " All power *is given* unto *me* in heaven and in earth. Go ye, THEREFORE, and teach all nations, baptizing them (in or into my name ? No, certainly, but) in the name of the

Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." He then as suddenly and significantly drops the other two names as he had introduced them, and confining his own attention and that of his auditory to himself alone, assures them that he will be with them to the end of the world. The relevancy of the consequent mandate to the reason here apparently assigned for it, will be duly appreciated by the merest novice in the art of reasoning : and the quite overwhelming attestation with which its novel and peculiar phraseology closes the long list of unvarying depositions to the characteristic dogma of Unitarianism is so unquestionably prominent and striking, that it were a mere waste of time and words to dilate upon it as our learned adept in the science of Eurêka has so well done, to the palpable and utter discomfiture of any (if any there can still be) who may be fantastical enough to differ with him in opinion. From this moment, the apostles must, then, have been, had they never been so before, advocates of the strictest and most inviolable unity of their Jehovah : and the only wonder is,* a wonder, indeed, shared by the patrons with the opponents of the dogma, that so decisive, and just then so unexpected, a confirmation of it, should not have imbued throughout, or here and there at least, their subsequent history and writings with *analogous* testimonies to its truth. With the single exception, verily, of the long hermetically sealed text of which the adventures have now been so entertainingly developed to the world, nil viget simile aut secundum to this curious Oasis of genuine Unitarianism from the very first chapter of Genesis to the very last of Revela-

* Our Tritheists, indeed, denominate the doctrine differently : but this is only in character. One of them observes, (and the remark in more discreet language is a very familiar one with theologians of this sect,) " The mystery of the ever-blessed Trinity would, perhaps, be instanced by many orthodox Christians as a doctrine less directly taught in the book of life, than its supreme importance and fundamental character would have led them to anticipate." Dissertation on Unauthorized Tradition, by C. Hawkins.

* The Scriptures passim.
 † Orthodox works passim.

tion. Whether these oracles of our faith thought that it stood out to more advantage alone and aloof, or whether (but it were to *little purpose* to guess at their *motives*)—so beyond all controversy it is that this wonderful mandate seems never afterwards to have made any more impression on the minds of the apostles, than if, like good Gyas and Cleanthus, it had merely swelled and closed the aggregate of that rank-and-file host of testimonies to the leading and fundamental dogma of the religion of Moses, which a less industrious investigator than Postellus might in less than half an hour extract from the sacred records of the Old Covenant. The quite astounding fact really throws conjecture into despair. But our present business happily is not with these inspired messengers of Christianity, but with the fallible delegates or usurpers of their office. Whether or not we can apologize for the apparent inadvertence of one and all of the apostles on the particular occasion, we feel perfectly satisfied that an unanswerable apology existed in its circumstances.

We bow at once to the implication from their silence, as we should have bowed to the conclusion to have been derived from their express or only indirect testimony. Not so with their successors. We deal with them as we should deal with any other men, review and sit in judgment on their conduct and opinions. In what manner, then, can we possibly account for their ostensible tenderness and all but extravagant predilection indeed for, and vaunt of, a passage in Scripture, *so satisfactorily demonstrated* to be in stark staring hostility to their professed creed? Whence this reverence for the theorem, this horror at the corollary? No sooner does this text come into the hands of these *apostolic* Christians forsooth, (this text, as we have seen, of so little moment in the eyes of the apostles, that they never once thought it worth their while to quote, or so much as incidentally to refer to it in support of their newly modified creed,) than THEY, uno ore, cry it up to the skies as the *μεγα θαυμα* of their mysterious theology, the *δος περ στω* of their *peculiar* faith, the lever with which they

were to bring to the ground all the pseudo-Christianity of their own and every succeeding age. They could not surely have thought that the succinct mention of baptism in the Acts of the Apostles so neutralized its evidence against them, as scarcely to leave it a leg to stand upon. So far from it, that they seem always to have been rather perplexed than pleased with the enigmatical brevity of the historian as contrasted with the luminous parrhesia of the Evangelist. Still less could they have been propitiated to its *alarming heterodoxy* by the not more satisfactory references to the rite in St. Paul's Epistles. What, then, can have made them so unanimously enamoured of its fatal evidence? Let the long-lost truth be *at length* told, (*adsit reverentia vero!*) they did not dare to grapple, at the same perilous moment, with two such decidedly Unitarian texts, but artfully compounded, by the preservation of the less explicit, for the sacrifice of the more galling. A little *αρχιμοια* and effrontery might dispose of the heresy of St. Matthew, but that of St. John was too trumpet-tongued to be tolerated. Accordingly, they most magnanimously *pressed the one into their own service!* and sent the other to the right-about. And the event has proved that they were not unwise in their generation. How well the stratagem succeeded, let the history of the church bear witness. There stands to the present day the paradoxical text, a monument of apostolic indifference, and of orthodox fondling: and so long as there it stands, so long, without pretending to the gift of prophecy, might any one venture to predict, in spite of all the *palpable gain-saying* of its *par nobile*, *now so happily brought to light, and perpetuated beyond the possibility of redemption*, will it mock at the sceptical efforts of heretical criticism, and draw, or rather constitute, a triumphant and ineffaceable line between primitive and posterior Christianity.

The jam satis est! But decipit exemplar, &c.

T. T. CLARKE.

May 23, 1826.

*Specimen of a Revised Edition of the English Scriptures.**A Royal Proclamation for David ; vulgarly called the " Second Psalm."*

WHY were the nations tumultuous ;
 Or why did people imagine vanity ?
 Chiefs of the land rose up,
 And princes conspired together ;
 Against Jehovah and against his Anointed :
 " Let us break asunder their bands,
 And cast off from us their heavy yokes."
 He that dwelleth in the heavens did laugh at them ;
 The Lord did have them in derision !
 Then spake he to them in his anger,
 And in his fury did he confound them :
 " Assuredly I have anointed my King,
 Upon Zion, the mountain of my holiness."
 I will declare the purpose of Jehovah.
 He hath said to me—" Be thou my Son,
 This day have I adopted thee !
 Ask of me, and I will give to thee
 The nations for thine inheritance,
 And the ends of the land for thy possession.
 Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron,
 Thou shalt shiver them like a potter's vessel !"
 Now, therefore, O chiefs, be ye wise,
 Be instructed, ye Judges of the land.
 Serve ye Jehovah with fear,
 And rejoice with reverence.
 Embrace ye the Son, lest he be angry,
 And ye should perish in the way ;
 For his wrath will be kindled in a little.
 Happy are all they who confide in Him.

Remarks.

This specimen of a revised translation is submitted to the kind consideration of those biblical critics who occasionally enrich the pages of the Repository with their communications.

According to Townsend, (Old Testament Chronologically Arranged, I. 656,) this fine metrical production ought to be placed at the end of I Chron. xvii. Needs it be observed that thus historically read, it is full of striking references to the preceding narrative ; but how different the meaning thus conveyed, from the hackneyed interpretations of various theologues !

Whether the term " Psalm" be correctly applied to such a composition, is apparently doubtful ; but what is the accurate biblical signification of this word, now so indiscriminately employed in our Bibles ? A philological disquisition on the Hebrew, Greek, Latin and English appellations of the " Psalms," would be highly interesting and useful : for where are the Lexicons which have given them their full consideration ?

MAOHTHE.

*Bloxham,**May 25, 1826.*

SIR,
 I AM sorry that our learned and worthy friend Mr. C. Wellbeloved has given his opponents so plausible a ground to oppose Unitarian principle, by the very free remarks which he has made on Gen. ii. and iii., which are affixed to his exposition of the book of Deuteronomy.

VOL. XXI.

2 U

It is, however, proper to observe, that he professes himself to be a believer in the inspiration of Moses and the prophets ; of Jesus Christ and his apostles ; and is ready to give up his thoughts on these two chapters, if they will not bear examination.

In this state of things I beg leave to make the following observations :

1. There certainly was in very an-

cient times a spot of the earth called Eden, near where the Sacred Scriptures lead us to understand that the Garden of Eden was situated. The name is met with several times in the Old Testament, and in other ancient works. See Wells's *Geog. of the Old Testament*, and Maundrell's *Trav.* pp. 119—142. As to certain little differences between the Scripture account of it, and the present state of that spot, they may, perhaps, be accounted for by the deluge, or later convulsions of nature, to which our earth is so subject.

2. We also learn from the Sacred Scriptures that the ancient Eden was planted with the most valuable trees that the world was blessed with; for it is said in Isa. li. 3, "Make her wilderness like Eden." Ezek. xxxvi. 35, "And they shall say, that this land that was desolate is become like the garden of Eden." And chap. xxviii. 13, "Thou hast been in Eden, the garden of God," &c. The inability of our first parents to provide sustenance for themselves, made it necessary that their first place of residence should have been such a place as Eden was; and, therefore, the infinitely wise and good God prepared it for them.

3. It also appears from other passages of Scripture, that were certainly written by inspired persons, that there was a tree of life in the ancient garden of Eden, the very name of which strongly suggests that there probably was also a tree there that had death somehow connected with it.

The Hebrew term Eden signifies pleasure or delight; and Paradise signifies a rich and beautiful garden, such as Eden was; they are, therefore, sometimes used in the Holy Scriptures as synonymous terms. See Rev. ii. 7: "Him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God." And in chap. xxiii. 2: "And in the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life." Chap. xxii. 14: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life." Now, when we consider that the ancient garden of Eden is called by the Seventy the paradise of Eden, Gen. ii. 8; and that Eden is called in the Hebrew, in Ezek. xxviii. 13, the

garden of God, (not to mention other places,) it appears sufficiently evident that the Apostle John had, when he wrote the above passages, in his eye the state of the ancient garden of Eden; i. e. that there was a tree called the tree of life in it. So that the history of the garden of Eden, as it stands in Gen. ii. and iii., agrees with other parts of the divinely-inspired writings.

4. We, moreover, learn from other passages of Scripture, that our first parents were tempted by the serpent to eat of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and that they complied with the temptation. The terms Devil and Serpent, are sometimes of the same signification. See Rev. xii. 9: "That great Dragon was cast out, that old Serpent called the Devil and Satan, who deceived the whole world." Again, Rev. xx. 2: "And he laid hold on the Dragon, that old Serpent, which is the Devil and Satan," &c. Verse 8: "And shall go out to deceive the nations." So our Lord says to the wicked Jews, "Ye are of your father the Devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own, for he is a liar and the father of it." John viii. 44. So the Apostle John says, 1 John iii. 8, "Who-soever committeth sin is of the Devil; for the Devil sinneth from the beginning." Here seems to be a plain reference to the conversation of the Serpent with Eve in the beginning of time. See Gen. iii. 1—8. And this is made still more evident by what is said in 2 Cor. xi. 3: "For I fear lest by any means, as the Serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty," &c. ver. 14. And in 1 Tim. ii. 14, "Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." Also Eccles. xxv. 24. Here again we find that the account of the fall, that we have in Gen. ii. and iii., perfectly agrees with what is said of it in other portions of the inspired writings.

5. We also learn from Scripture that death, that was threatened to Adam if he was disobedient, was executed upon him. See Rom. v. 12, 17, 19: "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin.—For if by one man's offence,

death reigned by one." 2 Cor. xv. 21, 22, "For since by man came death. For as in Adam all die."

6. So that the account given in Gen. ii. and iii. of the fall of man from his state of innocence, is abundantly confirmed by what is incidentally said in reference to it by several other most certainly inspired writers of Scripture. Therefore, whether the whole history as it stands in Gen. ii. and iii. be understood in the most literal sense of the words, or in part in an allegorical, yet the account as a whole is true, and contains very important matter; and any theological system that will not admit of a sober exposition of it, must necessarily be erroneous, and cannot possibly long maintain its ground.

7. There are also some less direct, but I hope solid proofs of the truth of what I am contending for. For instance, it is in a measure supported by the most ancient writings now existing in the Heathen world.

In the patriarchal ages there were but few subjects for the most intelligent persons to converse about. All things were then in their infancy. Therefore they would spend some of their leisure moments, as the Arabs and many others do now, i. e. in relating the few great events that had taken place in the world, and which their ancestors had made them acquainted with. In this way the history of the creation, of man's happy state in the garden of Eden, of his disobedience, &c., of the deluge, the building of the Tower of Babel, &c., would be handed down to posterity, until the art of writing was discovered, when they would record these facts in their manuscripts. Accordingly we find in the Hindoo, &c., MSS., some of which are of a very great age, or at least the original works which they are copies of,—I say, we find many things in them very similar to what is related in Gen. ii. and iii. and in later parts of that book. Sir William Jones, who was a very learned and good man and a Judge in India, believed that some of the writings of the Hindoos were of very great age *indeed*, and says in his preface to his translation of Menu's Laws, an ancient Indian Lawgiver, p. 10, "Dura Shucuh was persuaded, and not without sound reason, that the first Menu of

the Bramens could be no other person than the progenitor of mankind, to whom Jews, Christians and Muselmans unite in giving the name of Adam—but whoever he might have been he is highly honoured in the Veda itself," &c.

There are two sculptured human figures yet extant in one of the oldest pagodas of India which represent the two Hindoo deities Creeshna and Vishnu; one of them is trampling on the crushed head of a very long and large serpent, while a second enormous serpent is biting the heel of the other deity. Maurice's Hist. of Hindostan, Vol. II. p. 200; Taylor's Frag. to Cal. Dict. "One of the Hindoo fables, related by Father Bouchat, bears some resemblance to the Mosaic history of Paradise. The inferior gods who have ever since the creation been multiplying themselves almost to infinity, did not at first enjoy the privilege of immortality. After numberless endeavours to procure it, they had recourse to a *tree*, the leaf of which grew in Chonean or Paradise, and met with success, so that by eating from time to time the fruit of this tree they obtained this. At length the serpent, so called, perceived that the tree of life had been found out, and probably having been appointed to guard, was so exasperated at being overreached, that he poured out a great quantity of poison: the whole earth felt the dreadful effects of it, and not one mortal could have escaped, had not the god Chiven taken pity on the human race, revealed himself under the shape of a man and swallowed the poison.

"The evil being Ahirman, they farther say, got upon the earth in the form of a serpent, and seduced the first human pair from their allegiance to Ormusd, by persuading them that he himself was the author of all that existed. The man and the woman both believing him, became criminal, and their sin will perpetuate itself to the end." See Dr. Priestley's Comp. of the Hindoo Religion with the Mosaic, pp. 36—38.

"Yet we have authority too great to be doubted that the mild and fertile regions of the East formed the residence of man, when placed on earth by the Creator to begin his career of mortality; and by minute comparison

it has appeared, that a very considerable analogy exists between the *Paranas* or sacred writings of the Hindoos and that which forms the substance of the book of Genesis. See the *European in India, &c.*, by Charles Dooley, Esq., p. 66.

The account that Sir William Jones gives us from the Hindoo writings, of Noah and his three sons, under the names of Satyavarman, and his three sons Sharma, Charma, and Jyapeti, is so striking, that every intelligent reader must at once see that they both have the same origin. But this is not directly to my present purpose, and therefore I shall pass it by. These facts, taken from Hindoo literature, I hope make it more probable that what is said in Gen. ii. and iii. is founded in truth.

The truth of the history contained in Gen. ii. and iii. derives support from what is said of Abraham. Abraham lived about 400 years before Moses, i. e. when the world was about 2000 years old, and yet he is said by our Lord to have seen, or rather foreseen, his day, John viii. 56. Now in what way is it so probable that he acquired the knowledge of the Messiah, as by the written, or more probably by the traditionary, account of him that is contained in Gen. ii. and iii. Nothing, perhaps, that the Supreme Being said to Abraham seems so likely to have imparted to him the knowledge of a Deliverer or Saviour, as what is said in Gen. ii. and iii. The prophet Micah also says, "His goings forth were of old from everlasting;" that is, his coming was foretold from very early ages, perhaps from the earliest ages of the world, Micah v. 2. And the Apostle Paul says of eternal life, that mankind will have it in Christ Jesus "promised before the world began," Tit. i. 2. From the earliest ages or dispensations.

8. Finally, the character and condition of man, and God's dealing with him from that early period of time, perfectly correspond with what is said in Gen. ii. and iii. For, ever since that time man has been a sinful, suffering and dying creature. Nevertheless, his merciful Creator has not cast him off, but continued to admit him into his presence to be worshiped by him, has given him several new re-

ligious rites and ceremonies suited to his fallen state, and amongst them has appointed a sacrifice for sin, which intimates that though man was become a sinner, reconciliation with his offended Creator might be obtained. See Gen. iv. and Job i. and xlii. In a course of ages this, as was natural, became the religion of the whole world, as it is of the Heathen world to this day, though, alas! greatly corrupted, as is also the law of Moses and the glorious gospel of the blessed God: but this is only what Jesus Christ and his apostles foretold, and therefore is a confirmation of its truth. For though man cannot make religion, he can corrupt what God makes for him. This he hath shewn himself very expert in doing. Blessed be God, a purifying day is coming. See Rom. xi.

JOSEPH JEVONS.

Critical Synopsis of the Monthly Repository for May, 1825.

CONSTITUTION OF THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN ASSOCIATION. It would be quite superstitious and Anti-Unitarian, to suppose some mystic sympathy operating between the English and American professors of our faith. Otherwise, we could hail it as a happy omen, that, without the slightest concert, the self-same week was selected in both hemispheres for the consummation of two grand and paramount associations, the objects of which are generally identical. It was on the 25th of May, 1825, that the "American Unitarian Association" was constituted — an event, of which, I presume, the readers of the *Repository* have been already apprised. Without being given to superstition, however, we may regard this coincidence of time, both in a philosophical and religious view, as a symptom of the general and effective progress of our opinions, and an indication of the purposes of Providence, calculated at once to direct, strengthen and encourage us.

Since but comparatively few could have been present at the discussions that must undoubtedly have had place at the adoption of most of these constituent articles, would it not be well to publish something like a *rationale*, expository of the particular grounds

on which the most important regulations were formed? It would seem as if all constitutions needed some such accompaniment to recommend them with more speed and effect to the general body called upon to embrace them. *Parva componere magnis*, it is probably well known of what immense advantage the publication of "The Federalist" was in reconciling the American people to the reception of their national constitution. It was written by three eminent individuals, who had themselves attended and taken part in the debates of the Constituent Assembly, and it saved a world of discussion, misapprehension, explanation, delay and confusion among the people abroad, who were to decide upon the adoption or rejection of the instrument. An essay on the present subject in the Monthly Repository, by one qualified for the task, even if there be no necessity to conciliate the Unitarians of the kingdom to any of its provisions, would at least be of service in recommending the Association to their attention, and increasing its general resources. Indeed, I have been surprised at seeing the whole subject so little agitated in these pages, especially as there appear to be some differences of opinion about it in the body at large.

Mr. Hunter on Presbyterian Chapels. So little could I conceive of the injustice and presumption of those who wish to deprive Unitarians of their chapels, it was not without inculpating myself for some rashness, that I ventured in my last to offer such reflections as were suggested by Dr. Smith's attack. Not being acquainted with the newspaper controversy on the subject, and far removed from the scene of agitation, I was obliged to guess at the law and the facts, and still feared that there was something on Dr. Smith's side of the question so very obvious, that he forbore to press it, as matter of common fame in England. I am happy to find, however, that my imperfect views are here confirmed by a writer who knows the question well. Scarcely could I have imagined that Dr. S. had so little wariness, and so little right on his side.

On Dissenting Trusts. And here is a writer who indeed enters into the

true heart of the matter. Who would have thought that so much could be said in your defence? Let me add another consideration in answer to a position in Dr. Smith's last piece. He concludes it by protesting that he should feel worthy of condemnation, if he should ever himself administer, in such a manner as to promote his own doctrinal opinions, a trust left by Unitarians for Unitarian purposes. Now this is a very ill-grounded and morbid scruple. Because, one might venture to assure the Doctor, that how much soever Unitarians abhor what seems to them the mischievous tendency of Calvinistic principles, yet, with scarcely any exceptions, the whole denomination would be willing to consign their existing religious property to the future inculcation of whatever doctrines their descendants should gradually and conscientiously embrace. If, on a farther examination of manuscripts, a greater improvement and extension of biblical criticism, and a more deliberate exercise of the powers of reflection and mutual reasoning among Christians, the Unitarians of the twentieth century, should, in some strange, mysterious and unaccountable way, see cause to go back again to the dogmas of Calvinism or of the Westminster Assembly, in conscience' name, let them enjoy even those chapels for which such generous struggles and subscriptions are now everywhere making. Most living Unitarians, I think, will respond, Amen. If so, there is no force in Dr. Smith's *argumentum ad homines*.

Mr. Gibson, in Reply to Dr. Smith, writes in the fairest spirit of controversy.

Mr. Foster on the Writings of Job Scott. It is painful to witness a strong mind, unenlightened by the principles of legitimate criticism, struggling against the apparent meaning of the Jewish Scriptures, and endeavouring to render it conformable to occidental and modern habits of logical reflection. Mr. Foster could not suppose there was much to *instruct* us in the extracts here furnished, and embodying a kind of indefinite Sabellianism. As an article of curiosity, we have before had sufficient of the worthy Job Scott.

List of Norfolk Petitioning Clergy.

Can any one give us the philosophy of this difference between the sentiments of the York and the Norfolk clergy? Are the arts of humanization farther advanced as you go south? Is there any thing in the ecclesiastical history of the respective counties to explain the phenomenon? Is it the accidental influence of the higher dignitaries? Or what is the cause?

Mr. Gibson on the State of the Times, &c. Instructive and interesting.

Communication from Ram Doss. Doubtful whether it be our friend Ram Doss of the last year—seems like some sly English Unitarian of Calcutta. Yet it still may be Ram-mohun Roy, condescending to banter the bigotry which he finds prevailing in the victrix country.

On sending Dissenting Youths to the Universities. The state of things here animadverted upon ought to be repeatedly attacked and exposed, until either the Universities relaxed in their unrighteous requisitions, or more liberal institutions, with equal advantages, were elsewhere established.

Dr. Evans on the Employments of Heaven. These passages are confessedly executed with power and beauty; but they are defective in representing the bliss of heaven as too cloying. We should loathe a symposium of sweetmeats. Moreover, the images, materials, and combinations, here wrought up, although selected with a poet's power, are yet, I think, wanting in a certain strange, inspiring atmosphere of heaven, with which a more creative genius and imagination might have invested them. There is an earthiness about them, that leaves the soul unsatisfied, though cloyed. On these accounts, immediately after perusing Dr. Evans's extracts, I felt a refreshment and relief in the superior truth and soberness of his own subjoined reflections.

It is an opinion of President Holley, a fine genius of my own country, that the moral constitution of the future state will be analogous in all respects to what we witness here. He excludes not sin nor suffering from the highest circle of spirits around the throne. Discipline and retribution, he says, (as far as my memory of eight years' standing is correct,) will go hand in

hand through eternity;—they are the warp and woof which will constitute the web of our everlasting destinies. The idea is, that new retribution, whether of reward or punishment, will perpetually succeed past discipline, and will itself stand as new discipline to be rewarded or punished in its turn, according to the use that is made of it. A state of things so active, bustling, progressive and diversified as this supposes, is vastly more adapted to the active tendencies of the immortal mind, than the listless, gazing, voluptuous ennui of aristocratical parties of pleasure, visiting each other about upon elegant floating islands. These last conceptions were probably suggested to Dr. Evans's author, notwithstanding he denies rank or riches to heaven, by certain fine companies and analogous scenes in England. If we will indulge our impracticable imaginations upon this theme, let us rather think of *Hades* as containing a large middle class. All allow that there is more virtue and happiness in that sphere. The deviser, also, must beware of pictures of too insipid perfection and felicity. A paper in the Rambler has shewn how such scenes are in danger even from a flock of squirrels. How many of our most exquisite enjoyments, too, would be certainly sacrificed on such an hypothesis! Where there is no suffering, what becomes of the pleasure of administering consolation on the one hand, and of receiving it and cherishing gratitude on the other? &c. &c. Are not the angels themselves represented in Scripture as being tormented with curiosity? Take the richest happiness of which you can conceive in this world, and *pathos* is more or less intimately connected with it, or is rather one of its essential materials. Deprive us not of it above, nor think to supply its place with cold brilliancies and perfect harmonies.

Mr. Clarke on the name Unitarian. Notwithstanding Mr. Clarke gives us some of the longest and most unintelligible periods that I have met with in the Repository, yet I vehemently sympathize with him as to the rightful claim he lays to this honourable name.

Hymn of Mrs. Barbauld. If the principle of altering hymns when in-

roduced into new compilations be ever justifiable or allowable at all, perhaps "unwarrantable" is too harsh a term to be applied to the case in question.

Remarks on Ordination. To shew how impossible it is to reduce every thing to that abstract and drab-coloured Quakerism which this writer would recommend, let us observe that he begins this very essay with a kind of flourish and preamble, not unlike the useful and impressive ceremony of ordination at the commencement of one's ministerial career. The truth is, human nature dislikes what is abrupt and meagre. There is as much reprehensible extravagance in receding to the opposite point of an abuse, as there is in the abuse itself. The nearest approach to true perfection lies in a medium path. I know not why a little imagination, ceremony, decoration, may not be innocently blended with the simplicity of Unitarian rituals. God, in the works of nature, is as lavish of beauty as he is provident of utility. Let an ordination-service precede one's entrance upon the ministry on the same principle that a flower announces the coming fruit. I believe it must be simply the *word* Ordination that troubles your scrupulous correspondents. They are the victims of a name. Surely they cannot object to a religious and impressive observance of the occasion. The mere fact of even twenty or fifty ministers assembling to preach and pray in behalf of a young man, can give offence to no reasonable person. If the use, then, of the *word* be the only thing exceptionable, and if the persons employed in the ceremony professedly disclaim all assumption to spiritual authority, it appears to me, that those, who have shewn so much uneasiness about the services at Bolton, are striking instances, how opposition to prejudice may itself degenerate into prejudice, and a hatred of bigotry become a very bigoted thing.

There is something unfair in this correspondent's argument, 5th paragraph, where he represents ministers *alone* as being collected to offer prayers in behalf of a young preacher. To say nothing of the custom in New England, where the congregation belonging to each of the officiating or attending pastors, is invited to send

as many representative delegates as it chooses, which they sometimes do to the amount of four or five, is not the congregation of the pastor-elect, at least, supposed to join in the service, and to be as much interested in it, as any party on the spot? Would not the objection, moreover, go to the exclusion of ministers from all public services whatever?

Mr. Johns's Reply to Mr. Baker. It is a pity that Unitarians have not more of the forms and restrictions of organization to which Mr. J. alludes in the beginning of his article. Certificates, in particular, of the qualifications of candidates, will sooner or later be found to be indispensably requisite.

With reference to the practice of ordinations, Mr. Johns asks, "Who will assure us that in its progress, it will not unfurl the ensign of ghostly power and authority?" This appears to me the objection of a morbid imagination. Mr. J. would be unwilling to have such a jealous clamour effectually raised in his neighbourhood against his own school. But "who will assure us," that that seminary, good as are the present *intentions* of its principal, will not degenerate into a sink of immorality?

Does Mr. J. encourage any congregation with which he is connected, to sing in *rhyme*? Why, that is unscriptural. It is, to borrow his own civil expression, "a silly practice." Why do we dress better than savages? Why do we shake hands on meeting after long absence? Why is the Repository printed in a clear and beautiful type? Why is a silver bason used at baptism? Why is the humblest architectural ornament applied to our chapels? Why are quarterly and yearly meetings held? There is something beyond your austere *cui bono* in all these things—some tendency to extravagance—some occasion to ask, Who can tell whither these customs are likely to lead us? A man must not take the luxury of an afternoon's walk, if he is to be impeded by the anxious inquiry of a timorous wife, Who can tell to what precipice you may be led? Must we not entrust something to people's good sense, self-controul, and particularly, in the case before us, to the *anti-superstitious* spirit of the age? I may seek

another opportunity ere long to demonstrate, that in many places, a dread of clerical influence and authority is going to an injurious extreme—that you must either abolish the order at once, or allow it to exert a mighty influence on society—that a clergyman has as much right to exert such an influence by his fair character and assiduous attention to duty, as any other class of men—and that, in the existing state of knowledge and independent inquiry, so far from the clergy being ever like to obtain any thing resembling the spiritual domination of the dark ages, the danger and the probability lie all on the other side. Of course, I allude not to a merely politico-clerical order.

I am unable to perceive how “the passages quoted by Mr. Baker can scarcely be said to have any reference to the subject.”

With respect to *advice*, Mr. J. says, “there is enough on record.” But will not advice be more effective, if given in a public, solemn, *vivâ voce* manner, before the congregation? “Enough on record”? Why then will Mr. J. ever write or preach another sermon? The nature of mankind, is, not to sit at home in the calm of philosophical abstraction, or to be for ever poring over old-fashioned printed books, but sometimes to go abroad, and look at each other, and talk, and originate, and dramatise a little on this proscenium of existence. Let your severe correspondents, Mr. Editor, come out of their studies for a time, and gaze on the sun-shiny side of Dinner-speeches, Bible-Society speeches, Ordination Services, and the like, (against which, in some points of view, it may be perhaps in their power to laugh or to be querulous,) and they will assuredly go home better pleased than to be always dreaming over gloomy possibilities. Let us labour with all our might to remove 1, existing, 2, impending, and 3, and *lastly*, only conceivable and distant evils.

New University in the Metropolis. An institution of this kind, when once established, although prejudice and interest might succeed for a time in depriving it of parliamentary countenance, would be almost sure at length of commanding every aid which the legislature could give it.

Peculiarities of Philo, &c. A few references would have caused this article to appear less like a prize essay written in support merely of an ingenious hypothesis.

Baxter MSS. Mr. Biddle’s “Great Congregations” is a fact worth all the rest.

Do they apply such phrases now-a-days to Unitarianism as “venting blasphemy”? Or are we no more civilly dealt with than were our distant predecessors?

REVIEW. *Spry’s Sermons.* It is most lamentable to think that for the next three or four hundred years, and perhaps much longer, the minds of Christians are to be distracted and harassed about the true meaning of a few Jewish phrases. Vast and bitter must be the struggles, before all the students of the Bible will coincide in their explications of these very difficult terms. I can conceive of no summary mode of settling the controversy, and one becomes absolutely sick at heart with the thought of the anger, jealousy, hatred and suffering, that must be developed in the continued prosecution of a few etymological questions.

In the margin of the first page of this article, the 43rd verse would have been appropriately added to the 42nd of the xxviii chapter of Matthew.

It might have been well to illustrate by references the position that *all things* mean all mankind, both Jews and Heathens.

At the bottom of p. 297, Trinitarian seems an erratum for Unitarian. How far may the honours and promotions of Dr. Spry be traced to his two orthodox sermons?

Bruce’s Sermons. The view given of the intercession of Christ, in the beginning of this article, would probably cause offence and pain to the believers in the common doctrine. Nor ought we to wonder at it. It is like being forced to take an awful leap into vacuity, thus to see the *personal* intercession of Christ, on which one has hung so many dear and firm-felt hopes, changed at once into a vague abstraction. I allow that this is no argument against the Reviewer’s doctrine. It may still be perfectly true, although it is dreaded more than a venomous serpent by the most pious Calvinists existing.

The Roman Catholic undoubtedly feels shocked beyond measure and distressed, when his reason begins to convince him of the inefficacy of absolutions, extreme unctions, and the other palpable supports against which he has so long leaned for happiness. But that is no argument for their efficacy. I only mean to suggest, that when we thus pursue our speculations into what seems to us to be truth, we ought to be prepared for a good deal of abhorrence and hatred from those whose souls are still lashed to the machinery from which we have extricated ourselves—in fact, that we ought not to complain perhaps quite so much as we do.

Captain Thrush's Letter. When other denominations value themselves on the useful institutions which they have established and promoted in the present age, let it not be forgotten that Peace-Societies derived their original support in America and England, almost exclusively from the sect of Unitarians.

Poetry. The author of so classical an effusion as the Lines on General Riego, ought not to say, he *believes* it was C. Cassius, who was called the last of the Romans. Has he at least no confidence in Lempriere?

The passage from Milton's prose is perhaps full lyrical enough for versification, and is not injured by the present attempt.

Obituary. Although I lately pleaded in favour of detailed obituary notices, yet it is hard to approve of such physical and diagnostic descriptions of disease, as that introduced into one of these articles. Still, how far this description may inform and gratify a numerous circle of partial friends, I pretend not to determine.

Intelligence. A highly interesting article of Intelligence for the Repository, would be, an annual, or perhaps triennial list of Unitarian Congregations, Ministers, and average number of Worshipers. By means of the Editor's extensive correspondence, and other collateral advantages, such a document could undoubtedly be furnished without much trouble, and to a good degree of accuracy. We could then compare from time to time the progress of our opinions. The Repository would be an eligible channel for this species of information, inas-

much as a large number of societies will probably be unconnected with the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, or any other organized general avenue of communication.

Mr. Emlyn to Mr. Manning.

DEAR SIR,

June 8th.

I HAVE yours. I grant you that Creator and God Most High are the same, and I think it so as to the new creation too: none but he bears the character of Creator there, 1 Pet. iv. 19, as many understand that text; none but *he* has the character of *him that raises the dead*, 2 Cor. i. 9, Rom. viii. 11. The glory of the principal is peculiar and most conspicuous to all, while that of the instrument is not so certain nor evident. If I could find it usual for men or prophets, &c., to be said to come down from heaven, I might suppose Christ to come down the same way, i. e. metaphorically, but I think 'tis said of no man else. As to Luke x. 30, the coming down is from the city Jerusalem, as the supreme seat in the land; and James i. 17, implies the agency of God as dwelling in heaven, according to the common representation in Scripture; but yet there is no opposition to a proper local ascent. The going in and out of the mouth are of the same sort in the parable, but not in the moral of it. I think the whole of what you urge, at least the chief thing, is the harshness of the Synecdoche, that the Son of Man shou'd be said to descend who was not such, till after the descent; and yet it seems not to me to carry any such violence in it, while the subject that had descended was really the *Son of Man* at this time, as *born of a woman*, and perhaps as much her son as any man is the son of his mother. Methinks 'tis not much more than to say *King William* was born in *Holland*, tho' he was no King then. As to Acts ii. 34, you must not urge that, for as the context plainly limits the discourse to the resurrection of the body, so by that arguing it would follow that *Abram* or *David* *do not live to God*, that Paul was not caught into paradise, (if out of the body as he supposes,) is not with Jesus Christ, &c., because only the Spirit is there, which will be too much. I need not,

after all, assert this as necessary, tho' it may seem more probable, and I think that upon the supposition I can argue with advantage against those of the Trinitarians who are for the proper sence, and will thence prove the præexistence, for it can never prove such a præexistent to be the true God. I intend to consult Mr. Woolner, whom I have formerly read. As to the caution against undervaluing Christ's humiliation as they do who ridicule it on supposition that he be not the great God, I grant it ought to be guarded against, but the Vindicator of the B—— dos not suppose his *humiliation* or abasement to be small, without præcedent glory quitted, for still his sufferings and positive miserys were not the less; only since laying by actual glory is somewhat more than only enduring pain and shame, in the want of what there was only an expectation of, or some title to, (tho' not till he had finished his work,) it is most certain that if this præcedent glory be made out, it gives a much more sensible idea of our Lord's exinanition; and if such texts as John xvii. 5, 2 Cor. viii. 9, do import a quitting what he once actually possessed, 'tis as clear, that without this part we have not a full view of his abasement; so that there will need caution on both sides, which may be better than great peremptoryness. (Here Mr. Manning has interlined, But 'tis not pain, &c. only, but his present glory veiled that I insist on.) I thank God I am in part recovered, and was abroad on the Lord's-day last.

On the other hand, Mr. N.* sollicitates me earnestly to return to the Church, as perswaded that three modes is her true sence of the Trinity; and an inhabitation of the Deity is her meaning in the incarnation and personal union, and that to gainsay it is captiously to seek occasions of contention, rather than to remove 'em, no better than *vitiilation*; this is all

* This must have been Mr. John Norris, a learned Platonic philosopher and mystic divine, author of an "Essay towards the Theory of the Ideal or Intelligible World," intended to support the system of Malebranche against the principles maintained in the Essay on the Human Understanding.

the encouragement on that side! I hope what I do shall be with a sincere aim to serve the true honour of God and Jesus Christ his Son, and if I mistake in the means, that he will in his great mercy pardon it, and teach me better.

I am,

Sincerely yours.

For
Mr. William Manning,
at Peasenhall in Suffolk.

(Immediately under the letter Mr. Manning has written as follows):

I can't make sence of Mr. Baxter on J. vi. 38. What means he in avoiding a local removal to construe the coming down of Christ there by an energy on the *manhood*? Why, did Christ descend from heaven so in a peculiar operation on the Man Christ Jesus? Or if, as he saith, chap. xvi. 28, it respects his miraculous conception or production (soul and body he means), who will deny the rest of the conjunctive operation (not of Christ, but) of God with him? But on Heb. i., that the Divine Nature is the whole hypostasis, but not personal, *cujus contrarium verum est*. I shall write no more on this subject, finding it wastful of my short time and unprofitable to me.

(Emlyn's letter does not quite fill the two first pages of the paper, the rest of which is filled with Mr. Manning's notes, beginning with a reference to 1 Pet. iv. 19). For what concerns the old creation, (viz. of all things out of nothing,) and style thereof given to God, I think that we can say little more that may tend to any useful purpose. We agree it, that all things are of God, 1 Cor. xi. 12, Heb. ii. 10; even whatever is builded now by any man, chap. iii. 4, and that God may take the character thereof to himself as the principal cause, or the origin and conserver of all second causes. But in this we differ: you think that nothing of being out of God, nothing made or done, that is or ever was visible, but was or must be mediately effected by a created second cause, thro' its native communicated power, consequently that it could be no dictate of the light of nature, but uncertain and false reasoning (since confuted in the Gospel), to discern of the eternal Godhead and power, concluding it to belong to the

immediate Author and Architect of all things made, and, least of all, such as are to be seen of men. It could not be clearly understood thence or known by them, neither by any effect ad extra, nor the style of Creator in Scripture, nor instance of fact, (such as Gen. ii. 3, &c.,) no more than from his appropriating to himself the style of quickening the dead, or every thing effected by men, &c. I contrarily can't but think otherwise, and that Christ meant it (Mark xiii. 19) himself, and so it must rest with us. I take that instance, 2 Cor. iv. 14, to be immediate: and what think you of Heb. iii. 4?

For that, Acts ii. 34, I being then aware of what you object, meant not to draw from it more than 'tis not true in proper speech, the contrary being as true in figurative speech *secundum quid*, but neither true of the whole person, neither fit to be predicated commonly of it by the name of the contrary nature, as when men say that God was killed. But what I would insist on with them and you, is what I said, that no instance can be given in Scripture, or in nature, to warrant the attribution to a person by the name of such a species of being, any act or doing that was acted or done, while he confessed he then was none of that nature of being. (It would not hold true, supposing the transmigration of souls continuing the species of being, to be denominated of the next man by name.) But to you I observe, that neither the Arian, who, after Justin first made use of that trite (so they call it) distinction or salvo by a communication of properties, would offer at it, till first they undertook to prove otherways the preexistence of the one nature distinct with its previous acts and doings; and then, again, to prove by itself that person's incarnation and assumption of the other nature into an hypostasis conjunctive. Nor yet the Trinitarian would do it; but both essay it from John i. 14, &c., as being aware that no text that you rely upon will amount to any proof at all, till the former be made good; 'tis not enough to say the sence of such texts can't be adjusted without the concession (if that would do it). If any one can prove the preexistence of the one, two or three natures, and the after as-

sumption of another to constitute one being with all or either of them, of that person I will not stick to predicate the properties of either nature of it in concrete, or the achievements of it to him by that name, whatever was acted or effected in it, tho' since dead. And further I have no instance that can be shown for it.

Then as to what you allege of no prophet being said to come down from heaven, it may be so; only to come or be sent from God as a word is, Isa. ix. 8, an Hebraism, then, and ours translate another word so, 1 Pet. i. 12; and I own it to agree to the signification of the word properly. But yet I might take it possibly but for an Hebrew idiotism. I left it to you to examine, tho' I take it that when 'tis used, John iv. 47, 49, 51; Acts xvi. 8, xxiii. 16, &c., it might not import more than simply to go or come. However to the point. I reckon that those words of Christ, John viii. 14, 42, and xiii. 3, import the very same with what those texts speak that you insist upon, and are rendered by a word used for a local descent. But the other text, chap. xvi., that you argue the most from, ver. 28 is but exegetical to ver. 27, with his resolve added to their former doubt, ver. 17; the question is of the antithesis, touching his coming forth and going; that the latter means a local ascent none doubt; but that the former was intended by him of his preexistence and consequent local descent, I can hardly believe that. I find the Trinitarians themselves at a stand about it, as about the ascent, John iii. 13, that it could not be meant local. They grant that those to whom he spake understand Christ speaking of his coming forth from God, not at all of his preexistence and local descent; and I think with them, else they would have noticed it in their reply, ver. 30. But now Christ twice recognizes, ver. 17, and chap. xvii. 8, that they did surely know and believe what he had so often said to them, that he came out (or down) from God, (or heaven,) as sent from thence. Nor is his origination from God, Luke i. 34, that I know of any where witnessed unto by him unless within those expressions, as John vi. 42, 51. It was a common question, too, Whence is he? Whoever shall compare the Evangelists in their

wording the sayings of Christ in forty instances, in his teaching and answers on his trial, will not lay the stress of an article of faith introduced on the etymon of a Greek word, when the same thing, too, by the same writer, is reported in diverse words, and that not of all one common signification.

I am not positive in all this nor for the Socinian notion of these texts, tho' if I were certain of a local descent meant, I should agree with them. From Christ's 12th year to his 30th, we have no account of his doings or what he might meet with.

When you say that he was the Son of Man then when he spake these words, and perhaps as much as any man is the son of his mother, tho' it reaches not any objection still, yet if so (as I take it for true), then he pre-existed not, or else all souls do, touching which I am not so certain as some other matters, tho' I take the contrary to be the most likely. I can't but think how John's Gospel alone in several hands is urged *pro* and *con*, and why Christ should 40 times so signalize himself by the title of Son of Man.

Then for the exinanition of Christ you speak well, and I would be wary on the other hand. I am drowned in the search into and comprehension of what is certainly revealed of it, and of his glory following, 1 Pet. i. 11; neither would I overlook his glory here below, (tho' poor in the world as the glory of others, James ii. 5, 2 Cor. vi. 10, 2 Peter i. 17, Heb. i. 3, &c.,) while voluntarily veiled by him, John viii. 50; not quite, Luke xiii. 17. But if what you infer more from a single dubious text be certain, I should give instance of his loss in that, that on your supposition is only plainly revealed thereof, *viz.* his suffocation in the womb and loss of his reason so long, and so gradual recovery to the use of it, and growth in wisdom, &c. I content myself to hold fast Matt. xvi. 16, but of what we may still differ in I shall write no more.

For what Mr. N. solicits men to, 'tis a sham and all he has said to it.*

* I suppose the work here referred to must be Mr. Norris's Account of Reason and Faith in relation to the Mysteries of Christianity.
H. R. B.

The Dean counts of it as of the disinterested tract, that 'tis a *Socinian* pamphlet he calls it, but perfidiously done by some to gain on others, to give credit to them in their prevarication to save their titles and emoluments. The real Trinitarians of the Dean's followers (almost all England) hoot at it as perfect nonsense. I doubt that Mr. N. can't persuade you that the Trinity, Matt. xxviii. 19, the same with 2 Cor. xiii. 14, &c., are *modes* of God only. When many men's eyes began to be opened, those (as the schools before) put a blind upon them to solve the matter and hold their places void of danger, in subscribing to what they must do, and thinking otherwise than the terms ever meant. One thing is, there is not one of an hundred thousand with us know any thing of what they say, nor themselves very well if at all. Theirs is the last support to the real Trinitarian cause, by courting men to the Church prayers and offices to weaken the Unitarians, that no fears be left to them nor place to strengthen them. Now the writers have done with it, and the common doctrine goes for currant.

I might, were it not too long, tell you something of what some time ago caused me some diversion against my inclination. Mr. — has an additional character after his funeral sermon for Mr. Jns. wherein as he had before made the belief with him of the Trinity to be the first test of entering into our Lord's joy, (Parkhurst printed it,) he gives that as a part of his encomium, that his deep hatred of Socinianism was such that the infection of some of his parish hastened his end through tenderness for their souls. I believe it to be so false an information that it moved me to write to him to unfound it. Tho' Mr. J.'s own sermons on the decease of some few of them, and praise of them therein, without any reflexion, was too open a confutation. But withall contriving a way that he could not easily avoid the reading when he saw whence it came. I took occasion not only to vindicate their opinions and to answer to his weak arguings against them, but, tho' with tenderness otherwise, sharply to reflect upon what he had printed, wherein he crys up the Littany and lyturgie forms as

a most happy barrier to stop the inundation of Socinianism. (Stirring up all his brethren to contest for that faith and to rivet it into the understanding of the people on all occasions,) as in service for them, whose opinions (making nothing of Scripture but of Reason) border upon Deism and tend unto Atheism.

— Pool on John xvii. 8, saith, that the belief there was not of the Eternity or Godhead of Christ meant, but of his being the Messiah only, and that ch. xx. 28, is the first time that in the Gospel the name God is given to Christ. Rom. i. 4, and the evangelists use not the same words in other their reports.

[This letter has no other date than June 8th. It could not have been written during his confinement, since he speaks of going abroad on the Lord's-day. I suppose it was written after his release, during his residence in London in 1706. I do not well understand the post-mark of that day, but the charge appears to have been two-pence, and that of each of the other letters 8d. The direction is also different, being without the pr. London. H. R. B.]

On the Passages ascribed to Matthew and Luke; Matt. i. 18 to ii. 23, and Luke i. 5 to ii. 52.

LETTER II.

SIR,

THE inconsistency of the above passages with the ensuing narratives, is no less a proof that they were not written by the same authors, than that the particulars they relate did not actually transpire. Matthew as an Apostle must have written for the purpose of recording his testimony; but that testimony, as has been shewn with regard to the apostles in general, commenced from the preaching of John the Baptist, nor is there any reason to imagine that the testimony of this Evangelist, as founded on his personal observation, could have an earlier commencement than that of the other apostles. Previous to the call he received from Jesus to become his follower, he was engaged in an employment little congenial with that to which he now became destined; an employment which probably engrossed most of his attention,

and afforded him few opportunities of acquainting himself with the history of Jesus. If it be admitted that Matthew actually began his narrative from the period assigned by the early Hebrew Christians both to that and to the miraculous part of our Lord's life, his undertaking will entirely accord with his office and qualifications as an Apostle; it being evident that he would not have been called by Jesus to so distinguished an office, nor have yielded that ready obedience to the call—changing an employment by which lucre might be obtained, but perhaps not without the sacrifice of patriotism and virtue, for pursuits of an opposite description—if some important revolution had not been newly effected in his mind by a knowledge of the *recent* facts of our Lord's ministry and that of his precursor. Now when an apostle expressly chosen for the purpose of witnessing the ministry, death, and resurrection of Jesus, and of afterwards devoting his life to the publication of the facts and discourses which he had personally witnessed, commits that testimony to writing, he acts strictly in character, and faithfully discharges the trust reposed in him. Such a history is just what might be reasonably expected from such a person under particular circumstances. But that the person so qualified and so commissioned in consequence of his qualifications, should relate a variety of extraordinary facts and conversations of which he had no personal knowledge whatever, in such close connexion with those which appertained to his testimony as to leave the reader every reason to conclude that he meant the whole to be regarded in the very same light, and intended the particulars which he had not witnessed to be as confidently received on his authority as those of which he was the divinely-appointed witness, appears the reverse of what might reasonably be expected. What vastly increases the improbability of this conclusion is, that the particulars which he is represented as thus, without apology or intimation of any such design, mixing up with his personal testimony are so inconsistent with it, so unknown and estranged from those who should have been acquainted with and enlightened by them, that it seems quite impossible they could ever have

transpired. If there really were no such occurrences, it is impossible that a person so circumstanced as Matthew could have imagined that there were, much less have received and recorded them with the same confidence and in the same manner as if they formed a necessary part of the particulars to which he was specially appointed to bear his personal testimony.

But it will be said, "If the account of the birth and early life of Christ, recorded in the Gospel of Matthew, and contained in every manuscript and version of it now extant, and which is also confirmed by the testimony of the orthodox fathers, was not written by Matthew, how could it have been so generally received under the sanction of his authority?" The answer is, that this passage must have been one of those forgeries in the name of the apostles which are known to have been committed toward the end of the first, and the earlier part of the second centuries. How many false Christs were there in the very age of the apostles? So also were there "false apostles," false pretenders to miracles, acting in their name, and to the writing of epistles as "from them." "Jewish fables" were attempted to be imposed upon the first Gentile Christians, no doubt as realities. These fables would eagerly seek shelter under apostolic authority, and being addressed to recent Gentile converts, who, having little knowledge of Jewish affairs, excepting those miraculous facts relative to Jesus which had been made known and proved to them by the Apostle Paul, might yield an easy credence to other miraculous particulars, especially when they appeared honourable to their adopted Lord, and calculated to wipe off the ignominy which they could not help attaching to his low birth, and withal a little congenial to their remaining Gentile prejudices. The temptation to avail themselves of apostolic authority for the promotion of their favourite systems, would operate powerfully on the minds of the ambitious, and when these pretences, as in this case, fell in with the predilections of those for whom they were intended, they might soon find access into *some* of the copies of *some* of the Evangelists; not perhaps, in the first instance,

as certainly written by them, but rather as interesting particulars collected from other sources, and forming a suitable introduction to their narratives. As the three first evangelical records were written in countries remote from each other, and each of them was intended as a sufficient gospel history, a considerable time elapsed before they could all of them become generally known in the churches, and probably a much longer time before copies of them all were collected together and read in all the churches. The respective records would continue to be read in the particular churches or districts for whose use they were originally written, in a great degree, to the exclusion of any of the others which were less known to them. This appears to have been the case as it respects the Hebrew Christians and the adherents of Cerdon and Marcion; the former adhering to the sole use of Matthew's, and the latter of Luke's Gospel. In the mean time other copies of these Gospels might easily be tampered with in churches who, being more in the use of the other Gospels, were comparatively little acquainted with them, and therefore the less solicitous about preserving them in their purity. It is not, however, easy to conceive that those for whose use the respective Gospels were originally written, or who were in the habit of having them constantly read in their assemblies as the records on which *they* rested their confidence, would suffer such considerable additions to be made to them, without the best authority; and, accordingly, we find that neither of those sects who adhered to the sole use of the respective Gospels of Matthew and Luke, would admit of the passages which treat of matters anterior to the preaching of John the Baptist. This fact is, I apprehend, of much greater weight *against* the genuineness of those passages, than that in their favour arising from their *subsequent* introduction into all the copies. It should appear that so long as there subsisted a distinct sect of Hebrew Christians, they adhered, many of them at least, to the use of Matthew's Gospel without the two first chapters, and that it was in consequence of the dropping of the Hebrew original, into which these chapters were never admitted, that

they became so universally palmed upon the Evangelist. We learn, on the authority of Jerom, that this representation of the record of Matthew, was not only that which was in use by the Nazarenes and Ebionites in his time, but was "by most called the authentic Gospel of Matthew." It appears then that such was the force of the evidence in favour of this, as the genuine representation of the original writing, that all the prejudices which in the fourth century had attached to the two first chapters, could not in the minds of most Christians resist the conviction that they were *not* authentic.

But it has been maintained by Dr. Carpenter, that as the internal characteristics of the passage in Luke's Gospel have much stronger recommendations than those of that ascribed to Matthew, so the external evidences against it are very inconsiderable. Whatever force may justly attach to his observations upon these heads, I cannot help thinking that the matters of fact recited in it are still more glaringly inconsistent with the ensuing history than those in Matthew. Their grand object appears to have been to introduce the Messiah in a glorious manner into the world; to make him known to the Jewish people, and to excite a lively interest and spirit of acquiescence and co-operation in the blessings of his government. Consistency would require that intelligence of so august and animating a description, should not only have been retained, but have given rise to measures for establishing the young prince on that exalted throne to which he was so manifestly destined; and a writer who aimed to preserve consistency in the thread of his narration, would have found the people directing their eager attention on the individual who had been so indubitably marked out as their deliverer and sovereign ruler. Instead of this, the whole splendid display of the Saviour's glories appear to have been no sooner unfolded, than they vanish into air; and the very next chapter commences evidently upon the principle, that no measures whatever had been adopted to make known the Messiah, and that, though in consequence of the predictions of the ancient prophets, the people were in

earnest expectation of his appearance, no person had hitherto been introduced or announced to them under that character. As miraculous facts so destitute of results as those related in the passage under consideration, could never have transpired, so it is inconceivable that any writer who had a complete command of the whole of his materials, would, after so brilliant an introduction, have suffered it to vanish like a baseless fabric, and in the very next chapter have produced a new and entirely different account of the introduction of his hero to the knowledge and attention of mankind. Regarded as a *Jewish Christian* fable, intended to remove the ignominy attached to the low birth of Christ, and to raise both him and his people in the estimation of the Gentile converts, it is sufficiently intelligible: but viewed as the actual production of the Evangelist, who in the next chapter introduces the Baptist announcing the subsequent appearance of a distinguished character then unknown, it presents an opposition of ideas mutually irreconcilable.

An attention to the preface of this excellent historian, will, indeed, tend further to convince us that the remaining portion of the two first chapters are foreign from his design, which he expressly limits to a narrative of the testimonies of actual witnesses to the ministration of Jesus. The following is Dr. Campbell's translation: "Forasmuch as many have undertaken to compose a narrative of those things which have been accomplished among us, *as those who were from the beginning eye-witnesses, and afterwards ministers of the word* have delivered them unto us; I also have determined, having exactly traced every thing from the first, to write a particular account, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mayest know the certainty of those matters in which thou hast been instructed." In his note on the second verse, the Doctor observes, that "it is impossible on reflection to hesitate a moment in affirming, that the historian here meant to acquaint us that he had received his information from those who had attended Jesus, and been witnesses of every thing *during his public ministration* on earth, and who, after his ascension, had been entrusted with

the charge of propagating his doctrine in the world. *Spectators* first, *ministers* afterwards." Now, here is not only no allusion to the account which immediately follows of transactions at the *birth* of Christ, but if words have meaning, in a writer, for whose distinguished accuracy we may safely appeal to the general tenor of his narratives, in acquainting us with his authorities for a history which certainly required the most incontestable vouchers, it is expressly confined to the facts immediately relating to the *public ministration* of Jesus; and if it be inquired what previous or subsequent particulars our author considered as necessarily connected with that ministration, and within what precise period the testimony to which he makes his appeal was circumscribed, we may again refer to his recitation from Peter: "Beginning from the baptism of John unto that same day that he was taken up from us." If it be necessary further to confirm this sense of the Evangelist, and to shew that his history actually was included within that period, we may appeal to the two introductory verses of his "Acts of the Apostles," in which he states its contents: "The former treatise have I made, O Theophilus, of *all that Jesus began both to do and to teach, until the day in which he was taken up.*" I cannot conceive how an author could give a more definite account in general terms of the contents of his book, and of the sources from whence it was derived, or more clearly mark the period to which it was confined; nor can I conceive how it can be supposed to have embraced a minute description of events thirty years anterior to the epoch from whence the testimony of his witnesses expressly commences, without a plain departure from his avowed object. And as that object was of the most vital importance, requiring that the particulars testified should by no means be confounded with others by no means included in it, it is not in the least credible, that so accurate and faithful an historian would have been guilty of such a deviation. If, however, he actually had thus represented the testimony of his witnesses as extending to such extraneous matters, or related them in that intimate connexion with their testimony in which we now find

them, how could he, in a subsequent reference to this history, when writing to the person to whom it was addressed, have again described it only as a relation of the "teachings" and "doings" of Jesus, that is of his ministry? Let the preface to his Gospel be placed in immediate connexion with the third chapter, and we are introduced to an appropriate commencement of an accurate and consistent history, formed on the basis of the apostolic testimony, which is not more distinctly anticipated in that preface, than the whole intervening passage is in all logical fairness excluded by it.

With respect to the internal marks of piety and benevolence apparent in the sentiments of this passage, will it be maintained that they are of a character equally chaste, rational and exalted as those which are so uniformly manifested in the subsequent narratives? That a recent convert to Christianity, probably in the very age of the apostles, should be considerably under the influence of Christian principles, even amid his attempts, by means of fiction, to render them more palatable to the converts in general, is not more than might reasonably be expected. But can it be said to preserve consistency in its representations, either with itself, with the nature and progress of the Christian character, as represented by Christ and his apostles, and indeed with the gradual and progressive nature of the human mind in general, or with the actual fate of the Jewish people? Is it agreeable to the manner in which the mind is formed, and makes its attainments under the influence of religious and moral principles, that the Holy Spirit should be represented as infusing its influences, even in their plenitude, before the mind can have any capacity of receiving it? What analogy is there between the tale of the babe "filled with the Holy Spirit even from his mother's womb," and the modest account of the Evangelist, that "the word of God came to John, the son of Zaccharias, in the wilderness"? Understanding by the "Holy Spirit" those miraculous gifts and influences which, when used on similar occasions, it appears uniformly to include in its meaning in the undisputed portion of the New Testament, it does not appear ever to have been mani-

festated in his person. As he himself performed no miracles, but simply predicted those which would be performed by Jesus, so the proof of his commission depended on the miraculous powers or gifts of the "Holy Spirit" displayed by him. It was the observation of the Jews that "John wrought no miracles, but all things that he said of this man are true." Since, then, the very evidence of his divine mission depended on the miracles of Jesus during his public ministry, with what truth or consistency could he be represented as under such miraculous influences from his birth and upward? With what sort of consistency could he be described as "leaping in the womb," as if "with joy" at the approaching birth of Christ, who, at thirty years of age, could only announce in indefinite terms his subsequent appearance? Or what correspondence is there between the fond anticipations of Zacharias, who is also described as filled with the "Holy Spirit," (Luke i. 68—79,) and the awful warnings of John (iii. 7—9)? Were not the latter justified in the obstinacy and fate of the Jews, and the former proved to be at best but a pleasing illusion? Could such opposite anticipations or predictions have been recorded by the pen of the same faithful and accurate historian, as proceeding from persons animated by the same spirit of piety and prescience? What analogy, again, is there between the maternal Mary bespeaking the blessings of all future generations for having given birth to the Saviour, and Jesus himself checking a much more moderate expression of the blessing due to her, by representing that the circumstance of giving him birth was of far inferior consideration, and less entitled to blessedness, than that of understanding and yielding obedience to his doctrine? This, indeed, is in the true spirit of our great Master; while the other savours as strongly of Jewish pride and vanity, appertaining to mere natural relationships.

T. P.

Liverpool,
June 6, 1826.

SIR,
WILL you permit another correspondent to make one or two remarks upon the subject of "Unbelievers in Unitarian congregations"?
VOL. XXI.

2 x

I give entire credit to Mr. Noah Jones for the purity of his motives in bringing this subject under discussion; at the same time I think him mistaken in the premises with which he sets out, and cannot agree with him in the conclusion at which he arrives.

His premises are, "If there be two things in nature utterly incompatible with each other, they are the genuine spirit of Christianity and the spirit of Infidelity. Between the man who receives the word of revelation and him who rejects it, there can exist no religious sympathy. Our blessed Master and his apostles drew the line of separation between the two in the strongest manner." His conclusion is, that we ought to say to every Unbeliever, "You are unwelcome in our councils, your presence disturbs our feelings, and your interference is injurious to our interests; we have therefore to request that as you are not of us, you will go out from us." Now, Sir, with regard to the premises I am prepared to say, that in the time of our Saviour and his apostles there did not exist such a body of men as the present class of Unbelievers. I mean inquiring, conscientious Unbelievers, and therefore they have not "drawn the line of separation between the two in the strongest manner."

Bearing in mind the disposition and spirit of our Lord, let us suppose a sincere and conscientious man to have come to him, and to have said in the language of W. J. in his letter, "I honour thee as a moralist and a reformer beyond any other name which history has transmitted to us. I agree with thee in the evidence displayed by this magnificent creation, of an all-wise, all-powerful Creator, and beneficent Providence. I am persuaded that this intelligent, benevolent Being designed the present world as a state of education for higher scenes of action and enjoyment in futurity. But I cannot believe in the supernatural parts of thy history, and in the miracles which have been ascribed to thee. May I, therefore, with a view to my moral and religious improvement, listen to thine instructions, and in the same assembly with thee worship the common Father of the whole human race?" Would our Saviour have replied, "There is an

immense gulf between us—your presence is unwelcome—go out from us”?

Whether he would have made use of any such language, others must judge; it is sufficient for my argument that no such case ever occurred, and that there were no persons then in existence who possessed such feelings and entertained such views. No; the Unbelievers of that day, the Unbelievers censured and condemned in the New Testament, were persons convinced of the reality of our Saviour's miracles, but ascribing them to improper, malignant agency. “This fellow doth not cast out demons but by Beelzebub the prince of the demons.” The unbelief reprobated by the apostles was “an evil heart of unbelief,” and the term “Unbeliever” was almost synonymous with “hypocrite.” Is Mr. Jones therefore warranted in saying of the present class of Unbelievers, “Any weight from the New Testament is against their safety, and it is a vain affectation of candour to exceed Christ and the apostles”?

Upon the general question, permit me just to observe, that Mr. J. in his reply says, that “he shall notice the most important parts of each writer as far as possible. But he has not noticed *any* important part of the most important letter, that of “An Unitarian Christian.”

The supposition of a Christian church now becoming “a mixed assemblage of Christian believers and anti-christian Deists, Jews and Mahometans,” is so outré that I wonder it should be offered as an argument.

The alarm too about Deists gaining the ascendancy in our congregations and managing all our concerns, is surely unfounded. We can have no such apprehensions.

The test and confession which Mr. J. would require, viz. “The confession of Christ” is so exceedingly vague, that it would admit of a different definition in the mouth of every different sect, if not of every individual; and many Deists would “confess Christ” to have been a good and pious man.

In whom also, what man, or what body of men, is invested the *right* of making this examination, demanding this confession?

We are surely too apt to forget that the church of Christ is not our church, any more than the Lord's table is *our* table, and that of this church Christ is the Founder, the Legislator, and the Supreme Head. Can we, therefore, be justified in saying, “We are a society of Christians; we have *formed ourselves* into a society to enjoy the privileges of the gospel,” and, in consequence, add, “You, who do not belong to our caste, shall enjoy none of these privileges in common with us, lest you should ‘cast a stigma upon us’ in the eyes of our weaker brethren”? Being myself a firm and decided believer in the divinity of our Saviour's mission, I regret equally with Mr. Jones the prevalence of a spirit of scepticism, and I would do every thing in my power to check the progress of Deistical opinions. In the strongest terms which language can give, I would express my abhorrence of that ribaldry and profane levity with which the subject is sometimes treated. But at the same time I think a great distinction ought to be made between the irreligious Infidel and the serious, the religious Sceptic, who is anxious but unable to obtain conviction, who is moral, conscientious and devout. I conceive that the sufferings of such a man, in consequence of his want of belief, must be great, and especially when he comes to apply his principles in the education of his family. Such a person is more an object of compassion than of indignation, and ought not to be driven away from the enjoyment he still receives by coming amongst us.

J. G.

To W. J. of Liverpool.

SIR,

May 22, 1826.

MR. NOAH JONES's letter which lately appeared in the Repository, (pp. 72, 73,) has already excited considerable discussion, mixed with some angry feeling, and in this discussion you have taken part. You cannot, therefore, be offended at my requesting your attention to the following observations, which have been occasioned by several parts of your communication, as printed in the Monthly Repository, p. 193.

You commence by observing that

Mr. Noah Jones's proposal is an unwise one. Certainly, if Mr. Jones proposed "to introduce tests and subscriptions to articles of faith," such as you insinuate, it would be an unwise proposal; but after attentively reading the letter of Mr. J. which has given such offence to you and your friends, it seems clear to me that you have misunderstood the purport of that gentleman's remarks. If to urge upon those who wish to become members of a *Christian* community, a real belief in the divine mission of Jesus Christ, in the reality of the miracles he performed, and in the truth and fitness of the doctrines and precepts which he taught, be an *unwise* proposal, then Mr. Jones is guilty. But your assertion, in this respect, is no proof of impropriety. Your opponent, on the other hand, is borne out by the declarations of Jesus Christ and his apostles, and by the practice of the primitive church. Those only were disciples or members who believed in the divine mission of Jesus, and in the truth of that gospel which he brought to the human race.

You say that Mr. Jones's proposal "remains unseconded;" that it "has met with that reception from Unitarians themselves which I confidently anticipated from their known liberality;" and that "calm reason and glowing eloquence" from the pens of persons equally sincere and zealous with himself in their profession of Christianity, have been called forth in opposition to it, and in vindication of those whom he attacks." All this sounds very fine, but a great part of it is *untrue*. The Unitarians as a body are certainly liberal, and I sincerely hope that they will ever continue to cherish and manifest a feeling so noble. There is, however, a *spurious* as well as a real liberality—a *loose, careless indifference*; and I fear that some of those whom you eulogize are characters of this stamp. Be this as it may, I can assure you that Mr. Jones's proposal *has* been seconded, and *will* be supported. No doubt, there are individuals in the body who would have no objections to include Deists, or even Atheists upon the same principle, or rather want of it; but the great body of Unitarian Christians in Great Britain have too great a regard for Christ and

his laws knowingly to admit either for their ministers or even as members, men who deny the truth of Christianity and treat Jesus as an impostor. Neither the "calm reason" nor the "glowing eloquence" of your friends can overturn this fact; but if you have still any doubts, Sir, make the experiment fairly, and you will soon find that you have been labouring under a gross delusion.

The questions which you put relative to creation affording evidence of the existence of an all-powerful Creator, and of man being able to find out God from these magnificent displays alone, have excited my risible faculties. Creation, Sir, was the same when Athens and Rome were in their glory, as it is at present. The sun then shone, and the clouds dropped fatness; the planets then revolved in harmonious grandeur, and the seasons succeeded each other in regular succession; the Greeks and the Romans were as polished as the present Europeans, and had obtained a high degree of perfection in sculpture, painting, poetry, history, architecture, and various branches of the mathematics. How comes it, then, that nations so polished and civilized could not read nature as accurately as the moderns, and that amidst the multiplicity of their gods and goddesses they were without God in the world? It was because the sages of these nations had no revelation, and reason was insufficient of itself to find out the Almighty. As for the ideas which you and modern Deists have of nature teaching the existence of an all-powerful Creator, you have *derived* them, Sir, from the Bible; yes, from that very book which you despise, and at which you affect to sneer. You are not, then, a competent judge of the indications of nature, neither of the capabilities nor incapacities of reason in finding out the existence and perfections of one great First Cause. In reply you may refer me to Socrates. I honour that great man as the wisest and the best of the Greeks, but I question whether his views of one all-glorious God were as luminous and just as have been commonly represented. The man who so often talked of *gods*, who asserted that a *demon* attended him, and who in his last moments ordered

a cock to be sacrificed to *Æsculapius*, had not the same brilliant ideas of the Deity as modern Deists. And why? Were his mental energies inferior to theirs? Was his desire to find out truth less ardent? Did nature appear to him under darker shades than at present? No: he had no revelation, whilst modern Deists are wholly indebted to it for all the valuable information they possess upon this interesting subject. The same remarks are applicable to the inferences you draw respecting a future state. You have taken them, Sir, from the Bible, and not from nature, because there is nothing in nature analogous to the resurrection of the dead. Without the Bible, you might, like the sages of antiquity, have dreamed of Elysian fields and of Pluto's gloomy reign, but you could not have obtained any thing satisfactory respecting a future state of being. A belief in the existence of God is not necessarily accompanied by a belief in a future state. The sect of the Sadducees, in the time of Christ, believed in the existence of one only God, but denied a resurrection and a future state.

The sympathy to which you allude is that which is founded upon our views and feelings as *Christians*. We sympathize with you as men, as neighbours, and as children of the same common Father, but in a *religious* point of view there is no common feeling between us. We believe in the divine mission of Christ, you treat him as an impostor; we believe in the reality of Christ's miracles, you laugh at them as impositions; we believe in revelation, you deny it; we worship the Father in the name of Christ, you do no such thing. Between us and you there is, then, a wide distinction. This is the impassable gulf alluded to. We cannot cross it to come to you, without renouncing principles which we hold most dear; nor can you cross it to come over to us, without embracing Christianity.

You say, "I honour Jesus as a moralist and reformer beyond any other name which history has transmitted to us, not excepting Socrates himself." I thank you for this declaration; but is it consistent with your principles? Jesus repeatedly declared that he was sent by God, that the doctrines which he preached were not

his but the Father's who sent him, and that he could do nothing of himself without the Father. By such repeated and explicit declarations, Jesus impressed upon his followers that he had received a revelation, and also a divine commission to make it known. All this you, as an Unbeliever, most strenuously deny. Now, if your denial be just, what are we to think of the *real character* of Jesus; and how can you honour, as the greatest moralist and reformer, him who, upon your own principles, must have been guilty of repeated falsehood and deliberate imposition?

You are further pleased to affirm, "And I think it possible to account for the supernatural parts of his history, without supposing that he either performed, or pretended to perform, the miracles ascribed to him, and even without impeaching in any considerable degree the character of the first promulgators of Christianity." This is, indeed, Sir, a most extraordinary assertion. It must surely have been penned in haste and without any reflection. After having attentively considered it, I am decidedly of opinion that you *cannot* prove the first part of the assertion just quoted, but that if it were possible you could do so, you would *most seriously* impeach the character of the first promulgators of Christianity. With this opinion, I very respectfully but earnestly request you to undertake the task. I shall weigh your arguments with attention, and, if convinced of error, make such acknowledgments as are proper.

Whether your presence be considered as an *intrusion* or otherwise at the place where you meet your neighbours for *Christian worship*, is not for me to say, but I can assure you, Sir, that the presence of Unbelievers in Unitarian places of worship is *not* agreeable to the body generally, and much less so when Deists push themselves forward as members, as officers, and even sometimes as preachers. I do not blame you for being a Deist, if after mature deliberation you really think that Deism is true. Every man has an undoubted right to form his own opinions upon religious subjects, and to worship his Maker in that form which coincides with his views. But I respectfully submit it to your

sense of honour, to your regard for consistency of character, and to your respect for truth and moral rectitude, whether it be proper for you and other Unbelievers to associate for religious worship with a body of men who believe in a divine revelation, and who worship the Father in the name of Jesus. Would it not be more honourable, and are you not called upon by every manly feeling, to form a separate society, and to address your Creator in a way that may harmonize with your views of truth? Do you fear the civil power? The Unitarians boldly proclaimed their principles and worshiped God in the way that was deemed heresy, when placed under similar restrictions with yourselves; and even yet it is declared, that we are liable to prosecution at common law. But if you have not courage to worship God in a Deistical form, why not petition the Legislature to remove your present disabilities? I, for one, will cheerfully sign such a petition, and from what I know of the views of our Legislative Assemblies, I should sincerely hope that a proper application of this nature would not be made in vain.

I am, Sir,

Yours respectfully,
GWILYM MAESYVED.

SIR,

I HOPE that Mr. Jones's important communication (pp. 72, 73) will engage the serious attention of all your readers whom it may concern. It is an apostolic question, What part hath he that believeth with an Infidel? In the common duties and pleasures of life we may indeed associate with Unbelievers without blame, nor could we without an uncharitable bigotry do otherwise. But to desire any union with them in our religious services is every way unreasonable, for if we are really Christians, light and darkness are not more opposed than their views and ours in all that regards religion. If the Unitarian chapel is found agreeable to the Deistical worshiper, is there not just ground for suspecting that the religious views which are there inculcated under the name of Christianity have but little real claim to that title? Few, indeed, are the Unbelievers to whom the pages of the Bible yield

an acceptable entertainment, but if the same men can listen with complacency to the disquisitions of the Unitarian preacher, what inference can be drawn but that the preaching savours but little of those mysterious realities which form indeed the burden of revelation, but which the sceptical mind regards with so much fastidiousness and impatience? If Deists love to be hearers, it is to be feared the preacher may be but half a Christian.

Yet this is not a matter in which any half-way, compromising dealing is admissible. It is not enough to be even *almost* a Christian. A decided character is here the only consistent, the only safe one. If one thing on earth is more solemn than others, it is to have received a revelation from God, to hold that revelation in one's hand, to behold it opened, to hear it read. If the mind is susceptible of pious reverence and awe, they will be exercised here. This revelation will be felt and acknowledged to be the only standard of truth on those great subjects on which it professes to inform us. Its testimony will be allowed to be conclusive, and will not be disputed. All tampering with the words of the sacred record, all attempts to explain away their obvious meaning in order to adapt them to our own opinions will be felt to be presumptuous and vain. The truly Christian minister who has the Bible before him, will have no other wish but to proclaim with simplicity and energy the very truths which that Bible contains, and no others. If, abandoning this exalted post, he descends to the low and fluctuating level of human opinions, and begins to inculcate not what God has said, but what himself thinks, how is the true dignity and authority of his office obscured! And if, what is still worse, but not uncommon, he has not only taken on himself to preach what is not written, but also been so bold as to enter on a course of doubting and cavilling and evasion in respect to much that is written, what wonder is there in such a case that the Deist is found among the complacent and well-satisfied hearers? The authority of the testimony of God, like that of his law, is of such a nature, that if rejected in one point it is in effect re-

jected altogether; and if we once begin to fancy that we can improve on the Bible and amend the Christianity of the New Testament, if we are for being more rational and enlightened Christians than Christ himself and his apostles were, it is surely easy to see that the authority of Scripture goes for very little with us: we give ourselves credit for a wisdom of our own which we follow as a sure guide. I must own that the consistent Deist appears to me in a more respectable light than the professed Christian who picks holes in the Scriptures, and is for ever finding matter of doubt and exception in a record to which he allows the authority of God.

I had written the foregoing remarks before I saw the several communications which have appeared in answer to that of Mr. Jones, and I must now add, that in more than one of these papers there appears to me something very uncourteous and unchristian-like in the manner in which that gentleman is treated. It may be allowed that it is going too far to wish to exclude Unbelievers from Unitarian worship, inasmuch as we may reasonably hope that they attend from laudable motives and may be likely to receive spiritual benefits. But for them to be associated with Christian societies in the management of their concerns, to have conceded to them the Unitarian name, and especially to be permitted to take any part in the offices of religious instruction, I hold to be in the highest degree inconsistent, and of very mischievous consequence. We should wonder that any professed Christians should be found advocating an opposite opinion, but there is something in these papers which throws light on this matter. There has been invented a new phrase, by the magic influence of which, as some of your correspondents seem to think, the distinction of believer and unbeliever is merged and vanishes away.

The word which is the matter of this great discovery, (for there is nothing discovered but a word,) and a great word it is, is Anti-supernaturalism. This new name for Deism certainly appears to carry a powerful charm in it, for under its influence our old enemy is so metamorphosed that he is welcomed as a very good

friend. But, Sir, in my own humble opinion, all this is sad and pitiful trifling with a most solemn subject. Mr. T. C. Holland refers us with evident satisfaction to the idea of Anti-supernaturalism given by your American correspondent at p. 79. Let the reader turn to that place, and attend to the sketch of the pseudo-Christian there drawn. Such a one, believing that God's providence orders all things, admits that in the course of that providence Jesus, by the excellence of his moral instructions, became a great blessing to the world, greater probably than any other teacher that has arisen of the same kind. He was sent from God only in the same sense that Socrates was sent, and his resurrection is only an idle story of a ghost. That, Christian reader, is the amount of the Christian faith of the Anti-supernaturalist: he disbelieves the whole of that long tissue of miraculous events which forms the burden of the sacred narrative from beginning to end: he disbelieves in that resurrection of Christ, our Master, which is the only rational evidence of a future life. Yet of such a one Mr. Holland says, that to "such a person I should be very unwilling to refuse the name of Christian, and I should always be glad to join with him as a fellow-worshiper." Truly, Sir, I know not what one claim such a man has to the name of Christian, unless that name is to be extended to Hume and Voltaire and all their company: for they all pretty well allow that Jesus was an excellent and useful instructor in morals. Most truly may we apply to this case the words *Vera rerum nomina amissimus*. I trust there are many Unitarians who regard this matter with very different feelings. If there is any truth in the gospel, the true Christian is justified by his faith, "and this," says the Apostle, "is the word of faith which we preach, that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thine heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." Again, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be condemned." But it were endless to adduce the declarations of Scripture on this subject: it is evident that if the gospel be true,

we are saved by the belief of those very things which the Anti-supernaturalist rejects; and whatever resources the mercy of God may ultimately command in favour of those who reject the gospel through ignorance or prejudice, we are plainly assured that their present state is one of guilt and condemnation, and that they are utterly alien from all the hopes and privileges of the Christian. The faith of Christ I regard as the touch-stone by which it has pleased the Divine wisdom to try the hearts and discriminate the characters of men. If, indeed, there be a man who wishes to believe, but is distressed by difficulties which he cannot at present surmount, I believe we may say of such a one that *he is not far from the kingdom of God*, and be desirous to communicate to him every religious advantage in our power. But even such a one is but a learner and wholly unfit either to rule or to teach, and if he be sincere, his own modesty will teach him this.

For the sake of argument, the Anti-supernaturalist has been represented agreeably to the indulgent and partial portrait of your Transatlantic correspondent. I am, however, inclined to believe that few persons will long remain in such a state of mind. If we discard the belief of all the supernatural events of Christ's life, the obvious conclusion to which we are conducted is, that he was a visionary enthusiast, who, though of benevolent and virtuous dispositions, was carried away, as many others have been, with false imaginations, mistaking the impulse of his own fancy for the inspiration of Heaven. For men of sense to hold such a character in that profound veneration which your correspondent describes, appears to me impossible. That weak and deluded sort of men, among whom this supposition places the prophet of Nazareth, have ever been objects of contempt and pity with the more enlightened part of mankind. This miserable halting between two opinions is wholly vain. "If Christ be not risen our faith is vain; we are yet in our sins." The whole evidence of the doctrine of a future life vanishes in air, and we return, now in the nineteenth century, to the old Epicurean maxim, "Let us

eat and drink for to-morrow we die." Feeling myself that the hope of the gospel is the richest treasure that we possess, our best consolation amidst the inevitable distresses of life and our only support in the prospect of death, I have thought it my duty, among others, to bear this my feeble testimony to the inestimable worth of true Christian faith, and to the reality of that "immense gulf which subsists between the true Christian and the Unbeliever."

T. F. B.

SIR,

May. 10, 1826.

I WISH your correspondent I. F. (p. 225) had given the authority for his anecdote, which is, however, not too barbarous to be credited, considering the numerous and well-authenticated cruel freaks exhibited not only by *Whites* in the West Indies, (before they were restrained by the salutary progress of opinion in Europe,) but by *autocrats*, in various ages, of every colour and of every clime.

Burke, in the "Introductory Discourse concerning Taste," prefixed to his *Sublime and Beautiful*, thus relates what was doubtless the same story:

"A fine piece of a decolated head of St. John the Baptist was shewn to a Turkish Emperor; he praised many things, but he observed one defect; he observed that the skin did not shrink from the wounded part of the neck. The sultan, on this occasion, though his observation was very just, discovered no more natural taste than the painter who executed this piece, or than a thousand European connoisseurs, who probably never would have made the same observation. His Turkish Majesty had indeed been well acquainted with that terrible spectacle, which the others could only have represented in their imagination."

Burke has not mentioned the name of the emperor, nor the horrible test to which, according to your correspondent's anecdote, his Turkish Majesty submitted his opinion on this question of taste. Yet, when he wrote the *Sublime and Beautiful*, almost his earliest production, Burke had not yet learned, what he unhap-

pily lived too well to acquire, a complaisant courtly reserve on the weak or wicked eccentricities of despotic power.

R. L. C.

Eminent Men of the last Generation.

— “Studious let me sit,
And hold high converse with the mighty dead,
Who blessed mankind and humanized a world.”

THOMSON.

*City Road,
April 19, 1826.*

SIR,
THE latter years of the last century formed an era that has never perhaps been equalled for the theological and political discussions which distinguished it; nor, indeed, can any age or country be compared with our own for the number, the talents, and the intrepidity of its advocates of political, civil and religious liberty. Those who can remember the concluding years of that period, must have associations and feel emotions of the most pleasing kind, because they must forcibly recall such instances of moral and intellectual dignity, as have probably never before or since been exhibited to the world. The sacred names of the individuals who displayed such superior virtue, will stand conspicuously eminent in the records of our history; they were then familiar to every lover of free inquiry; and the recollection of them must be endearing to every friend to truth and to the happiness of man. Great, indeed, were their exertions in this benevolent and honourable vocation: and the disquisitions then published relating to the political, civil and religious condition and improvement of society, produced effects so extensive, that they are still felt by a considerable portion of the community. Many of them seem now either to be forgotten, or deemed unworthy of attention; but if any value be attached to clear and luminous statements of the points in discussion, cogent argumentation with striking and apposite illustrations, and a style at once perspicuous, forcible and impressive, for such are the characteristics of many of the productions of these writers, the time will probably arrive when

they will be sought with an avidity proportioned to their inestimable importance. They gave an impulse to the human mind on subjects of the the highest interest, and produced astonishing effects in giving a new current to public opinion.

These reflections have been suggested by a recent conversation with an old and esteemed friend, whose name has often appeared in your pages, upon the neglect or indifference, with which many of our young men seem to regard the exertions and writings of such men as Sir George Saville, Dr. John Jebb, Priestley, Price, Wakefield and others of that period.* Whatever may be their reasons for indulging such a feeling it may not be easy to ascertain; but the loss to themselves is undoubtedly great. The advantages to be derived from the examples and writings of these men are so extensive, that, perhaps, it is not possible to furnish any that can be compared with them, for their acquirements were as various as their views were enlarged and laudable. But they considered the pursuit of truth as an indispensable obligation, and, consequently, deemed no topic so sacred as to be exempt from

* Where is the number of volumes that contain an equal portion of useful and interesting information as well as fine writing, as those *three* comprising the Life and Writings of Dr. John Jebb? His strenuous efforts to improve the discipline, and to effect a reformation in the University of Cambridge, entitle him to the gratitude of his country, had he done nothing more.

Is not the small degree of encouragement afforded to Mr. Rutt for his highly valuable exertions in the publication of a *complete* collection of the Theological and Miscellaneous Works of Dr. Priestley, a reflection upon those who are desirous of being deemed the friends of rational religion, and freedom of philosophical and political investigation? To what other man are they so much indebted for improvement, and for exciting attention to and elucidating these important subjects? But the writings of the above great men are not *novelties*, and therefore *unworthy* of the attention of the idlers of this age, who are satisfied with amusing their fancy, and, perhaps, consider the *exercise* of their *reason* as too great an effort—if not a degrading labour!

severe examination.* They inculcated the duty of scrutinizing, with unlimited freedom, every prejudice and every opinion, however sanctioned by great names, or seemingly consecrated by time and authority. Whatever notions they were induced to adopt, after patient and deliberate investigation, they freely and fearlessly avowed; but while exercising this freedom they did not neglect to accompany the disclosure of their opinions with the *reasons* for embracing them, and urged upon others to imitate their frankness and sincerity. “*The wisdom of our ancestors*,” so much dwelt upon by the venal and superstitious, had no influence in their decisions, unless it were proved to be “*wisdom*” by diligent and rigid inquiry, and found to be consonant to the impartial conclusions of an enlightened judgment, unaffected either by fear or interest.

Were not these great moral teachers the “burning and shining lights” that animated the men of their day with the love of knowledge and freedom? Is it right that such men should be suffered to sink into oblivion or neglect? As our gratitude is immeasurably due to them for their instructive lessons and examples, why should not these benefactors of mankind be held up to the attention of the present generation? For what

philanthropists ever cherished or inculcated more liberal sentiments, or more manfully or effectively asserted the dignity of the human character by the pre-eminent exercise of human reason? Though uniting the most ardent love of truth with the purest moral conduct, and much as they laboured to promote human improvement and happiness, they could not avoid, and were not exempt from, the application to themselves of those vituperative epithets which are too commonly bestowed where there is any difference of opinion.* But does not this seem to be the kind of persecution that every man must expect to suffer if he inquires freely, and may therefore be led to conclusions different from those of his neighbours, however conciliating may be his temper or liberal his conduct? Reprehension, obloquy, and perhaps calumny, are too usually the portion of the person who merely doubts; and no ordinary degree of intrepidity is requisite to him who may deem it a duty to avow a *change* of religious opinion, or dissent from his associates or the multitude. Lamentable, indeed, is the slow progress and confined extent of candour and charity; but how much more ought that man to be esteemed, who scorns to compromise his love of truth and sincerity in order to retain the notice of the unthinking and uncandid, or who disdains to sacrifice his regard for veracity and rectitude at the shrine of hypocrisy and venality, whatever re-

* How few act up to the noble feeling of Dr. Middleton! “I persuade myself,” says he, “that the life and faculties of man, at best but limited, cannot be employed more rationally and laudably than in the search of knowledge; and especially of that sort which relates to our duty and conduces to our happiness. In these inquiries, therefore, wherever I perceive any glimmering of truth before me, I readily pursue, and endeavour to trace it to its source; without any reserve or caution of pushing the discovery too far, or opening too great a glare of it to the public. I look upon the discovery of any thing which is true as a valuable acquisition to society; which cannot possibly hurt or obstruct the good effect of any other truth whatsoever: for they all partake of one common essence, and necessarily coincide with each other; and, like the drops of rain which fall separately into the river, mix themselves at once with the stream, and strengthen the general current.” Middleton’s Pref. to Free Inquiry.

* “Let us not only allow every one to read the Bible for himself, but let us not esteem him the less, because his conclusions and opinions are opposite to our own: let us not call him *heterodox* and ourselves *orthodox*,—him foolish and ourselves rational and wise; let us not shut him out from our communion on earth, nor either hope or fear that he will be excluded from the higher fellowship of heaven; in short, let us encourage free inquiry; let us set up Scripture above system; let us revere integrity of mind; let us in our inquiries and debates seek truth, and not pre-eminence; let us always bear in mind that Truth came down from heaven in company with Love, twin-sisters of divine extraction; and that neither will reside apart from the other with us mortals.”—Mr. Aspland’s Letter to Rev. H. Norris.

proaches or privations he may have to encounter or endure! How much superior in the scale of moral worth does Andrew Marvel appear when contrasted with Edmund Burke! But such blots, the effects of sordid and selfish views, it is to be lamented, have too often obscured the splendour of the greatest talents, and defaced the character as well as destroyed the utility of some men of highly cultivated minds. Happily, those whom it is the object of the present communication to recall into more particular notice, were of a different class, for they were, perhaps, some of the finest instances of inflexible integrity and candour that can be selected to illustrate the intellectual and moral history of man. May the young men of our days be animated by their example to emulate their industry and beneficent deeds; and may they endeavour to obtain that "honest fame" which is to be found only in the career of virtue and the acquisition of knowledge!

THEOPHILUS.

Mr. Brazer's American Sermon.

WE are constantly receiving from the United States of America theological publications of great value. Our Transatlantic brethren appear to be making up by activity and energy of mind for a long period of inertness and torpor. The Unitarian cause especially is indebted to them for many recent defences, expositions and illustrations, of singular ability and admirable temper; and not the least indebted for a variety of Essays and Discourses which uphold the Unitarian doctrine, not by argument and controversy, but by an unostentatious and indirect display of its reasonableness and Christian spirit and happy social tendency. Amongst these we may place a Sermon which we have lately received from the author: viz. "A Discourse delivered before the Society for the Promotion of Christian Education in Harvard University, at its Annual Meeting, in the Church in Federal Street, Boston, on the Evening of the 28th of August, 1825. By John Brazer, Pastor of the North Church in Salem. Published at the request of the Trustees. Boston: Cummings, Hilliard, and Company—Washington Street. 1825."

The subject of this Sermon, from Mark xvi. 15, is, *The Duty of Disseminating Divine Truth*. We quote Mr. Brazer's answer to one of the objections frequently made to efforts for the diffusion of what is regarded as the pure gospel:

"It is said, that Christian worth is matured, and often found in a high degree of perfection, even in those whose religious opinions appear to us most incorrect; and that, by consequence, there is no reason why we should attempt to alter or reform these opinions. The fact is freely admitted, and it is a delightful consideration that the spirit and temper of Christianity is to be found amongst all classes of Christians. Still let us not infer from this, that religious improvement is independent of all speculative belief, or that error is as good as truth. Certainly, as, in the nature of things, faith is the source and spring of conduct,—as what a man really believes, must necessarily influence what he is and does,—it must follow, that an erroneous belief will, *if left to itself*, produce an erroneous practice. If it do not, in any instance, it is because the principle of faith in such a man is only speculative,—because the truths he professes to adopt, float inert and dead upon the surface of his mind; or else because they are controlled in their effects by the higher and sounder principles of religion. As the bitter waters of Marah in the wilderness were rendered sweet by the tree which Moses, at the command of God, cast into them, so the fountains of error, in the cases under remark, have been *neutralized* by the divine truths with which they have been mingled. Besides, what reason have we for believing that errors of belief will, in the majority of minds, always be thus controlled, or always remain inoperative? The fact is, that it is the error mingled with our religion, which much impairs its influence over the human mind—it is this which prevents its more universal reception—it is this which has swelled the ranks of infidelity. But, to dismiss this topic, the whole question turns upon this point: If we believe that religious truth is better than religious error—and who does not believe it?—and if we think that in the same degree that Christian truth prevails, religious advancement is promoted—and who can doubt this?—then we are bound to use all proper and truly Christian methods to diffuse, according to our best ability, in its purity and power, the truth as it is in the gospel."

REVIEW.

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

ART. I.—*Helon's Pilgrimage to Jerusalem, &c.* By F. Strauss.

(Concluded from p. 678.)

TAKEN in all its circumstances and bearings, the Jewish constitution is the most memorable object in the page of history. On a comprehensive survey of this dispensation, we must even acknowledge, that no person deserves the title of a well-informed Christian, who is but imperfectly acquainted with the nature, principles and evidences of the Mosaic law. These subjects, however, are less studied and understood than the importance of them demands: they have not, we suspect, their just share in courses of religious instruction; they do not occupy a sufficient degree of our thoughts and reading. We forget the intimate alliance existing between the Old Testament and the New; between the divine mission of the Hebrew legislator and that of Jesus of Nazareth. This neglect and ignorance are, perhaps, attributable, in part, to the remote antiquity of the Jewish Scriptures, and the vast difference of Eastern customs from our own. Nor can it be denied that those books present more and greater difficulties, even of style, than the records of the gospel. But are the difficulties insurmountable? Ought they not to animate rather than check our diligence? In the concerns of the world, in the pursuit of some favourite end of wealth, or pleasure, or outward distinction, in studies and inquiries that are merely secular, do we permit ourselves to be so soon and easily deterred? Do we then refuse to labour with a zeal that carries us through every obstacle? Let us not give cause of its being supposed, that our judgment and our feelings can be attracted more readily by any thing than by religion: to every division of the Sacred Volume let us consecrate a due regard, in order that our faith may be stable, and have a sovereign influence over our characters and lives.

With these views of the eminent value of the books of the former covenant, and of an accurate knowledge

of whatever concerns the singular people to whom they were committed, we hail the appearance of the present work in an English dress.

There are literary undertakings, the arduousness and benefit of which men do not correctly estimate. One of these employments, is *translation*: to excel in it, requires attainments and qualifications that we rarely see in a single individual; and this task, laborious, delicate and useful, as we must confess it to be, is commonly intrusted to inferior pens, or, though placed in the hands of scholars, is too often performed in a slovenly and careless manner. The history of English translations, will evince the accuracy of these remarks; to which, nevertheless, it furnishes some honourable exceptions. Among the successful efforts in this department of literature, which our own times and country have witnessed, none can fairly claim a higher rank than belongs to the version now coming under our review.

In an *Essay*,* characterised by elegance and discrimination, some admirable general rules have been given for judging of the merits of a translation: it is shewn that the translation should be a complete transcript of the ideas of the original work, that the style and manner of writing should correspond with that of the original, and that the translation should have all the ease of original composition. Under each of these general laws are comprehended many subsidiary precepts: nor is it an ordinary degree of intelligence and talent, that can fulfil these several requisitions.

The editor and translator of *Helon's Pilgrimage, &c.*, evidently possesses an intimate acquaintance with his author's native language, and with his own. Accordingly, he is literal and faithful, without being servile, and proves his ability of retaining the

* “ On the Principles of Translation.” [London, 1791.] We believe that an enlarged edition of this performance appeared subsequently, and that the author was the late Lord Woodhouselee [A. F. Tytler].

phrases and idioms of the English tongue, while he gives the full meaning of those which occur in Strauss's German. His style and manner of writing, correspond sufficiently with those of his original: they vary with the nature of the scenes and topics that are introduced, and with the different kinds of composition—such as dialogue, narrative, description, &c.,—of which the work consists; and he feels, at the same time, that deep interest in his subject, and has that perfect knowledge of it, which renders him both correct and animated.

In opening these volumes, we are particularly impressed by the translator's exemplification of the last of the general rules, which the writer of the *Essay*, &c., has prescribed. Never was that essential law more completely and happily obeyed. The English reader can with difficulty believe that he is not perusing an original and a vernacular composition: so pure and easy and flowing is the style; so entirely has the translator caught the spirit of the German author, and done justice to his materials and his sentiments. By means of the extracts already given it will have been perceived with what felicity all the properties of a good translation are here illustrated. Yet, as our former quotations were produced for other ends, we deem it right to bring forward one or two, for the sake of establishing the reasonableness of the praise that we have just bestowed.

It is probable that in his picture of the near approach of the pilgrim-train to Jerusalem, and of their first view of the city, from a little distance,* the writer did not forget Tasso's well known lines;† though he stands perfectly free from the charge of slavish imitation.

"Expectation had reached the highest pitch. The last strophes were not com-

* Vol. I. 223, 224, B. ii. Ch. ii.

† Ali ha ciascuno al core, ed ali al piede,

Nè del suo ratto andar però s'accorge,
Ma quando il Sol gli aridi campi fiede,
Con raggi assai fervente, e in alto sorge,

Ecco apparir Gerusalem si vede,
Ecco additar Gerusalem si scorge,
Ecco da mille voci unitamente
Gerusalemme salutar si sente.

G. L. Lib. Canto 3.

pletely sung; many were already silent, eagerly watching for the first sight of Jerusalem. All eyes were turned towards the north; a faint murmur, spread from rank to rank among the people; only those who had been at the festival before continued the psalm, and these solitary scattered voices formed a solemn contrast with the silence of the rest of the multitude. Helon's heart was in his eye, and he could scarcely draw his breath. When the Psalm was concluded, the instruments prolonged the sound for a moment, and then all that mighty multitude, so lately jubilant, was still as death.

"All at once the foremost ranks exclaimed, Jerusalem, Jerusalem! Jerusalem, Jerusalem! resounded through the valley of Rephaim."

The translator is particularly successful in the clause, "all that mighty multitude, so lately jubilant, was still as death." [Nun war eine Todesstille in dem früher so lauten und lärmenden Zuge.] Nothing can be more appropriate here than the poetic word "jubilant." There is a slight and extremely judicious retrenchment of the description, as it appears in the original; the taste of the English editor being much superior to that of the author.

Of an orator in the synagogue, to whom Helon and his friends listened on the second day after the Passover, we are informed,* that

"— he spoke of the captivity in Babylon, of the silent tears of the people, as they sat by the streams of the Tigris and Euphrates, and of the evening of the Passover, when the fourteenth day of Nisan came, and no paschal lamb could be eaten, but only the unleavened bread. No one drew his breath while he delineated the picture of this misery. 'Unhappy, forsaken people,' he exclaimed, 'ye had sinned, and Jehovah visiteth the iniquities of the fathers upon their children. O thou almighty and jealous God, thine eyes are open on all the ways of the children of men.' He paused for a moment, as if overpowered by the contemplation of the might and justice of Jehovah. Every bosom was agitated, 'Woe, woe to me and to my children!' exclaimed at once a woman, so carried away by the words of the speaker, that she forgot herself and the presence of the multitude. 'Woe to us all,' resumed he, 'if we forsake Jehovah, the living fountain, and hew out to ourselves broken fountains, which hold no water.'"

* B. ii. Ch. vi. Vol. I. pp. 300, 301.

We shall consult the gratification of our readers, by laying before them a further extract: it is a description of an Oriental Nomadic tribe.*

“ Helon dismissed the escort of the governor [of Samaria] and pursued his way to Thirza, the limits of this day's journey. He had purposed to reach Megiddo, but his progress was arrested by a spectacle equally new and interesting; a tribe of wandering shepherds, who were making their annual migration from the plain of Sharon to Mount Hermon. They had been detained later than usual, for they commonly remove early in the spring. The flocks and herds led the way; behind them came camels, laden with their tents, baggage and poultry, and the young of the flocks, which as yet were too weak to accompany the march. The women and children followed, mounted on other camels; some of the females were spinning as they rode, others grinding in their hand-mills, others tending their infant children. The boys ran by the side of the camels, playing or fighting. Lances, from eight to ten feet in length, were every where seen above the heads of this tumultuous train; and on all sides were heard the hoarse voices of the men who carried them, some of whom were endeavouring to maintain order, and others surrounded and protected the line of march.

“ When they reached their ordinary place of encampment, a new scene began; the sheep and goats laid themselves in the grass, the camels knelt down, the poultry flew from their backs. In two hours the dark brown tents were erected,† Helon made Sallu assist them, while he himself looked on and enjoyed the animated confusion of the scene. With upright and cross poles a large tent of an oblong form was erected. The coverings were of a thick brown stuff made of goats' hair, and the door of the tent was nothing but a curtain of this cloth, which could be lifted up or drawn aside. In the middle was the tent of the chief of this nomadic tribe; the rest were pitched around it, to the distance of thirty paces. Every one of the larger tents was divided into three parts by curtains; in the outermost were the young and tender cattle which required shelter, in the next the men, and in the innermost the women. The mattresses, pillows, and coverlets for sleeping were laid in one corner; the weapons were hung on the sides of the

tent; carpets were spread upon the floor, a hole dug in the middle for the fire; and the few and simple articles of household furniture, wooden dishes, vessels of copper, a hand-mill, and bottles of leather, easily found their appropriate place.”

A few specimens of quotations from the Hebrew Scriptures, will now be given: numerous extracts of this sort, form an important feature of Strauss's work, and, consequently, of the translation.

The seven first verses of *Psa. lxxviii.* are thus rendered: *

“ Give ear, O my people, to my teaching!
Incline your ears to the words of my mouth!

I will open my mouth in parables;
I will declare the histories of old,
Which we have known and heard,
Which our fathers have told us,
That we might not hide them from
their children,
Shewing to the generation to come the
praise of Jehovah,
His strength, and the wonders he hath
done.

“ He established a testimony in Jacob,
And appointed a law in Israel,
Which he commanded our fathers,
That they should make known to their
children;

That the generation to come might
know them, the sons which should
be born;

That when grown up they might declare
them to their children,

That they might set their hope in God,
And not forget the works of God,
And keep his commandments.”

In translating this deeply impressive exordium, Strauss appears to have profited by the labours of some of his countrymen and predecessors: among these, Rosenmüller, (E. F. C.,) Dathe and Mendelssohn, should be noticed, as, in many respects, agreeing with him. This just medium between paraphrase and too literal a translation, is very happily observed by the author, and by his editor. In defence of the reading adopted in the fourth verse, Kennicott's excellent *Remarks on Select Passages of the Old Testament*† may be consulted.

A part of *Psa. cxxxii.* will next engage our attention: ‡

* B. iv. Ch. i. Vol. II. pp. 206, &c.

† This part of the description may serve to illustrate the images in *Isa. liv. 2.*
—Rev.

* B. i. Ch. iii. Vol. I. p. 58.

† In loc.

‡ B. ii. Ch. ii. Vol. I. 217, 218.

"Lord, remember David !
 All his afflictions.
 How he swore unto the Lord,
 And vowed unto the mighty one of
 Jacob,
 Surely I will not go into my house,
 Nor go up into my bed.
 I will not give sleep to mine eyes,
 Nor slumber to mine eye-lids,
 Until I find out a place for the Lord,
 A habitation for the mighty one of
 Jacob.
 Lo we heard of it at Ephratah,
 We found it in the fields of Jaar :
 Let us go into his tabernacle,
 Let us worship at his footstool."

The circumstance that will here strike the English reader, as a peculiarity, is the substitution of "*Jaar*," in the sixth verse, for the rendering ["the wood"] by our public translators. It may not be an easy task to ascertain whether the Hebrew word be in this place a proper name. A great number of learned and judicious writers, have received it as such : indeed, the majority of those annotators, &c., to whom we have access, take it in that sense ; and the change seems to be vindicated, and perhaps required, by the parallelism and by the history.* At the same time, we should feel pleasure in obtaining more satisfactory evidence of there having been a spot distinctly known among the Hebrews as "*Jaar*:" *Wells*, in his *Geography of the Old Testament*,† is far from being perspicuous and decisive on this point.

We shall now compare Strauss's translation ‡ of a few of the introductory verses of the book of Jeremiah with that which Blayney has given of them : ch. i. 4—11 :

"Even [see ver. 2] the word of Jehovah came unto me, saying : Before I formed thee in the womb, I knew thee ; and before thou camest forth from the birth, I separated thee ; a prophet unto the nations have I constituted thee. Then said I, Alas ! O Lord Jehovah, behold, I know not how to speak ; for I am a child. And Jehovah said unto me, Say not, I am a child : but unto whomsoever I shall send thee, thou shalt go, and whatsoever I shall give thee in charge, thou shalt speak. Be not thou afraid because of them, for I will be with thee, to protect

thee, said Jehovah. And Jehovah put forth his hand, and touched my mouth. And Jehovah said unto me, Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth. See, I have given thee power this day over nations and over kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to overthrow, and to build, and to plant."—BLAYNEY.

"The word of the Lord came unto me, saying,
 Before I formed thee in the womb I knew thee,
 And before thou camest forth out of the womb I had chosen thee,
 And I ordained thee a prophet to the nations.
 And I replied, 'Ah, Lord God ! Behold I cannot speak ; For I am a child.'
 But the Lord said unto me,
 'Say not, I am a child : For thou shalt go to all to whom I shall send thee,
 And thou shalt speak whatsoever I command thee.
 Be not afraid of them ; For I am with thee to help thee ;' So saith Jehovah.
 Then Jehovah put forth his hand And touched my mouth,
 And said to me,
 'Behold, I put my words into thy mouth,
 See, I have this day set thee before nations and kingdoms,
 To root out and to pull down,
 To build up and to plant again.'" STRAUSS.

There is no considerable difference here between the English and the German translator. Perhaps, some little advantage may be found on the side of Blayney, in point of strict and minute fidelity. Strauss's editor has scarcely retained the parallelism at the beginning of the passage, ver. 5.

Among the quotations, are the noblest, the most picturesque and beautiful and tender effusions of Hebrew poetry. We regret that we have not room to copy additional specimens of them into our pages. There is one fragment, however, that we must not pass in silence.

A portion of *Psa. lxxxiv.*, occurs twice in this work, and well expresses Helon's zeal for the services of the temple : *

* 1 Sam. vii. ; 2 Sam. vi.

† Vol. III. p. 1, 2d ed.

‡ B. iii. Ch. ii. Vol. II. 27, &c.

* B. i. Ch. ii. Vol. I. 21 ; B. ii. Ch. ii. Vol. I. 208.

“Better a day in thy courts than a thousand!
I would rather be a door-keeper in the
house of the Lord
Than dwell in the tents of sin.”

The rendering of this passage, is afterwards somewhat varied, without being equally correct:

“A day in thy courts is better than a thousand.
I *had* rather be a door-keeper in the
house of God
Than dwell in the tents of wickedness.”

In the German original the words are the same in both the instances of citation.

To the editor we must acknowledge our obligations for the signal taste and judgment, with which he has executed his task: our gratitude is offered to him, not only for what he has done, but for what he has forborne to do.

“The liberty,” he says,* “which I have used with the original consists wholly in retrenchments. Of these alterations some have been made to prevent repetition and diffuseness: in a very few instances what appeared evidently fanciful or unfounded has been silently effaced.”

Such a discretionary power, essential as it is to a translator, could not be safely committed to every individual. In the hands of the editor of *Helon's Pilgrimage*, it has been exercised with great advantage to the author and to the English public.

The writer of the “Essay” remarks† that “whenever an idea is cut off by the translator, it must be only such as is an accessory, and not a principal in the clause or sentence: it must likewise be confessedly redundant, so that its retrenchment shall not impair or weaken the original thought.” Redundancies of this class are frequent in Strauss's own volumes,‡ but have no place in the translation.

That some, though not all, the the-

ological opinions advanced in this work are the opinions of the author, may in reason be supposed. In these sentiments the translator* wishes by no means to be understood as uniformly agreeing: but he has neither suppressed nor disguised them; they are stated honestly and fully, and left to make their just impression upon the reflecting and candid reader.

The editor of *Helon's Pilgrimage*, should he again lay this work before his countrymen, will perceive it to be susceptible of amendment in a few, though not material, circumstances. Occasionally, he will have to correct errors, now existing, of the press; occasionally, yet rarely, some inadvertencies of the pen. In bidding him, for the present, farewell, we shall employ the words of the writer who has so well deduced and illustrated the laws of literary translation, and shall pronounce of the volumes before us, that they exhibit *a good translation*,† because in it *the merit of the original work is so completely transfused into another language, as to be as distinctly apprehended, and as strongly felt, by a native of the country to which that language belongs, as it is by those who speak the language of the original work.*

N.

ART. II.—*My Thought Book*. J. P. Thomas. 8vo. pp 404. Sherwood and Co. 1825. 8s.

THIS volume, like the title-page here fully given, is a curiosity. The author, who, it appears, is a solicitor, has set down in his book whatever came into his mind, and his Thoughts, 869 in number, he terms Essays: some of them are contained in three words and some extend to a dozen pages. As was natural, the writer touches upon many subjects connected with his own profession: he devotes many pages to the fine arts: and not a few are the passages relating to theology and metaphysics. With respect to these last, Mr. Thomas shews himself to be of the liberal school, though not the follower of any master. From the plan of his book, his Thoughts sometimes succeed one

* Pref. xv.

† P. 33.

‡ See, among many examples, B. ii. Ch. i. par. 3, [at the end,] in the original.—Ch. iii. par. 4. In B. iii. Ch. i. some circumstances are very judiciously omitted, as also in B. i. Ch. v.

* Preface, xii.

† Essay, &c. p. 13.

another in ludicrous order: for example, No. 828 is upon early piety, No. 829 upon the removal of the General Post Office, and 830 upon ladies wearing light stays. This odd mixture of topics, as well as the homeliness of certain of them, would seem to shew much ease not to say carelessness in the composition of the work; yet the author, who is the best evidence in this case, speaks feelingly in his concluding paragraph of the labour and pains expended upon it:

“Many have been the midnight hours which this work has cost me. Many have been the fearful anxieties, and anxious hopes, which have attended the preparation of this book for public perusal. Many have been the hours of rest which have been sacrificed to its production. Many have been the abridgments of personal ease which its completion rendered indispensable. A book of this description cannot be completed *ad libitum*. Those who know the difficulty of such a task will peruse the book with a liberal feeling. Those who know the author will, I hope, conclude, that what he has written, he sincerely believes to be true. Those who do not know him will, I trust, give him credit for candour and consistency, and pardon his faults. To the public I humbly consign the work, and whilst in form I dedicate it to no individual, in substance I devote it to the service of every one.”—P. 393.

Mr. Thomas speaks his mind upon topics on which fashion prescribes silence. He says, for instance, of Gibbon's infidel chapter what most men think, though few would dare to say it publicly:

“GIBBON has been bitterly censured for introducing his sceptical views with regard to Christianity into his History of the Fall of the Roman Empire, but I question much whether there is a full measure of independent justice in the reproach. Had the theme been other than religious, the gall of his calumniators would have been less virulent. Let fair and impartial men answer the questions which I am about to propose to them, in the sincerity of their hearts:—Was Gibbon under any obligation to the world to conceal his honest opinions with respect to the growth of that faith, the progress of which he related historically? Or was it any thing more than candid for him to divulge, without deceit or dissimulation, doubts which occurred to him on that same subject of

which he was writing? Suppose, for instance, that I, a Christian by conviction, were to write a history of Turkey, in the course of which I must necessarily allude to the progress of Muhameddanism: should I subject myself to just condemnation by stating explicitly the reasons which I believed to have operated in accelerating the growth and nourishing the creed of Mussulmen? And would it lessen my worth, if my speculations upon that subject were untrue? Would it not be a sufficient defence of my character, if not of my literary reputation, that my declarations or suggestions were sincerely avowed? And yet, what alone would constitute the real difference between Gibbon and myself? He has written of Christianity; I should write of Muhameddanism. He expressed what he thought. So should I express myself. The inference is clear.”—Pp. 25, 26.

In the same spirit, he writes very freely, but we think very justly, of the affected terror at the names of three other celebrated Unbelievers:

“A thrill of horror generally succeeds the mention of the names of Voltaire, Rousseau and Paine. But why should we despise the memory of those men? Because they were mistaken in their opinions—because they erred in their conclusions—because they opposed our system—or because they laboured indefatigably in what they believed to be the cause of truth? No, forbid it, generosity! Forbid it, all ye Christian virtues! ‘But,’ say many, ‘it was impossible, had they diligently and sincerely searched for truth, for them not to discover it.’ Does every man, then, who diligently and sincerely seeks the truth find it? Is no one involuntarily mistaken? Is it a crime to be in error? Are we doing as we would be done by, when we unhesitatingly and unthinkingly condemn as stubborn hypocrites, men whose intellectual powers were majestically grand—men whose eagle-eyes sought for the sun of truth, but could not find it—but who, had they happily discovered that orb of glory, would have gazed at it without confusion and with intense delight? The authors to whom I refer greatly expanded the intellectual horizon of man, by their arduously-philosophical inquiries, notwithstanding their opposition to our theological system. They thought as few men can think—they wrote as few men can write, and pure Christianity will rather pity than vilify them, for the errors which we believe them to have fallen into. Their erroneous views of the Christian dispensation will not injure

the fabric of elevated reason. Persecution and cruelty alone can retard the progress of the holy faith. Christianity is a rock of imperishable strength and durability, against which the surges of unbelief may dash and foam, but the rock is destined to be coeval with time, and remains unmoved and immovable."—P. 365.

We quote these passages, because the writer not only avows himself a Christian, but also expresses great anxiety for the prevalence of rational Christianity.

In the following remark, he strikes at a palpable inconsistency in the sentiments and conduct of some of our zealous religionists :

"It is worthy of attention that the reason which some very patrons of missions assign for punishing Unbelievers, for the dispersion of their tracts, is an argument against their own missionary system. They complain that the minds of the poor are unprepared to investigate. Are not the uncivilized Heathens much more so?"—P. 47.

We say, with this author,

"It is extraordinary that many Christians bend at the mention of Christ's name, but not when terms to express the great God are used."—P. 50.

The author exposes the hypocrisy of some of the advocates of national religious establishments :

"The excuse often alleged for national religious establishments is, that the opinion of the majority should be treated at least with respect by those who are in the minority. This proposition as applied to the subject, is either true or untrue. If true, why has Protestantism been established in Ireland? If untrue, there is an end to this view of the subject."—P. 54.

He takes notice of one of Mr. Belsham's arguments in favour of a national establishment of Christianity :

"I have heard the Rev. Mr. Belsham, in one of his discourses, state, as an argument in favour of religious establishments, the fact, that in those places in which the Christian religion has been unprotected by the civil power, as in Asia, such faith has degenerated, until it has been utterly extinguished. But he omitted to add, that such degeneracy has arisen from the active protection afforded by the body politic to another profession of religion substituted in the place of the genuine faith."—P. 67.

VOL. XXI.

3 A

The maxim and the question in the following passage are obviously just and pertinent :

"Any law which binds men to a particular form of marriage hostile to their consciences, is a legal prohibition of marriage. What necessity is there to force religious opinions into a civil contract?"—P. 95.

There is sound theology in the remark,

"The works of art are as much the productions of the Deity as the works of nature."—P. 99.

We fully agree with the author in the observation (to descend to a lower subject,)

"It is rather singular that amidst the refinements of this literary age, the letters 'u' and 'v' are still confounded together in dictionaries, to the great annoyance of readers, and in opposition to the facility of alphabetical reference."—P. 103.

Mr. Bentham's faith is, we apprehend, sufficiently comprehensive to admit the following aphorism :

"The grand object of the creation is, doubtless, to do the greatest possible good to the greatest possible number."—P. 131.

The author's estimate of what are called "historical novels," is by no means peculiar :

"The historical novels lately published, I am so presumptuous as to think, have not the useful tendency so generally ascribed to them. They distort facts for the purpose of ingenious and inviting embellishment, and they therefore distract and confound the attention of the young reader in the consideration and recollection of historical subjects."—P. 164.

The author's politics are free, but moderate. He is a reformer, but not a revolutionist, though he makes more excuses than we can bring ourselves to approve for public abuses. He writes in warm praise of Sir Francis Burdett, especially on account of the Baronet's having moderated his tone as a reformer.

In one sentence our author puts in a striking form one of the intelligible doctrines of the Political Economists.

"Restrictions upon commercial importation are in general very unwise. By enriching our customers we enrich ourselves."—P. 195.

We know not how far the writer's numbers are correct, but every man that mixes much in society must perceive that a large proportion of the nominal members of the Church of England are not believers in her doctrines or advocates for the whole of her worship.

"It is surprising that in the rapid march of knowledge, no liturgical reformation has taken place. I have been told by an honest yet most zealous Church-of-England man, that not more than one lay member of that Church in five thousand, subscribes in his heart to the whole of the Thirty-nine Articles. According to this remarkable admission, (and I believe that it is very true,) 4999 out of 5000, who profess the doctrines of the Church, are really dissenters from that Church."—P. 197.

We wish we could suggest to many a pert theological talker the author's maxim,

"Every philosophical inquirer is a Free-thinker; but every Free-thinker is not a philosophical inquirer."—P. 220.

Some of the writer's shortest "Essays," as he calls them, are the best, and we finish our extracts with one which is somewhat plain, but very sensible, and moreover expository of a part of that system of morals which works well for human nature:

"Prudence and good temper will compensate for a multitude of freckles on a wife's face."—P. 224.

There are some opinions and maxims in the volume to which we cannot assent. Is the author serious in thinking that "God is space"—(p. 26)? Does he indeed persuade himself that the "Paradise Lost" is "out of fashion," *as it ought to be* (pp. 61, 62)? Is he a bachelor that he dares to pen the ungracious doctrine that females are not always to be exempted from corporal chastisement from the hands of the other sex? Bachelor he cannot be, for persons to whom this epithet belongs are commonly distinguished by their gallantry; but being, as we therefore presume, a husband, can we sufficiently admire his hardihood?

The long list of "Corrigenda" at the end might be very easily enlarged. For Wilkin, p. 60, read Wilkins, for Priestly read Priestley, pp. 69, &c. &c.

We cannot dismiss the volume without observing, according to our cus-

tom in the like case, that it is sold at a price which reminds us of the good old times of English literature.

ART. III.—*A Letter to Dr. Blomfield, Bishop of Chester, in Reply to the False Charges which his Lordship has brought against the Unitarians and their Ministers.* (Reprinted from the *Christian Reflector*.) Liverpool, printed by F. B. Wright; sold by Teulon and Fox, London. 8vo. pp. 8. 3d. 1826.

IN the Bishop of Chester's Letter to Mr. Butler is the following passage:

"I do not admit the truth of what Dr. Milner says, that most of the old stock of Presbyterians and Independents are now Socinians; many of the Meeting-houses which were formerly occupied by Presbyterians are now, I acknowledge, in the hands of Unitarian congregations, (who have been deluded into Unitarianism by the most disingenuous artifices on the part of some of their preachers,) but a great number of the descendants of the old Presbyterians have entered into communion with the Established Church, and the number of those independent communities who have lapsed into Socinianism is, I believe, very small indeed."—P. 3.

Upon these assertions the writer before us, who signs himself *Camber*, animadvert with considerable severity. He pronounces the term "Socinian" offensive; he doubts the accuracy of the statement with regard to Presbyterians conforming to the Church; and he resents, with much indignation, the charge of disingenuousness and artifice brought against certain unnamed Unitarian preachers. His "Letter" would have lost none of its force if its language had been a little more temperate. We cannot say, however, that the Bishop does not merit rebuke. We should be glad if by any means Dr. Blomfield could be induced to explain what he means by representing certain Unitarian preachers as deluders! He cannot refer, we are sure, to any part of the history of the Unitarian congregation at Bury St. Edmunds, though more likely to know something of that congregation than any other, a near relative of his, not long ago deceased, having been one of its zealous and active members.

POETRY.

TO THE SWALLOW.

1.

ART thou return'd, swift racer of the skies,
To course the breezes of my land again,
And, o'er these northern meads,
To skim the new-born flowers ?

2.

In what far zone, while Winter darkened here,
Hast thou forgot the tempest left behind ?
O'er what strange seas displayed
Thy heaven-directed wing,

3.

To find the Summer which thou lov'st so well,
To shun the ills which *thou* hast power to flee,
And, in some bright sojourn,
Thy vagrant bliss enjoy ;

4.

Where foreign skies with vernal sapphire glow,
And deep savannahs spread their virgin store
Of greenest solitudes,
And never-trodden flowers ?

5.

But, whencesoe'er thou com'st, alike receive
The lonely welcome of a simple lay,
From one who fondly strives
To weave his heart in song.

6.

Fleet pilgrim, bound to Summer's fragrant shrine—
Tracing her flight, o'er ocean's dark-blue zones,
Where'er her wing she rests
The girdled world around—

7.

I hail thee, prophet of those fairy hours,
Ere long to dawn upon our hearts and isles,
When Nature yet once more
Her bridal robe shall wear,

8.

And braid her tresses with the glowing rose,
And breathe profounder azure o'er the skies,
And bid old Ocean tune
More soft his awful lyre.

9.

Soon will the thorn be hoar with May's rich snow,
The lilac soon its flowery plumes display,
And lithe laburnums wave
Their locks of pendant gold.

10.

Even now 'tis sweet to dream of future hours
In the brown umbrage of the wood consumed,
When high the noontide sun
Shall pour the burning day—

11.

To dream of hours, when we shall muse on Truth
In the green school of Nature ; or call up
The beautiful in death,
By spells of magic song ;—

12.

Or roam, perchance, the deep and leafy glen,
Listing the clear brook, and the pastoral bell,
While many a quiet bleat
Makes peace more peaceful still,

13.

And, lost by fits, the cuckoo's plaintive note,
Mellow'd by distance, swoons along the vale,
Borne on the sunny breath
Of evening's golden fall.

14.

These are thy tales ; and, for them, once again
Welcome, fleet halcyon of the land !—oh, long
Float on these northern winds,
And haunt our island flowers !—

15.

Enough of *thee* ;—but there is One, to whom
Even *thou*, frail thing of dust, canst lift the eye
Of him, whose spirit owns
In all His works the God.

16.

Oh THOU, whose word directs the swallow's flight,
Guide of her path, and guardian of her way—
Whose power upholds her wing
Thine own wide waters o'er ;—

17.

Led by Thy law, and by Thy strength sustained,
So may *we* safely pass our stormy world,
And reach the shores of rest,
The summer land of God !

Crediton, April, 1826.

THE ENCAMPMENT OF THE ISRAELITES IN THE PLAINS OF MOAB ;
OR
BALAK AND BALAAM :

A Poem, founded on the History recorded in Numbers, chap. xxii.—xxiv.

LED by their prophet, Israel's hosts
Triumphant march from Gilead's coasts,
And wind afar their devious way
Thro' Moab's plains in long array :
Till near the brink of Jordan's tide,
Which o'er his willowy banks had flow'd,
Their tents they spread in martial pride,
Their banners in the sun-beams glow'd.
The sons of Moab, when they saw
Their numerous tribes, were struck with awe,
And, gazing where their banners shone,
The bravest felt unwonted fear ;
E'en Balak trembled on his throne
And sent this message to the Seer :—

“ A people, countless as the sands,
Spread o’er the great sea’s billowy strands,
Escap’d from Egypt’s servile chains,
Have pitch’d their camps in Moab’s plains,
And, as the ox licks up the grass,
They eat the nations as they pass.
Sihon in vain their course withstood—
Arnon is red with Sihon’s blood :
From that deep stream’s empurpled tide
They slew his sons to Jabbock’s side,
And with the sword’s destructive blade
His fruitful land a desert made.
In vain did Og, the giant king,*
His troop of mightiest warriors bring,
In strength and stature tow’ring high,
Like his own oaks that touch the sky :
Cut down before the naked swords’
Unsparing edge of these fierce hordes
Great Og fell prostrate ’midst his hosts ;—
Then Bashan shook thro’ all her coasts,
Trembled her woods—in their deep shade
The altar’s fires to darkness fade,
Whilst from each lofty pedestal
His vanquish’d gods in terror fell.
A scream was heard thro’ all the land—
Not one escap’d this murderous band !
Haste, Seer, with imprecations dire,
More fatal far than sword or fire,
And, where their banners wide unfurl,
The thunder of thy curses hurl :
Perchance, tho’ arms and valour fail,
Thy stronger sorcery shall prevail,
And Moab drive these hordes away,
Scatter’d like sheep, in wild dismay !”

The prophet came—and Balak leads
Thro’ secret paths his winding way,
From silvery Arnon’s flowery meads
To Baal’s summits, bare and grey :
Till from that mountain’s lofty peak,
O’er which the rays of morning break,
The Seer beholds, in dread amaze,
The lengthening camps of Moab’s foes,
Far as the eye can stretch its gaze,
Spread o’er the plains in calm repose.

“ Raise here sev’n altars to the skies,
Sev’n horned rams and oxen bring,
Prepare, prepare to sacrifice !”

Loud cried the prophet to the king.
Rais’d are the altars—and the fires
Curl up to heaven in flaming spires :
The priest and king the victims slay,
And offerings on each altar lay,
Whilst Moab’s chiefs, their prince around,
Stand awe-struck on that holy ground.

“ Feed ye the flames,” exclaim’d the Seer,
“ Whilst I still higher yet ascend ;
Perchance, approaching heav’n more near,
To me the God of heav’n will bend ;

* “ Only Og, king of Bashan, remained of the remnant of giants,” &c.—Deut. iii. 11.

And, from his everlasting seat
 Descending, here his prophet meet.
 Watch ye the fires—and see they burn
 Brightly as now with sacred glow.
 Monarch ! here wait till my return,
 If thou the will of Heaven wouldst know.
 Doubt not I will unfold to thee
 Whate'er the Lord shall shew to me."
 Hasten'd the prophet from their sight
 To that wild mountain's loftiest height ;
 The king and chiefs his word obey'd,
 And kneeling by the altars pray'd.
 But, lo ! he comes—all instant rise
 And rev'rently before him bend,
 As if descended from the skies—
 He speaks—and silent all attend.

" From the children of Ammon, the sons of the east,
 Hath Balak, the king, call'd his servant the priest,
 And the monarch of Moab hath said to the Seer,
 Come, curse me this host, that hath fill'd me with fear :
 But my tongue from its roots ye shall tear away first
 Ere I curse whom the God that I serve has not curs'd ;
 And how shall these lips, which his spirit doth guide,
 Ere defy whom the Lord hath himself not defied ?
 From the summits of Baal, the God of the earth,
 Hath shewn me the people he nurs'd from their birth ;
 Who, O Jacob, can count half the tribes thou dost lead ?
 As the dust of the earth is thy numberless seed.
 May the death of the righteous, O Balak, be mine,
 And the sun of my life as serenely decline !"

" Prophet !" the king in anger cried,
 And grasp'd his bright sword's glittering hilt,
 " None yet have Balak's power defied,
 Whose blood this sharp blade has not spilt.
 Of all my priests thou art the first
 That dar'd to bless whom I have curs'd."
 Undaunted answer'd that bold Seer,
 " Tho' like these slaughter'd rams I bleed—
 A fate it seems I well may fear—
 The word of God his priest must heed :
 King ! from my lips that word *will* break
 When he commands those lips to speak."—
 " Come, then," the monarch said, and seiz'd
 The prophet's mantle as he spoke,
 " Thy answer hath my wrath appeas'd—
 Fear not this sabre's fatal stroke :
 But haste thee to another height,
 Whence still this host shall meet thy sight,
 But not as here in prospect wide—
 Thou shalt but see their 'utmost part ;'
 The rest a mighty rock shall hide,
 That fear may leave thy trembling heart :
 Thence hurl thy curses on yon crowd
 Like lightning from the thunder-cloud."
 Then hurried Balak and his train
 Along Abarim's rocky chain,
 Where darkest cliffs—whose rugged side
 All tract to human foot denied,
 Their broken fragments hanging down—
 Seem'd o'er the fearful road to frown.

Thro' these they drag the lingering Seer,
Nor from their toilsome journey stop,
Till far below their foes appear
From lofty Pisgah's verdant top.

Again the blazing altars rise,
And bulls and rams they sacrifice.
Again the prophet leaves the king
And priests around the holy fires,
And, where the eagle rests his wing,
To meet his God alone retires.

Again he comes—the princes bow
Low as the dust in silent dread :
A light beam'd from his sacred brow
And o'er his radiant features spread—
Bright as the sun that pure light shone,
Whilst thus he spoke in loftiest tone :

“ Arise, king of Moab, and silently hear
The voice of thy servant, of Balaam the Seer :
‘ God is not a man’ that his word should deceive ;
What his lips have declar'd his own arm shall achieve ;
For firm as this mountain, that looks o'er the plains,
His purpose immutably steadfast remains.
His spirit, now prompting, forbids me to curse ;
‘ He has bless'd,’ and I cannot his blessing reverse.
His eye, that beholdeth the heart, doth not see
Obdurate iniquity, Israel, in thee :
The God of thy fathers, on whom they relied,
Is still present with thee, thy strength and thy guide,
And the mountains and valleys far echoing ring
With the shout of a host, that proclaims Him thy King.
Against Jacob the arts of the sorcerer fail,
No enchantment, O Israel, o'er thee shall prevail :
As a lion, by slumber refresh'd, in his might
Goes forth from his lair, thou shalt rise to the fight,
Nor, till thou hast drunk of the blood of thy foes,
From the feast of the battle lie down to repose !”

“ Hold, Seer !” the monarch, starting, cried,
“ And what remains in darkness hide ;
Thou hast already said too much,

The rest an infant child might guess :
Thy words my soul too nearly touch—
Yon host no longer curse nor bless.

Some evil pow'r is in this place
Unfriendly to myself and race,
Or thou perchance—but no delay ;

Come quickly with me, son of Beor ;
God yet may bid thy tongue to-day
Curse yon fierce hordes from lofty Peor.”

They haste along with rapid speed
That doth not toil nor danger heed,
As if for life they urg'd their flight,
Till breathless on that dizzy height,
Scaring the vulture from its nest,
Their weary feet once more they rest.

It was a stony, desert place,

Where not a tree its branches spread ;
The lightning scarce had left a trace

Of verdure—all was sear'd and dead :
It seem'd a spot by Heav'n accurs'd,

Where oft its bolt of wrath had lighted,
And, as the cloud of vengeance burst,

For some dark deed the earth had blighted.

Fiercely the fires they kindled burn,
 Darkly the clouds of smoke arise ;
 All to the prophet fearful turn,
 Who, heedless, stands with downcast eyes.
 Dire rage in Balak's bosom rose—
 Trembled his lips and shook his frame—
 Gasping he cried, " Curse me these foes,
 Or thro' this all-devouring flame
 Shall instant pass thy body, Seer,
 To *Moloch*, who is worshiped here!"
 He struck against a cliff his lance,
 Till shivering in his hand it broke—
 The prophet stood, as in a trance,
 Unconscious of the angry stroke,
 Tho' loud the mountain with the shock
 Echoed afar from rock to rock.
 Now chang'd the monarch's rage to fear,
 And all his chiefs stood trembling near.
 So motionless the Seer remain'd,
 It seem'd as if some pow'rful spell
 His every limb and sense had chain'd—
 A charm his sorcery could not quell.
 At length, as from a sleep he woke,
 His eye resum'd its faded light,
 With rapturous energy he spoke,
 Whilst gazing from that lofty height :

" How lovely, O Jacob, thy tents where they stand,
 Spread forth as the measureless vales of the land :
 As gardens by rivers whose waters are clear,
 When cover'd with blossoms, thy dwellings appear ;
 Like sweet flowering aloes in beauty they rise,
 Like cedars that lift their tall heads to the skies !
 As the waves of the sea without limit or end,
 Thy reign o'er the nations shall widely extend ;
 The secrets of ocean thy sons shall explore,
 And the wealth of the ocean shall come to thy shore ;
 Thy king shall surpass even Agag in power,
 And his throne o'er the thrones of proud monarchs shall tower.
 The chains of thy bondage God fearfully broke
 And led thee triumphant from Egypt's proud yoke :
 Thou art strong as the unicorn* rushing in rage—
 Who can stand in the battles thy valour shall wage ?

* The Hebrew word *קֶרֶן* (*ram*) has had different significations given to it by different interpreters. In the Septuagint it is rendered in every passage in which it occurs, except one, (Isa. xxxiv. 7,) by the Greek term *μονοκερως*, and our translators, supposing this interpretation to be correct, have rendered it by a term of like signification, borrowed from the Latin *unicornus*, viz. unicorn, which I have retained in the line above, merely because it suited the measure of the verse. The great objection to this term is, that the unicorn is now considered a fabulous animal, and later interpreters, for this reason, reject it, supposing the original to mean the rhinoceros. I confess the arguments deduced in defence of the latter signification appear to me very strong: but having lately met with a passage in a recent publication, asserting the real existence of the unicorn, I shall transcribe it, as it contains strong, if not decisive, evidence in support of the assertion: " To-day the *unicorn* coming upon the *tapis*, his Lordship (Lord Hastings) observed, that he had no doubt of its actual existence. During his presidency in India, a native, from the interior, was desired to sketch out such animals as he had seen, with charcoal, and to give some description of their mode of life, for the purpose of ascertaining whether he was familiar with any that were unknown to Europeans. Amongst the rest he drew a *unicorn*, at the same time being totally ignorant of the curiosity attached to it. It was delineated with the horn somewhat curved and (I think his Lordship said) fluted. Its feet resembled those of a stag, and its tail was curled or twisted, like that of a

Tho' nations withstanding, thy progress oppose,
Thy sword shall devour all the hosts of thy foes :
The bones of the mighty thy strong men shall break,
And thy arrows shall pierce thro' the flesh of the weak.
As a lion from slaughter lies down in his den
'Thou reposest awhile—who shall rouse thee again ?”

Darken'd on Balak's brow the cloud,
The lightning shot from Balak's eye,
“ Prophet of plagues !” he cried aloud,
And smote his hands in agony ;
“ I call'd thee here to curse yon band
Whose tents are spread o'er all my land,
Yet, heedless of thy king's behest,
Thy lips have thrice these robbers bless'd.
Amidst the princes of my state
I had design'd to raise thee high,
But God has shew'd me, not too late,
'Thou art the tool of treachery.
Hence to the mountains of the east—
'Thy office only saves thee, priest !”

Before the monarch's angry mood
Intrepid still the prophet stood,
And, whilst his rage he calmly eyed,
With dignity, unaw'd, replied :
“ Tho' kings hold forth the threaten'd rod,
The prophet must obey his God.
Said I not, prince, when first I heard
What Moab's elders from me sought,
' Bear ye this message to your lord—
Truth cannot, like a lie, be *bought* ;
If Balak's bounty offer'd more
Than I could count of precious ore,
'Treasures of silver and of gold
Vast as his royal house would hold—
I cannot do, or good, or ill,
From the mere prompting of my will ;
But I will truly speak the word
That shall be told me by the Lord’ ?

pig. The communication thus made was immediately acted upon. Lord Hastings sent the drawing to one of the native princes, an ally of the British, and one who had received considerable favours at their hands, with a request that he would signify whether such a thing existed, and whether it were possible to obtain a specimen. The answer was satisfactory. It stated, that though the animal had occasionally been taken, yet that it was by no means common ; that it was extremely fleet of foot, ferocious and shy ; that they were only enabled to obtain them by penetrating to their haunts, entirely covered with green branches, and shooting them from the ambush. He promised, withal, to send the first specimen that could be taken to the governor. It is to be regretted that this never came ; but the fact of their existence cannot now be discredited. That point may fairly be set at rest.”—*Journal of a Voyage up the Mediterranean, &c., Vol. I. pp. 349—351.* By the Rev. Charles Swan.

Rejecting from the descriptions of the unicorn, left us by the ancients, what is clearly fabulous, so strong a resemblance will be found between them and the above extract as to render it highly probable this animal has a real existence. At all events, enough surely has been advanced to justify my retaining, in the line above, the term unicorn, in preference to the less poetical word rhinoceros—especially as the former may, by a poetic license, be used for the latter, being descriptive of the *one horned* animal of that name, according to the Linnæan nomenclature the *rhinoceros unicornus*. But it is high time to escape from the *horns* of this dilemma.

That word offends thee, and I go
 Back to the place from which I came,
 Yet hear thou first what future woe
 Awaits thy kingdom and thy name.
 The veil is lifted from my eye
 And things to come I see as nigh;
 The vision of my God is clear
 As in yon heav'n the sun is bright;
 Mistrusting monarch! trembling hear
 What bursts upon my raptur'd sight:

“Thro' the gloom of the future I see thee afar,
 O Jacob, beam forth as a world-lighting star,
 And the sceptre of Israel, exalted in might,
 The borders and children of Moab doth smite;
 It ruleth o'er Edom and stretcheth to Seir,
 The mountains and rocks bow before it in fear,
 Its empire is wide, and resistless its sway,
 It strikes to the dust all the idols of clay,
 And the blaze of its glory o'er earth is so bright,
 Its foes melt away, like the mist, in its light.
 Lo! Amalek lifts himself up in his pride,
 A giant in strength o'er the earth is his stride,
 And his head is exalted in triumph so high,
 All the bright hosts of heav'n he seems to defy:
 But Amalek falls in his pride and his lust,
 Like a tow'r by the lightning struck flat to the dust,
 And the bolt of destruction his throne has cast down,
 And in ruins for ever it lies with his crown!

An eagle that builds his high nest on a rock,
 The Kenite seems rais'd above ruin's dread shock,
 And strong in his dwelling-place, near to the sky,
 Looks down on his foes with a fear-scorning eye:
 But woe to the Kenite! tho' loftily plac'd,
 Desolation his dwelling doth fearfully waste.

Who pompously marches in warlike array,
 Destruction behind him, before him Dismay?
 'Tis Asshur the mighty—ah! what do I see?
 He leadeth thee captive, O Israël, thee:—
 Alas! who shall live when the hand of thy God
 Shall hold o'er His people *His* chastening rod?
 He will not destroy thee—from many a coast
 Ships of war sally forth, each arm'd with a host;
 On swift wings of vengeance to Eber they haste,
 And now what is Asshur?—a desolate waste:
 Wide o'er the sad ruins, low wheeling their flight,
 Discordantly scream the dark vultures of night,*
 And, whilst they carouse on the flesh of the prey,
 Scare far from that desert man's footsteps away!

The vision departs—and my eyes see no more
 The scenes they beheld so distinctly before;

* We are informed in Gen. x. 11, that Asshur built Nineveh. Hence Assyria, of which that city was the capital, is sometimes called in Scripture language Asshur or Assur: as in Ezra iv. 2, Esar-haddon is called “King of Assur.” The destruction of Asshur, therefore, foretold by Balaam, was the destruction of the Assyrian empire, when Nineveh was entirely destroyed. To the utter ruin and desolation of this once splendid city I allude in the lines to which this note refers; borrowing the imagery of Nahum iii. 3, 7, and Zeph. ii. 13, 14.

But a voice, from a distance, yet audibly clear,
In accents not human, cries loud in my ear,
' Can thy God ere forget thee? O Israël, never;
Thy foes shall thus perish, and perish for ever!'"

Rotherham, May 31, 1826.

J. BRETTELL.

STANZAS ON IMPRISONMENT FOR DEBT.

1.

They talk about *Misfortune*—most sincerely
I wish *Miss Fortune* would but change her name
By marriage—it is not at all too early,
She being of all old maids the eldest dame;
Her long celibacy has cost us dearly,
And matrimonial discipline might tame,
Or break her heart—a deed it does sometimes,
As witness many melancholy rhymes.

2.

At present, she is a most bilious bore,
Her love is hate, her company perdition,
Her breath, like Milton's stygian soil, "burns frore,"
Her touch is quint-essential inanition:
She has sent millions to their graves before
Their hour—a most uncomfortable mission—
With broken hearts, and things of that sort, which are
Gifts that do not appear to make men richer.

3.

For me, I never lik'd her, name or nature;—
Yet she is a most philanthropic lady,
Loving mankind with hate; nought can abate her
Satanic charity, for all men ready:
For every human breather, soon or later,
She feels a passion, sometimes strong and steady—
If so, an early stone, his dust above,
Commemorates her diabolic love.

4.

All this is but a prologue, to begin
(Instead of an address to the nine muses)
A few slight strictures on a crying sin,
One of our constitutional abuses;—
I mean the plan of locking up, within
The four walls of a jail, whoever loses
The power of paying what he cannot get—
Commonly call'd *Imprisonment for Debt*.

5.

No doubt, it is "a passing pleasing" sight
(That is, to Christian creditors) to see
Debtors and sovereigns lock'd up, day and night,
Under the jailor's and the banker's key:
At the first superficial glance, one might
Imagine they were *both* priz'd *equally*—
Both being treasur'd up with equal care
From the same "charter'd libertine, the air."

6.

Yet this, I really think, is not the case;—
For, if said creditors were driven to loose
One of the twain from their familiar place
Of watch and ward, I think it might conduce

To clear our full jails, in a right brief space,
 Of many a pale and spirit-worn recluse—
 While to the winds you might as well go whistle,
 As hope to meet one liberated Chrysal.*

7.

This "glorious constitution" of our nation,
 However grave it may be *on the whole*,
 Is sometimes a most merry legislation,
 Fond of a joke, facetious o'er a bowl—
 Enacting the Joe Miller on occasion
 With gravity inimitably droll;—
 To which there's no objection on our parts,
 Except that, with its jests, it breaks men's hearts.

8.

Such jests, it must be own'd, are rather serious,
 Especially to those on whom they fall;
 To *them*, at least, they sound somewhat imperious,
 Or what, in *other* nations, we should call
Tyrannic;—but, of course, none but delirious,
 Or very silly people would at all
 Dream of asserting that there can be found
 One trace of tyranny on English ground.

9.

What an infinity of wittiness
 Lies in our free-born mode of treating debtors!
 The instant that a man is penniless,
 We *lock him up*;—and, save the want of fetters,
 We make no difference 'twixt him and the *Mess*
 Of cut-purses and murderous blood-letters;—
 Which proves we are, in classifying morals,
 Nice as Linnæus was in flowers and corals.

10.

It is not always that, in the same thing,
 Wisdom and wit meet in the same degree;
 But in the plan, for laud whereof I sing,
 They mix in most exact equality.
 The stray sheep of the *golden fleece* to bring
 Back to the fold from which they first got free,
 What step so sage as shutting up the pastor
 By way of making them return the faster?

11.

One never can sufficiently admire
 The ingenuity of this deep scheme;
 It needed an Egeria to inspire
 The Numa who first dreamt the brilliant dream:—
 Who would have thought that locking up the lyre
 Was the best way to sluice the Muses' stream—
 That bees shut up in hives would make most honey—
 And men in prison from the stones draw money?

12.

Not I, for one:—but, wise and witty as
 The scheme may be, its wisdom and its wit
 Are secondary to a nobler cause:
Humanity, all Christians must admit,
 Shines, in this grave provision of our laws,
 Above them both;—when once a man is bit

* Alluding to Swift's well-known tale, "Chrysal, or the Adventures of a Guinea."

By penury's sharp fang, they kindly take him
From scenes whose sight might melancholy make him.

13.

They promptly place him in a new abode,
Give his few friends occasional admittance,
Relieve his back from freedom's heavy load,
And deal him *gratis* out his daily pittance;—
Yet (strange to say) he would think well bestowed
All these rich blessings, to procure his quittance;
Thinking (poor ignorance) that *liberty*
Outweighs all else beneath his God's bright sky.

14.

It does not seem to be a pleasant thing,
To pace a prison-court through years of care,
Without an aim, except it be to fling,
Into the Red Sea of the open air,
A legion of blue dæmons; or to bring
Back the lost appetite; or to repair
The jaded functions, which without it might
Cost him a weary day and wakeful night.

15.

And then the memory of former days,
Of winter's hearth and summer's evening stroll,
With faces round on which he lov'd to gaze,
Wife, children, friends, to whom his heart, his soul,
Were given for earth, for heaven—all these sweet rays
Of other times his thoughts awhile cajole;
Till, starting from his reverie, once more
He sees the dull walls and the hopeless door!—

16.

But Romilly is gone; and Wilberforce
Pleads but for *blacks*, and Martin but for *beasts*:
Therefore, 'tis clear, "the law must take its course,"
Until some pity wakes in English breasts
For English sorrows, and sons feel remorse
For things which seem'd to be their fathers' jests;—
Then, o'er the place of Romilly's repose,*
Shall bloom sweet mercy's late but lovely rose.

Crediton.

OBITUARY.

1826. April 19, at *Wolverhampton*, in his 74th year, the Right Rev. JOHN MILNER, D. D., V. A., F. S. A., bishop of Castabala. He was born in London, in 1752, the son of Joseph and Helen Milner, whose name, for some cause not explained, he dropped, adopting that of Milner. He was educated at the Catholic school of Sedgely Park, in Staffordshire, and from thence was sent to the English College at Douay. Receiving Priests' Orders in 1777, he first settled

in London; in 1779 a malignant fever having deprived the French prisoners at Winchester of two Catholic pastors, charity prompted him to go to their assistance. This led to his being appointed to take charge of the mission at Winchester. The See of Rome, in reward of the labours of this champion of the Church, elevated him, in 1803, to the episcopacy of Castabala, constituting him Vicar Apostolic of the midland district. He was an active and, we have no doubt, a

* ——— Lay her in the earth;—
And from her fair and unpolluted flesh
May violets spring!—SHAKSPEARE.

sincerely religious prelate. His zeal betrayed him into frequent instances of bigotry, with regard both to members of his own communion and to Protestants. The controversy in which he was engaged at the time of his death, relating to Bishop Halifax and other Protestant Divines having died Roman Catholics, is by no means honourable to him, and is in reality a proof that his statements ought to be verified before they are trusted. His learning and talents were considerable; and his controversial dexterity and skill have been rarely equalled. The following are his principal publications:

An Historical and Critical Inquiry into the Existence and Character of St. George, Patron of England, &c., in a Letter addressed to the Right Hon. George, Earl of Leicester, President of the Antiquarian Society. London, 1792.

The History, Civil and Ecclesiastical, and Survey of the Antiquities of Winchester. 4to. Winchester, 1798.

Letters to a Prebendary, being an Answer to Reflections on Popery, by the Rev. J. Sturges, LL.D., Prebendary and Chancellor of Winchester, &c. 8vo. London, 1800.

Authentic Documents relative to the Miraculous Cure of Winifred White, of Wolverhampton, at St. Winifred's Well, alias Holywell, in Flintshire, June 28, 1805. 8vo. London, 1805.

An Inquiry into certain Vulgar Opinions concerning the Catholic Inhabitants and Antiquities of Ireland, in a Series of Letters addressed from that Island to a Protestant Gentleman in England. Second Edition. Revised and Augmented. 8vo. London.

A Treatise on the Ecclesiastical Architecture of England during the Middle Ages. London, 1811.

The End of Religious Controversy—addressed to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of St. David's. 8vo. London, 1818.

Vindication of "The End of Religious Controversy" from the Exceptions of the Right Rev. Dr. Thomas Burgess, Bishop of St. David's, &c. London, 1822.

May 19, after a few days' illness, in the 67th year of his age, the Rev. ROBERT BURNSIDE, for upwards of forty years pastor of the church of Sabbatarian Baptists, formerly meeting in Red-Cross Street, but more recently at Devonshire Square. He was educated at Marischal College, Aberdeen, on Dr. Ward's Foundation, and was engaged for the greater part of his life in private tuition. He was zealous for the observance of Saturday or the Seventh Day, as the Sabbath, and continued to preach on this day to a congrega-

tion of not more than a dozen persons. An endowed place of worship, in Mill Yard, Goodman's Fields, which had been for several years shut up, was lately reopened by Mr. Burnside and his friends, and he had proposed delivering a course of lectures in defence of his distinguishing tenet as a Sabbatarian, but his life was not spared for more than one lecture. He published, besides single sermons, "Essays on the Religion of Mankind," in 2 Vols. 8vo., and "Table Talk," in 3 Vols. 12mo. In other points he ranked with the Calvinistic Baptists.

June 7, at *Bodryddan, Flintshire*, WILLIAM DAVIS SHIPLEY, the Very Reverend the Dean of St. Asaph, in his 81st year.

— 21, at *Norwich*, Mr. THOMAS MARTINEAU, the head of a numerous, respectable family in that city, and one of the oldest and most valuable members of the Octagon congregation.

— 23, in *Staffordshire*, in consequence of an accident in travelling, at an advanced age, Mr. JOHN TAYLOR, of Norwich, looked up to as a patriarch by a wide-spread and respectable family and by the congregation specified in the last memorial of death, which has thus within a few days been deprived of two of its supports and ornaments. [We hope to be allowed to insert some further account of Mr. Taylor.]

Additions and Corrections.

EBENEZER JOHNSTON, Esq. (p. 297).

The ordination of the Rev. Ebenezer Johnston, at Lewes, took place on the 21st of July, 1742. In the Obituary narrative relating to his excellent son, the late Ebenezer Johnston, it is said, or rather supposed as exceedingly probable, that Mr. Mason, then of Dorking, took a part in the pulpit services of that solemnity. It is now ascertained by an authentic memorandum, preserved at Lewes, fully to be relied on, that the just-mentioned minister was on that occasion actually engaged in the pulpit, as were the ministers mentioned in the narrative as so engaged, and others. Mr. Jennings, not till afterwards Dr. Jennings, delivered the sermon from 2 Cor. iv. 5, and Dr. Doddridge gave the charge. The Rev. William Johnston was then settled at Wisbeach, which place he sometime after left for Tunbridge Wells, where he spent the remaining part of his life, and sustained till his death the office of pastor to the Dissenting congregation on Mount Sion.

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC.

RELIGIOUS.

Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty.

THE Fifteenth Anniversary of this Society was held on Saturday, May 13, at the City of Loudon Tavern. The most Honourable the Marquis of LANSDOWNE was in the Chair, supported by Lord DACRE, who had presided on a former Anniversary.

Mr. JOHN WILKS rose, and was received by the Meeting with enthusiastic cheering, which having at length subsided, he commenced an address that continued for more than three hours. After an exordium, in which he pathetically alluded to friends of the Society taken away by death during the past year, he proceeded to a case described at the last meeting which made a deep impression. It was a refusal to celebrate the marriage ceremony between David Davids and Mary Jenkins at the parish of Llangain in Wales: the clergyman refusing to perform the service of the Church, unless the female would forego her faith, and would consent to be introduced into what *he* called the Christian Church, by the baptismal rite to be administered by him. I will not detail the circumstances, but only remind you that the hoary father of the young woman, with the independence which honours the mountaineer and ancient Briton, ventured to express, in no measured tones, his disappointment and disgust. For that conduct the clergyman prosecuted him in the Bishops' Court at Carmarthen, for brawling on the occasion. The Committee pledged themselves to have this clergyman taught his duty by law, and that the shield of this Society should be spread over the peasant's head. They have therefore removed the suit into the Arches Court of Canterbury, in this metropolis, where an enlightened judge will preside, and justice will result.

Having detailed some minor grievances, in relation to Sunday-tolls, and the assessment of Chapels to the Poor-Rates, Mr. Wilks proceeded to take notice of some applications on the subject of rates for building New Churches. As Dissenters, he said, we do not complain that we have to erect and to repair the edifices, whether lofty or humble, which we dedicate to religious adoration. We do not complain that we have to support the ministers we prefer, and who amply

repay us by intellectual and moral benefits, and leave us their debtors in an amount no fortunes can supply. No; we feel no sorrow—we utter no complaint; it is our honour and delight. But really, when we find, that after paying dues, and fees, and tithes, and rates for ministers we do not know, and buildings we never visit; and after contributing to the £1,500,000 voted exclusively for the erection of New Churches for the accommodation of the members of the Established Church; we are further compelled to pay, long and largely, additional charges as New Church rates, in our respective parishes, for the repairs and expenses attendant on New Churches, we cannot but writhe under the new burdens, and our withers become wrung. But however grievous, such burden must be borne. From the Rev. Mr. Fry, the Unitarian minister of Kidderminster, an application on this subject was received. He felt as I describe. But it was not even of the new church—chapel, and the heavy rate alone that he complained. The introduction of organs and ornaments to please the taste or vanity of parish officers, and the requirement of rates from Dissenters for those objects, especially excited his displeasure. Those matters—those painted trifles—and gaudy decorations neither he nor myself could deem essential for the humble, spiritual, acceptable worship of the Infinite Supreme—He who disdaineth not to irradiate the humblest heart, and who sees no glory in the splendour of a thousand suns! Or if the gilded pageant could please some beings, he thought that they who were so pleased should not require him and the Dissenters to pay the purchase for the toy. As the law, however, gave the Vestry the power to sanction such expense, and he had not resisted the measure at the Vestry, the Committee could only advise acquiescence in the rate. Many such evils Dissenters might obviate or lessen, if they more frequently attended public Vestries, and asserted, as they well and usefully might do, their parochial rights. At Vestries, inhabitants are entitled to attend. There officers are chosen—expenses ordered—poor and church rates are imposed—and if Dissenters did not heedlessly neglect attendance, they might often crush in the bud those evils which, when matured, form a spreading plant which no time nor labour can uproot.

On demands of Easter Offerings many applications have been made. One of

those cases occurred at Dolgelly, in Merionethshire. A letter from Dudley states, that within the last month, even in these times, twenty persons, wretched in poverty, have been summoned up for arrears of these Easter dues, before the very Clergyman (though not a magistrate) by whom the claim was made. One poor old man, eighty-five years old, was summoned for two years' dues at 4*d.* each year! Another poor man was summoned for three years' dues, at 4*d.* each year, and then in the account came the charge, "for your daughter" 2½*d.* each year, making 7½*d.* But this was not all, for the person whose arrears for three years amounted to 1*s.* had 4*s.* to pay for expenses! Finally, however, the poor old man did obtain indulgence. After trembling before the judgment-seat, and hearing many threats of proceedings that should cost at least 20*l.*, his poverty and age were such advocates, that he was allowed to pay the Easter dues with the addition of four hundred per cent. for costs by moderation, at instalments of 6*d.* every week! and yet the clergyman was not a magistrate, and his conduct was illegal. The law does not allow the demand after two years, and the clergyman has rendered himself amenable to punishment at the instance of any person who may inform against him.

As to *Mortuary Fees*, two cases had occurred. These old exploded demands also are little in amount: in vexation only are they great. In parishes where they have been claimed since the reign of Edward V. they may now be claimed, and the clergyman is entitled to 6*s.* 8*d.* or 3*s.* 4*d.* on the death of a parishioner, according to his rank. But to support the claim, the clergyman must prove that from time immemorial the demand has been allowed, and which he rarely can perform. During the past year, the Rev. William Marshall, of Newport Pagnell, whose name will be long remembered as the clergyman who apprehended two men, and had them sent to Aylesbury gaol, because they dared to knock at his door, not knowing it was the parsonage, to ask for a contribution towards a chapel they had built, untaught by experience, had claimed fees for a corpse interred in the Burial-ground of the Dissenting Meeting-house within that town—the fees claimed amounted to 5*s.* 6*d.* The items were as follows:—for going to Church, 2*s.*; for reading the Service, 1*s.*; for the Clerk's Fee, 6*d.*; and for the grave-digger, and the passing bell, 2*s.*; total 5*s.* 6*d.*; though the corpse went not to Church, though no service had been read, though no clerk

appeared, though no sexton had been employed, and though no passing bell was heard to toll. This claim for services unperformed excited some remonstrance; but the Rev. Clerk thought his conduct was perfectly correct, and that the Burial-ground of the Dissenting Meeting-house, though it relieved him from his labours, ought not to deprive him of his fees! Proceedings, however, being threatened, new information visited the clergyman, and the money was returned. At Leicester, Mrs. Davies, whose father and husband had been ministers, refused to pay 10*s.* demanded by the Rev. Mr. Barnaby, of St. Margaret's, Leicester, for Mortuary Fees on the death of a truly revered husband, torn from her arms and from her heart. Bold in a right cause, this lady was not to be intimidated, and that demand was withdrawn. As to these claims, it would be well if those who had power and influence, and who valued the honour of the Church, would remonstrate with the clergy. Even according to the Decrees of the Council of Trent, the opinions of many of the Fathers of the Catholic Church, many Learned Judges, and of Selden himself, these claims on the part of the clergy for the administration of any of the Sacraments, were considered simoniacal. They were originally accepted as gifts, and are now sought as grants. Let us teach our children how they yield to little innovations. Illegal claims generally creep on until the bowing, grateful minister assumes the iron brow and tone of right. The voluntary offerings of affection may be converted into a legal tribute, and that which had first been proffered with kindest charity, may at last be extorted by the grasp of power.

Mr. Wilks then referred to some cases of Disturbances of Public Worship, and of Out-Door preaching, and came next to *refusals to bury the dead*.—You are aware that the clergy in various parts of the country have repeatedly refused to bury those who have not been baptized by ministers of the Established Church. On this subject the law is clear. Some doubts were entertained previous to a luminous decision by Sir John Nicoll in 1795, whether lay baptism had any validity. By Sir John Nicoll it was determined that lay baptism was valid, and that the ministers of the Established Church were bound to perform the rites of burial upon all those whom even laymen had baptized. Notwithstanding that decision, many clergymen have ever struggled, and still struggle, to withhold what their duty and the law require. At Child's Ercol, in Shropshire, the Rev.

Mr. Hodgkins declined to bury a child baptized by a Dissenting minister, the parents were therefore compelled to deposit the child in another and distant grave. In this case, however, ignorance rather than malevolence produced an effect which he now regrets, and which he assures us shall not recur. At Rudwick, in Sussex, a child named Etherington had been baptized by a Dissenting minister, and died. Application was made to the aged clergyman to officiate, but he refused. The parents gave him regular and convenient notice of the time they should attend, and they attended at the churchyard with their friends in sad procession. The clergyman, however, was determined in his refusal, and as the mourners passed along they saw him driving by in his chaise, heedless of their notice and their grief. The child was then taken nine miles to a Dissenting burial-ground, and there interred at great inconvenience and expense. To this clergyman we wrote. The result confirmed our experience, that the insolent are often timid, and this very man, when threatened with suspension from his living for his neglect, wrote to the minister connected with the Home Missionary Society, labouring in that district, "that he would attend and perform the customary service on the day he might appoint!" Resolved that an example should be made, the coffin was disinterred, brought back to the parish, and the burial service of the Church was read over the remains! At South Shields, the clergyman has refused to bury a child baptized by the Rev. Mr. Lawson of that place, unless he received the fees of baptism as well as of interment. What parents in such moments would withhold any demand? The fees were paid. Mr. Lawson was indignant, and interfered. An action was threatened against the clergyman for the recovery of the money; he offered to give Mr. Lawson back the money. "No, Sir," said he, "send it back yourself, and let all know that you had no right to do the evil you have done." There are, however, cases in which no efforts on the part of the Society can prevail, nor can we afford assistance to our members who complain. I refer to cases affecting a vastly extended body of Protestant Dissenters—our Baptist friends. Where children have been baptized by a Dissenting minister or by a layman, the law entitles them to burial, according to the ritual of the Established Church; but where persons die unbaptized, then, according to the present state of the English law, it is thought that no clergyman can be compelled to perform the service! This affects *several hundred thou-*

sand individuals, including many families of great opulence, intelligence and worth. On their behalf, we have, therefore, during the last few months, communicated with Lord Liverpool. The communication related to two points. The first was the power claimed by the clergy to refuse admittance to the corpse into the Church, and thus justify their omission of the biblical part of that most impressive composition which forms the Burial Service of the Established Church. This subject certainly appears to be involved in some obscurity. No legal decision has been pronounced, but some parts of the Rubric appear constructively to invest the clergyman with this invidious right. It must, however, be presumed, that it is an authority which the clergy ought not to possess, and as to which the Legislature should afford relief. The other and more important point related to that situation in which it has been stated, that all the Baptists throughout England and Wales unnecessarily are placed. This power to withhold the Burial Service from the unbaptized, we learn that they frequently exert.

At Llandulas, in North Wales, in the diocese of St. Asaph, the Rev. Mr. Hughes, the clergyman, refused interment to an infant six weeks old, the child of Baptist parents. At first he only refused himself to officiate; then he said, that it should not be buried; that prohibition, however, he recalled, and would allow the interment, provided the father and a friend brought the corpse at eight o'clock at night, (and this was in the month of December,) then without ceremony to be deposited in a certain part of the churchyard, where still-born infants are entombed! The parents would not comply with such gross indignities; they took their child to a Baptist burial-ground, nine miles distant. Another case had been communicated by Mr. Terrell, of Exeter, a most active and enlightened friend. At Islington, in Devon, a similar refusal had occurred. Oppression makes fools ingenious, and the timid brave. Determined that some funeral rite should be performed, fourteen yeomen and the Baptist minister stood outside the churchyard, and on its very verge, and the minister delivered an address and offered prayer. But even then they perhaps were trespassing, or if they stood on a church path, might be apprehended as breakers of the peace. And it is in England and in the nineteenth century these deeds are done! Is it not high time, indeed, that this Society and the Legislature interfere? The clergy should either themselves officiate, or permit the ministers and friends to conduct the service. Yet our illustrious

Chairman is aware of the alarm this proposal will excite. If a prayer should be offered up, if the monitory or consoling language of a Christian minister to surrounding mourners should be heard, Oh! then the cry would be loud-sounding that the Church was now in danger, and that its antique towers were about to be battered down by violence or undermined by fraud. Lord Liverpool has not, however, discouraged hope as to redress, and we trust that next Session the Baptists will be relieved from the oppression of which they well complain.

Amongst many *Miscellaneous* topics we can follow Mr. Wilks in only two or three.

At York, the Secretary to the Archbishop has given much trouble to Mr. Pritchett, an intelligent and highly respectable Dissenter, respecting the registry of Chapels in that diocese, but the intimation of an application to the Archbishop, or to the superior Courts, has soon supplied a remedy for that complaint.

In many places Dissenters have justly complained that the Poor's Rates have been made a mean of persecution. At Wittering, in Leicestershire, a poor man, who had allowed preaching in his cottage, was threatened to be deprived of all assistance. In other places, the same method has been adopted by persons of high rank to obtain the same result. But the plan adopted by Lord Rolle, in Devonshire, is most decisive, and for the information of all bigots, may be well revealed. He actually inserts a special provision in his leases, that the lease shall immediately be forfeited if any preaching be allowed. (The lease was produced and the sentence read.) Oh! liberal Lord Rolle! a British Nobleman! and an old man, too—trembling on the borders of the grave! Is not he forging fetters to bind posterity? Is not he planning that the spirit of intolerance shall descend with his estates as an hereditary heir-loom? Far be such a blot from any other escutcheon; and even by his successors may the blot be eternally removed!

The Isle of Man presents a theatre for new aggressions. Mr. Dalrymple had there established a private academy and Sunday-school in his own house, which the Bishop has attempted to suppress. Every thing relating to that island is involved in mystery. The Bishop claimed this power under some old Act of Tynwald, passed in 1705—and said that the Toleration Laws had no operation in the Isle of Man! If that be so, then the Legislature ought soon to interpose, nor suffer that little islet to form a dark spot unilluminated by the light which

should beam brightly over all regions subject to the British Crown.

In Canada, the Catholic religion was the religion of the State. After it became a British Colony, episcopacy was introduced. Presbyterians also became settlers, and an Act was passed to allow Protestants as well as Catholics to celebrate Marriages, Burials, and Baptisms. Subsequently, several Independent Baptists and Methodists became resident in the Colony, and for several years their ministers exercised these rights. As their numbers increased, the Chief Justice refused to grant books to their ministers, and denied their right under the statute. An appeal was made to the Courts of Law, by whom it was decided that Dissenters were not Protestants. The Methodists and Dissenters were precluded from the rights they had enjoyed! An act, supported by the Catholics, intended to remedy the evil, has, however, after a second attempt, passed the Legislature of Canada; but the Attorney General and Chief Justice protested, and prevented its final adoption, until it should be approved and confirmed by his Majesty's Government in England. Under these circumstances, the Canadians have requested this Society to interpose on their behalf: and we trust that our Government, who know the increasing trade of Canada, who desire its improvement, and who encourage emigration to increase its population and its strength, will not sanction there the introduction of intolerance, which will be more desolating than fires or inundations, than dreary winter, or American and Indian foes to those improving States.

The subject of Registration of *Baptisms* and *Births* is a point on which Dissenters and Methodists naturally feel a deep concern. It was long supposed that the registration of Births at Dr. Williams's Library, and of a Baptism by a Dissenting minister, was equal evidence of a Birth or Baptism with a Registration of a Baptism in a Parish Register by a minister of the Established Church. An act, now repealed, that passed and imposed a stamp duty on those registers of births and baptisms by Dissenters, confirmed the hope. But a contrary decision has been pronounced by the Court of Chancery as well as by the Ecclesiastical Courts. Great dismay has been consequently spread among Dissenting congregations throughout the country. That dismay is excessive, since such registers, although not equally availing with parochial registers, may materially assist as evidence in any cases of litigated claims. Yet it is highly important that other security should be obtained. Parochial registers, as far as

they extend to baptisms, are regarded as public records, and examined extracts from them are admitted as sufficient proofs on the matters to which they apply. But Dissenting registers and entries at the library of births are but secondary evidence, and the original books or entries must be produced, and other testimony must be given as to the signature of the parties and their identity to render them availing; and from which, in many cases, Baptists also, who never baptize their infants, are precluded from the benefit of parochial registers which extend only to the baptized. To obviate such inconveniences and meet the wishes of numerous congregations, the Committee have communicated with the Government, and sought the attention which the great body of Dissenters and Methodists are entitled to expect. Their sanction they thought desirable before any appeal was made to the Legislature for relief; and the liberal respect they have ever experienced from Lord Liverpool, Lord Bexley, and their ministerial friends, encouraged confident expectation of just support. In such application they felt more confidence, as in cases of settlement, entries of Baptism are not evidence of birth; as in a recent case Mr. Justice Bayley had decided that an entry of birth in a Register of Baptism was not evidence of birth; as the present entries of Baptism not only supply no proof of birth, but are much less useful to supply proofs of descent and identity than they might be made; and as all classes, whether Churchmen or Dissenters, are interested, that on this matter some improvements should occur. The remedy we propose, avoiding all interference with Registers of Baptisms, and thereby leaving clergymen and Dissenting ministers in possession of their present rights, is to obtain a voluntary registration of Births as a Civil and not Ecclesiastical affair. Such Registers are to contain ample information of the parents of the children, and the day of their birth, and, being duly verified and entered, shall be regarded as public records belonging to the State. Of those records, we propose that the Clerks of the Peace in their several cities and counties should have the care, and that for certain small fees they should make the entries and supply copies and information in forms to be prescribed. As the Registry would be optional, no person could be thereby vexed, and as no interference was contemplated with baptisms, no ecclesiastical persons could complain, and security might be obtained by parents as to their children, which would lessen future litigation and relieve the anxious heart.

Lord Liverpool made no objection to the measure and appeared willing to lend it his concurrence, but at this time intimated that it belonged particularly to the province of the Secretary of State for the Home Department. An interview was obtained with Mr. Peel. It cannot be said that he greeted the suggestion with the same cordiality as Lord Liverpool had shewn. Mr. Peel hesitated much about the expediency of the proposed alteration; he said he should be obliged to consult many persons, declined to legislate on a matter so important without much consideration, but at last doubted whether a universal Registry of Births should not be required and by compulsory enactments be enforced. The result was, however, a promise that when Parliament was dissolved, he would give the matter more attention, and either bring forward a Bill in the next Session or apprise the Society of the objections he entertained. That communication the Committee will await, and expect that propositions so just and needful cannot be repelled; but if that expectation be disappointed, they must apply to the Parliament for their protection, and trust that although they may meet some rocks and shallows in their course, and find some ebbing currents or opposing gales, they shall obtain the co-operation of the Deputies and all their Rev. friends, and be enabled to steer the vessel securely into port.

In conclusion, Mr. Wilks took a general view of the cause of liberty throughout the world. He thus pleaded the cause of the Greeks:

Some, forsooth, say they are insurgents; but are they on that account to be condemned? What is light? What the Reformation? What our glorious Revolution? What Creation? Are they not all insurrections? What is light but an insurrection against darkness? What was the Reformation but an insurrection against Popery? What the Revolution but an insurrection against a race of wretched tyrants? What Creation but an insurrection against chaos? And what was Alfred when he chased away the Danes? What were the Barons who on the plain of Runnymede extorted from the reluctant John the great Charter of our Rights? All, all insurgents.

Mr. W. finished his speech by saying,—Throughout the world, and in that assembly, the love of liberty did not decline. Many whom I see around me have grown grey, devoted to her cause; and the manly bosoms of our vigorous youths beat gladly at her name. Still shall it be taught by our pastors to the people, and by our matrons to their noble boys: and if we might raise a temple

to any thing below the skies, to liberty the altar should be reared; and if the inscription, or our purpose be inquired, I will reply in the language of the immortal Locke, "LIBERTY, ABSOLUTE LIBERTY, JUST AND TRUE LIBERTY, EQUAL AND IMPARTIAL LIBERTY, is what we need." He sat down amidst long and enthusiastic plaudits.

Quarterly Meeting of the Hull, Lincoln, and Thorne Association.

ON Wednesday, the 29th of April, a Quarterly Meeting of the Hull, Lincoln, and Thorne Association, was held at Thorne. The Rev. J. Platts, of Doncaster, preached in the morning from the words, "*He that doeth righteousness is righteous*;" and the Rev. Dr. Philipps, of Sheffield, in the evening, from the words, "*What think ye of Christ?*" The services, which were highly interesting, were heard with the most profound attention by large and respectable congregations. In the interval of the services the members of the Association and friends to the Unitarian cause dined together, and were excited to increased zeal in the great cause of truth and virtue by the animated addresses of several gentlemen present, but chiefly by the encouraging prospects of the Unitarian congregation at that place. It will be gratifying to those friends who so liberally supported the congregation in their first exertions, and enabled them to erect a chapel for the worship of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, to learn that the able and well-directed labours of the Rev. W. Duffield, who has lately settled amongst them, are meeting with all the success which those previously acquainted with the Christian zeal and energy of this gentleman would have anticipated. The congregation is already much increased, and an active and zealous spirit is excited.

Ditchling Annual Meeting.

THE Annual Meeting of the General Baptist Church at Ditchling, was held on Sunday, the 7th instant; on which occasion, the Rev. J. Briggs, of Bessel's Green, Kent, preached two very acceptable discourses to a crowded and attentive audience.

After the services of the day, tea being provided, as usual, in the Chapel, 165 persons sat down to partake of it; and the scene presented was of the most enlivening description.

The social harmony and cheerfulness that pervaded the whole company during the day, goes far to prove the valuable tendency of meetings of this description,

by shewing that they are eminently calculated to excite and to keep alive those social, which as well as religious, feelings are necessary to the advancement of our common cause.

After a short but appropriate address from Mr. Briggs, the company separated at six o'clock.

D.

Ditchling, May 23, 1826.

Dudley Double Lecture.

ON Whit-Tuesday, May 17, was the Anniversary of the Double Lecture at Dudley. The Rev. John Small, of Cosely, conducted the devotional service. The Rev. Richard Fry, of Kidderminster, preached, on Heb. ii. 3, "*How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?*" and the Rev. John Kentish, of Birmingham, on 1 Tim. iv. 13—15: "*Give attendance to reading. Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them.*" Ten ministers were present, and the congregation was unusually numerous. The Rev. John Small, and the Rev. Timothy Davis, of Oldbury, were nominated as the preachers at the next Anniversary.

J. H. B.

Unitarian Chapel, Middleton, Lancashire.

IN Middleton, on Sunday, June 4th, was re-opened for Unitarian worship a chapel which had been occupied by the Methodists. Two sermons were preached on the occasion, that in the afternoon by the Rev. J. G. Robberds, and that in the evening by the Rev. J. R. Beard. Middleton is one of the stations which are supported by the Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Missionary Society. The prospects which this station presents to the friends of liberal Christianity are highly gratifying. The congregation already consists of thirty families, and it supports a Sunday-school consisting of one hundred and thirty children. The room in which the Society had hitherto met was singularly inconvenient, and this it is believed has caused many to abstain from the public worship of the one God, who are expected to avail themselves of the convenience afforded by the chapel now opened. The audiences were exceedingly good—in the afternoon the chapel was very well attended, and in the evening crowded to excess. Both the services were highly interesting and listened to with the deepest attention. In regarding either the worldly circumstances of the congregation, or their religious feelings, one could not fail to be reminded of the highly interesting accounts that have been published of the state of Unitarianism in Welburn, near

York. May both societies increase in numbers and improve in godliness, and thus furnish another demonstration that to the poor now, as in primitive times, Unitarianism "is the power of God unto salvation"! Many friends attended the services from Manchester, who were greatly delighted with the proceedings of the day, and while they gladly bore their testimony to the zeal and piety of this congregation, could not but feel an anxious desire that both might remain in their present vigour, and cause their beneficial influences to be extensively felt among the inhabitants of Middleton. A controversy between the Unitarians and the Calvinists has for some time been going on in this town. Mr. Wake, a Trinitarian minister, preached against the Unitarians and aspersed their characters. This occasioned a letter to be written by John Buckley, a weaver, inviting Mr. Wake to a conference. Mr. Wake disdainfully refused. A correspondence ensued between Mr. Wake, John Buckley, and another weaver, Peter Cocker. Subsequently the correspondence was published. On this a pamphlet was issued, as it is believed, by the successor of Mr. Wake. This has met with a reply from the pen of Mr. Beard, in a pamphlet entitled, "A Vindication of the Conduct of the Middleton Unitarians and the Supreme Deity of the Father asserted."* The Committee of the Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Missionary Society, under whose patronage these exertions for the promotion of vital and primitive Christianity are made, respectfully solicit the aid of the friends to free inquiry, the education of the rising generation and the evangelizing of the poor. Assistance by advice, co-operation, pecuniary contributions, or donation of books and tracts will be acknowledged by T. B. W. Sanderson, Esq., Treasurer, Manchester; Edward Shawcross, Esq., Deputy Treasurer; the Rev. J. G. Robberds, Chairman of the Committee; the Rev. J. R. Beard, Secretary.

Removals, &c., of Ministers.

JOHN CROPPER, A. M., of Glasgow College, has accepted the unanimous invitation of the congregation assembling in the Unitarian Meeting-house, *Moor Lane, Bolton*, to become pastor of the society.

HENRY GREEN, A. M., having completed the term of his engagement with the Unitarian congregations of *Newcastle-*

* Sold by R. Hunter, St. Paul's Church-yard.

under-Line and Hanley, has signified his intention of leaving them at the end of July.

THE REV. JOHN REYNELL WREFORD, late of Manchester College, York, has accepted an unanimous invitation from the congregation of the *New Meeting-house, Birmingham*, to undertake the pastoral office in conjunction with the Rev. *John Kentish*.

Birmingham, June 16, 1826.

London Missionary Society.

THE Thirty-second Anniversary of this Society was held from Monday the 8th to Friday the 12th of May. The following is the *State of the Funds*.

Receipts of the Year.

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---------|----|----|
| General Contributions .. | £32,578 | 6 | 8 |
| Legacies..... | 1,967 | 15 | 8 |
| Dividends on Stock | 1,033 | 3 | 10 |
| | 35,579 | 6 | 2 |
| For Widows' Fund | 287 | 9 | 0 |
| For Mrs. Smith..... | 974 | 3 | 5 |
| For Anglo-Chinese College | 323 | 2 | 6 |
| Total£ | 37,164 | 1 | 1 |

Payments of the Year.

| | | | |
|---|---------|----|----|
| On Account of Missions .. | 38,860 | 14 | 10 |
| Anglo-Chinese College.... | 1,459 | 16 | 0 |
| Invested for Widows and Orphans..... | 2,530 | 0 | 0 |
| Balance paid to Mrs. Smith | 48 | 17 | 4 |
| Balance on account of Sunday Special Objects | 11 | 9 | 1 |
| | £42,910 | 17 | 3 |

The sums of 1750*l.* 3 per cent consols, and of 1750*l.* 3 per cent reduced, have been transferred from the Society's Stock into the names of Trustees to provide an annuity as agreed upon for Mrs. Smith.

Collections at Annual Meeting.

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|----|----|
| Poultry Chapel | £77 | 14 | 3 |
| Surrey Ditto | 404 | 18 | 2 |
| Tabernacle | 101 | 10 | 0 |
| Queen Street Chapel | 178 | 16 | 0 |
| Tottenham Court..... | 91 | 1 | 3 |
| Church | 121 | 16 | 2 |
| Orange-Street Chapel | 70 | 3 | 0 |
| Kennington | 43 | 14 | 0 |
| Sion | 70 | 10 | 0 |
| Tonbridge..... | 33 | 3 | 0 |
| Silver Street..... | 40 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1233 | 5 | 10 |
| Total collected last year | 1134 | 18 | 0 |
| In favour of this year | £98 | 7 | 10 |

Services at Buxton Chapel for the Season.

- July 23. Rev. Benj. Carpenter, Nottingham.
 30. Wm. Hincks, Liverpool.
 Aug. 6. Francis Baker, Bolton.
 13. Edward Hawkes, Pendlebury, near Manchester.
 20. Jacob Brettell, Rotherham.
 27. J. G. Robberds, Manchester.
 Sept. 3. Edward Higginson, Derby.
 10. James Brookes, Hyde, Cheshire.
 17. B. R. Davies, Chowbent.
 24. Robt. Smethurst, Monton.
 Morning service at eleven o'clock, evening service at half-past six.

THE Annual Meeting of the *Southern Unitarian Society* is appointed to be held at Newport, Isle of Wight, on the 5th

July. The Rev. W. J. Fox, of London, is expected to preach on the occasion.

THE Annual Meeting of the *Western Unitarian Society* will be held at Taunton, on Wednesday, the 19th of July. The Rev. W. J. Fox has engaged to preach on the occasion.

The Annual Meeting of the *Sussex Unitarian Association* will be holden at Lewes, on Wednesday, July 26, 1826, when the Rev. Benjamin Mardon, of Maidstone, is expected to preach before the Society.

T. W. HORSFIELD, Secretary.

Coward's Trust.—The Rev. THOMAS RUSSELL, A. M., is appointed Trustee to this Charity, in the room of the late Mr. Townsend.

NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

An Exposition of the Historical Writings of the New Testament, with Reflections subjoined to each Section. By the late Rev. Timothy Kenrick. With a Memoir of the Author. Second Edition. 3 Vols. 8vo. 17. 11s. 6d.

Lessons intended for Introduction into Schools and Cottages, consisting of Descriptive Hymns. 1s. 6d., in Foolscap Open Sheets, adorned with appropriate Prints.

A Collection of Sacred Music for Churches and Chapels. Consisting of Fifty-two Psalm and Hymn Tunes, for Four Voices: Twelve of which are Original (Six by the Author, and Six composed expressly for this Work by his Friends Mr. Clifton, Mr. V. Novello, Mr. E. Taylor, and Mr. S. Wesley, &c.) and Forty of Established Celebrity, with New Harmonies: Composed and Arranged for the Organ or Piano Forte. By Joseph Major. 10s. 6d.

A Collection of Ancient and Modern Psalm and Hymn Tunes, with Figured Bases, Selected and Dedicated to his Pupils, by N. Binfield. [The Profits arising from this Publication will go in aid of the Funds for the Support of the Charity Schools of the Gravel-Pit Chapel, Hackney. The words from a Selection of Psalms and Hymns by the Rev. R. Aspland.] 7s. 6d.

A Collection of Original Airs and Harmonized Tunes, adapted to Hymns of various Measures, with an Accompani-

ment for the Organ and Piano Forte. By the Rev. W. H. Havergal, M. A. 10s. 6d.

Exercises on Latin Syntax, adapted to Zumpt's Grammar. To which are added, Extracts from the Writings of Muretus. By the Rev. John Kenrick, M. A. 8vo. 5s.

Select Satires of Juvenal, with Explanatory Notes; for the Use of the Junior Department of the Royal Military College. By W. Hancock, M. A., one of the Masters. 12mo. 5s.

A New Greek and English Lexicon; principally on the Plan of the Greek and German Lexicon of Schneider: the Words Alphabetically Arranged, distinguishing such as are Poetical, of Dialectic Variety, &c., with Examples. By James Donnegan, M. D. Medium 8vo. 17. 11s. 6d.

Select Orations of Cicero, with English Notes and a Vocabulary of the Roman Magistrates and Laws, &c. &c. For the Use of Students. By Richard Garde, A. B., of the Middle Temple. 18mo. 4s.

Typographia: an Historical Sketch of the Origin and Progress of the Art of Printing, with Practical Directions for conducting every Department in an Office: also a Description of Stereotype and Lithography. By T. C. Hansard. Royal 8vo. 37. 3s. Extra Boards.

A Translation of the First Book of the Georgics of Virgil, in Blank Verse; with Notes, Critical and Explanatory. By Robert Hoblyn, M. A. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Lessons in Criticism to William Ros-

coe, Esq., F. R. S., and to a Quarterly Reviewer. By the Rev. W. L. Bowles, A. M. 8vo. 7s.

Hermes Philologus; or, an Inquiry into the Causes of Difference between the Greek and Latin Syntax: containing a Dissertation on the Origin of these Languages. By Francis Adams, A. M., Surgeon. 3s. 6d.

Etymons of English Words. By the late John Thomson, M. R. I. and A. S., Private Secretary to the Marquis of Hastings, in India. 4to. 18s.

Illustrations of English Philology; consisting of a Critical Examination of Dr. Johnson's Dictionary and Remarks on Mr. Dugald Stewart's Essay "On the Tendency of some late Philological Speculations." By Charles Richardson, Esq. 4to. 1l. 5s.

The Contests of the Twelve Nations; or a View of the different Bases of Human Character and Talent. 8vo. 18s.

A Commentary on the Prophecies of the New Testament, with an Epitome of Ancient History, Sacred and Profane, by way of Prelude, printed with the Text. By John Webb Cole. 2 Vols. 8vo. 1l. 1s.

Letters from the East, written during a recent Tour through Turkey, Egypt, Arabia, Palestine, Syria and Greece. By John Carne, Esq., of Queen's College, Cambridge. 8vo. Coloured Plate. 18s.

Personal Narrative of Travels in Columbia. By Baron De Humboldt. From the Original French. By Helen Maria Williams. Vol. VI. 8vo. Map. 1l. 5s.

Travels in Norway, Sweden, Denmark. &c. By William Rae Wilson, Esq., F.S.A. 8vo. Engravings.

Sketches in Wales; or, a Diary of Three Walking Excursions in that Principality, in 1823-4-5. By G. J. Freeman, LL.B. 8vo. 15 Views. 1l. 1s.

Recent Discoveries in Africa, made in the Years 1823 and 1824, by Major Denham, Captain Clapperton, R. N., and the late Dr. Oudney. 4to. Maps and Engravings.

A Dissertation on the Pageants or Dramatic Mysteries anciently performed at Coventry by the Trading Companies of that City. By Thomas Sharp. 4to. Numerous Plates. 3l. 3s. boards. 6l. 6s. large Paper.

A Note on the Suppression of Memoirs announced by the Author in June 1825; containing numerous Strictures on Contemporary Characters. By Sir Egerton Brydges, Bart. 7s. 6d.

A Mission to the East Coast of Sumatra in 1823, under the Direction of the Government of Prince of Wales's Island. By John Anderson, Esq. 8vo. Plates and Maps. 16s.

The Eccentric Traveller. 4 Vols. 12mo. 44 Engravings. 36s.

An Historic Outline of the Greek Revolution, with a few Remarks on the Present State of the Affairs of that Country. By William Leake, late Lieut.-Col. in the Royal Artillery. 8vo. Map. 7s. 6d.

The History of Seyd Said, Sultan of Muscat, together with an Account of the Countries and People on the Shores of the Persian Gulf, particularly of the Wahabees. By Shik Mansur, a Native of Rome. 8vo. 12s. Extra Boards.

Memoirs of the Margravine of Anspach. Written by Herself. In 2 Vols. 8vo. Portraits. 1l. 8s.

Adventures of a Young Rifleman, in the French and English Armies, during the War in Spain and Portugal, from 1806 to 1816. Written by Himself. Post 8vo. 9s. 6d.

The Life and Writings of Bishop Hall; with a View of the Times in which he lived. By John Jones, M. A., Perpetual Curate of Cradley. 14s.

Brambletye House, or Cavaliers and Roundheads. A Novel. By one of the Authors of the "Rejected Addresses." 3 Vols. Post 8vo. 1l. 11s. 6d.

The Story of Isabel. By the Author of "The Favourite of Nature," &c. 3 Vols. 12mo. 1l. 4s.

The Last Man. A Romance. By the Author of "Frankenstein." 3 Vols. Post 8vo. 1l. 7s.

Characters Contrasted; or, Character modified by Education. By the Author of "The Mirven Family." Foolscap 8vo. 4s. 6d.

The Naval Sketch-Book; or Service Afloat and Ashore. With Characteristic Reminiscences, &c. By an Officer of Rank. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 18s.

Woodstock; or, the Cavalier: a Tale of 1651. In 3 Vols. By the Author of Waverley.

Tales Round a Winter Hearth. By Jane and Anna Maria Porter. 2 Vols. 12mo. 16s.

Gertrude de Wart; or, Fidelity until Death. Translated from the Original German of Appenzeller. By W. H. Vivian, A. M. Post 8vo. 6s.

De Foix; or, Sketches of the Manners and Customs of the Fourteenth Century. An Historial Romance. By Anna Eliza Bray, late Mrs. C. Stothard. 3 Vols. post 8vo. 1l. 7s.

Diary of An Ennuyée. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Sandoval, or the Freemason. A Spanish Tale. By the Author of "Don Esteban." 3 Vols. Post 8vo. 27s.

The Martyr; a Drama in 3 Acts. By Joanna Baillie. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Molech; or, the Approach of the Deluge. A Sacred Drama. By Wm. Bassett, M. A. 8vo. 5s. 6d.

Anne Boleyn; a Dramatic Poem. By

the Rev. H. H. Milman, Professor of Poetry in the University of Oxford. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

The Dutch Salmagundi of M. Paul Van Hemert. Translated by Lewis Jackson. Cloth Boards. 4s.

Letter of a Spaniard, the Author of Don Esteban, to the Editor of the Quarterly Review. 8vo. 2s.

A Copy of the Report made to His Majesty by the Commissioners to Inquire into the Practice of Chancery. 8vo. 6s.

A Letter to the Right Hon. Robert Peel, in Answer to Thomas Campbell's, Esq., Suggestions on a New London University. 1s. 6d.

The Progress of Colonial Reform; being a Brief View of the Real Advance made since May 15, 1823, in carrying into Effect the Recommendations of His Majesty, the Unanimous Resolutions of Parliament, and the Universal Prayer of the Nation, with respect to Negro-Slavery. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

The West-India Question practically Considered. 8vo. 3s.

Observations on Sound, shewing the Causes of its Indistinctness in Churches, Chapels, &c. By H. Matthews. 2s.

The Consequences of a Scientific Education to the Working Classes of this Country pointed out, and the Theories of Mr. Brougham on that Subject confuted, in a Letter to the Marquis of Lansdown. By a Country Gentleman. 2s. 6d.

A Defence of our Laws against Usury. By the Author of "The Bank of England Defended."

Sermons.

Four Lectures, delivered at Worship-Street Meeting-House, near Finsbury Square, London, during the Month of March, 1826, on The History—The Subjects and Mode—The Perpetuity—

and The Practical Uses of Christian Baptism. By John Evans, LL.D., Edwin Chapman, James Gilchrist, and David Eaton. 8vo. 6s. 6d. boards.

By J. G. Foyster, A. M., Minister of Trinity Chapel, Knightsbridge. 8vo. 9s.

Parochial Sermons. By W. Wilson, D. D., Rector of Church Oakley, Hants. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Single.

A Discourse on the supposed Existence of an Evil Spirit, called the Devil; and also, a Reply to the Observations of Mr. Wm. Carlisle, the ostensible Author of an "Essay on Evil Spirits," written in Opposition to the Discourse which was delivered in the Unitarian Chapel, Bradford. By N. T. Heineken. 8vo. 4s.

The pure Humanity of Christ shewn to be a Scriptural Doctrine: its gradual Corruption traced during the Times of the Apostles, and until the Completion of the generally-received Doctrines of the Trinity, in the Year 863: a Discourse, delivered at Newport, in the Isle of Wight, October 12, 1825, and afterwards at Portsmouth. By Russell Scott, Minister of the High-Street Chapel. 8vo. 3s. Boards.

A Lecture at Portsea, November 3, 1825, occasioned by some Allusions made in Clarence-Street Chapel to other Places of Worship, in the Address at a Missionary Prayer Meeting. With an Appendix of Letters relative to Missionary Occurrences. By John Brent. 8vo. 1s.

Importance of Religion to National Education: preached in the Abbey Church, St. Alban's, for the Blue Coat Charity School. By Thomas Barber, B. D. 8vo. 2s.

The Translation of Elijah considered: occasioned by the Death of Dr. Bogue. By John Hunt, of Chelmsford.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from J. Cundill; An Unitarian Christian; T. P.; Te Tace; and R. M. Y.

Will not the annual reports of the Unitarian Association answer the wish of the anonymous writer who is desirous of a list of Unitarian Chapels?

Mr. Ragland's communication, too long for a nearly exhausted subject, is left at the Publishers.

We are desired to say in reference to a statement of Mr. Edward Taylor's at the Dinner of the Unitarian Association (see p. 311), that it was made through mistake, owing to the accession of the Old Meeting, Birmingham, to the Association, not having been officially reported.

ERRATA.

Page 286, col. 2, line 1, for "Christians," read *persons*.

— 3, for "or," read *as*.

294, col. 2, line 24 from the bottom, read "the feast."

295, col. 1, line 16 from the top, for "called," read *call*.

— col. 2, lines 6, 7 from the bottom, for "object," read *subject*.

297, col. 1, line 3 from the top, read "devotional."