

THE MONTHLY REPOSITORY

AND

REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, No. III.

MARCH, 1827.

ON A SCIENTIFIC EDUCATION AND THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

THERE is nothing more remarkable in the history of Protestant England, than the neglect with which she has treated education.

It is well known, however, that of the wise men who have left us their sentiments on the subjects most interesting to human kind, there is hardly one who has not represented education as the principal source of all that is to be wished, or all that is to be deprecated, in behalf of our species. A few names may be adduced as a specimen. Plato, with whom may be joined his master Socrates, whose sentiments he professes to deliver, Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, Bacon, Milton, Fenelon, Locke, are among those who have treated of education as the first of all sublunary interests.

Of education, it is necessary to distinguish two species ; one, the object of which is, to impart the qualifications required for the ordinary purposes of life ; the other, the object of which is, to impart the higher qualifications of intellect, and train the human mind to its greatest excellence.

The qualifications chiefly aimed at by the first species of education, are reading, writing, and arithmetic. As these are of indispensable necessity for all the pursuits of life, except the very lowest, an adequate interest compelled the provision of means sufficient in extent to supply that large portion of the population by whom these qualifications were required.

The higher qualifications of intellect, the object of the second species of education, appear to have been regarded in England as interesting but a small part of the population ; and as worthy of very little care on the part either of the community or its rulers. Two seminaries only, for the higher branches of instruction, exist in England, the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. These, however, existed in Popish times ; they are the result of Popish wisdom and philanthropy ; and no addition, notwithstanding the increase of population, notwithstanding the invention of printing, the multiplication of books, and the progressive importance of literature, has been made to them since the Protestant era.

One thing deserves to be remarked with respect to schools. The revival of letters, as it is called, or the passion for the study of Greek and Roman literature, which was diffused in Europe after the fall of Constantinople, gave rise to the formation of grammar schools, in which the rudiments of the

Latin and Greek languages were taught, and the study of them carried on to more or less of proficiency.

Of these several were erected in England, mostly at private charge; and the example of these schools, which were resorted to in preference by the sons of the more wealthy classes, was followed by the more numerous schools set up by individuals, and destined for the several gradations of the middle ranks. In most of these, to reading, writing, and arithmetic, Greek and Latin were added, though the instruction in these languages seldom proceeded beyond an early stage.

With the exception of the individuals destined for the clerical profession, a few of those destined for the medical and legal professions, and a few of the sons of the nobility and higher gentry, who alone resort to the Universities, the education of Englishmen stopped at this point. For all those classes of Englishmen, in whose hands, with the above exception, the business of the country, in all its departments, from the farm and the shop to the highest enterprises of industry and the highest functions of Government, is placed, no better education has been provided than a knowledge of reading, writing, and accounts, a smattering of Latin and Greek, and of late years a little geography.

In this respect England exhibits a contrast, by no means honourable to its people or its government, with every other civilized country in the world. Scotland, for a population not a quarter of that of England, has more than double the number of Universities; and so situated that a great proportion of its middle classes may and do obtain the benefit of a liberal education.

It is well known that Germany abounds with universities; and that the means of instruction in the higher branches of knowledge are brought within the reach of a great proportion of the population, who do, in fact, reap the advantage of them. The same encomium belongs to Holland, Sweden, Denmark, and even Norway; though of most of these countries the youth could with so much facility resort to the Universities of Germany.

France, even before the Revolution, by its established universities, and by the institutes of education set on foot by the Jesuits and other religious orders, had the means of a superior education diffused so generally as to reach even the lower classes; a fact of which a very interesting illustration is afforded in the Memoirs of Marmontel, who, though born in a very low situation, obtained in his native province, along with others of the same level with himself, the education which enabled him, at an early period of life, to rank high among the literary men of his age and country.

The mode in which the Protestants in England have neglected education; and the mode in which the Dissenters from the Church of England have neglected it; compared with what appears to have been done for education by the Protestants in France, who were there the Dissenters from the Church, suggest reflections greatly to the honour of the Protestants in France, and very little to the honour of the Protestants and Dissenters in England.

The state of education among the Protestants in France, during the first century, and a little more, from the period of the Reformation, is proved to us chiefly by its results: these results are so extraordinary, that it is difficult to conceive how an education, so perfect as to produce the great men who sprung from that stock, could at that time, and in such circumstances, have been brought into existence. The appearance of one extraordinary man at almost any time, or in any country, may be accounted for by accidental circumstances. But the number of men, among the Protestants of France, who, about the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth cen-

ture, stood in the highest rank among the men of intellect and literature in the world, can only be accounted for by general causes; and is one of the most interesting facts in the history of human kind. The following list, made at the moment from memory, and of course very imperfect, will, nevertheless, suggest to our readers convincing evidence that it must have been a fine system of instruction to which so great an amount of intellectual superiority can be traced.

We shall place at the head of the list of the men of eminence, educated among the Protestants of France, the first name, perhaps, of his age, Bayle; then followed Beausobre, Basnage (Jacques), and Basnage (Henri), Lenfant, Barbeyrac, Claude, Dacier, Lefevre, Le Clerc, Saurin (Jacques), Saurin (Joseph), Abadie, Daillé, Bochart, Rapin, Laplacette, Pelisson, Jurieu; a catalogue which it is not easy to parallel, and which leads decidedly to the conclusion, that a system of education, equal to, if not better, than existed any where else in the world, was at that time established among the Huguenots of France; for it is not the mere number of the men of eminence which deserves to be considered, but the proportion which they bear to the population which produced them. If Catholic France, with a population ten times as great, or England, with a population five times as great, produced an equal number of eminent men, the fact would bear but one-tenth in the one case, and one-fifth in the other, of the wonderful character which belongs to the production of so much talent among the Huguenots of France.

Circumstances have, in several most important respects, been more favourable to England than to other countries in Europe. One of the most remarkable results of the peculiar circumstances of England has been the raising up of a middle class, placed sufficiently above poverty to be exempted from those continual cares and toils which preclude the exercise of intellect, and sufficiently below that degree of opulence which substitutes the influence of wealth for the effect of personal qualities; a middle rank, more numerous, compared with the whole population, than any other country, perhaps, has ever possessed; a middle rank, whose energy and ingenuity have been the exclusive source of all the power and all the glory of England; and to whom the community must look for all that hereafter is to improve their happiness, and maintain their rank as a portion of the human race.

Another result of the peculiar circumstances of England, which also we pronounce on the ground of irresistible reason most fortunate, is, that a very great and a continually growing proportion of her population are Dissenters from the Established Church. On the importance of this fact it is not at present our province to enlarge. We mention it in conjunction with the fact immediately before adduced, of the amount in England of the middle rank of the people, of whom the Dissenters form a very great proportion, in order to remark the lamentable coincidence of both in one fatal mistake; we mean, the neglect of education; that unaccountable contentment, which up to this moment they exhibit, in the want of the means of imparting to their youth the higher branches of instruction, and all the more eminent distinctions of the human mind.

Remarkable enough it is, that the middle classes, and the Dissenters, though they have displayed the strongest spirit of rivalry with those to whom they look respectively as objects of competition;—the men of the middle class striving to approach, or to equal those of the higher class in the possession of wealth, and all that distinguishes it, the magnificence of their establishments, the elegance of their mode of life, even their share in the Legislation and Government of the country; the Dissenters striving to exceed,

and often successfully, their competitors of the Church in their influence on the minds of the people, and in all the qualities and appearances which are calculated to gain that influence;—have never yet shewn any considerable disposition to excel, or even to equal, the higher ranks and the Church in the means of education.

To constitute this a subject of rational wonder, it is not necessary to suppose either that the means of superior instruction provided for the higher ranks and the priests of the establishment are good, or that one or the other make a good use of them. The supposition would want much of being true in either case. But it is true, that the higher ranks and the Church have institutions which profess to teach the higher branches of education; and that the middle ranks and the Dissenters have no such institutions. At this we are not contented to wonder, we are indignant and mortified; and if we did not think that the time was come when the reproach would be blotted out, we should be grieved beyond what we can easily express.

This neglect, or rather this self-abasement, is not to be excused on the pretext that the youth destined for the business of ordinary life have not time to devote to the higher branches of instruction, and are without the means of defraying the expense which it requires. The pretences are groundless. The time which is now wasted in learning but little, would be amply sufficient for the learning of much. It is not the want of years, at the age of fifteen or sixteen, which hinders a young man from understanding a difficult subject, but the want of the previous training which his years, had they been well employed, would have amply afforded. The years which are now given to a most imperfect education by the sons of the middle classes, the years which are spared from the money-getting occupations to which these young persons are destined, or might be spared with little disadvantage, in the most sordid sense, either to their parents or themselves, would suffice to lay the foundation of a good education; an education which would initiate them fully in the mysteries of science, which would give them a taste for mental pursuits, endow them with the power of unravelling intellectual complexities, and prepare them to improve the reach and the force of their minds, not only by every moment which, during the whole course of their lives, they could spare for study, but by the intellectual observation of the very objects about which their business is conversant, and the events, ordinary or extraordinary, which are passing around them.

And with respect to the supposed difficulty of expense, one of the great objections to education as now practised, is, that it is not only bad, but more expensive than the best education has occasion to be. Where the resort of pupils is considerable, a moderate fee to the professors constitutes an adequate reward; the use of a public library diminishes greatly the expense of books; the cost of living to pupils within a certain distance of the seat of education would be reduced to its lowest terms, by their living, as in populous towns would most commonly be the case, in the houses of their parents; but even where they could not live in the houses of their parents, if collegiate living were not a part (always a noxious part) of the order and discipline of the seminary, each pupil might provide accommodation for himself on as economical terms as his circumstances should require. The poorest would associate in the halls of instruction with the most opulent of their fellows, would partake with them in the reception of those ideas and the acquisition of those habits and tastes which would enable them in after life to place themselves on a level with the most exalted of their species; and in retiring to a modest apartment and simple fare, they would more naturally feel a

stimulus than a check to that intense application by which the means of future distinction would be the most effectually secured.

The time, we believe, is wholly gone by, when some confused and rude notion prevailed among the middle classes and the Dissenters, that the faculties on which success in life depended were very little connected with intellectual improvement, and that a cultivated understanding was by no means a recommendation to a minister of the gospel; that the conduct of the shop, the manufactory, and the farm, was rather injured than improved by any knowledge beyond that which the shop, the farm, and the manufactory yielded, and that the power of enforcing the truths of religion was enjoyed in greatest perfection by him who, possessing the knowledge of his Bible, was not encumbered with knowledge of any other kind.

Our persuasion that the benefits of knowledge are sufficiently appreciated by the classes whom it is now our principal purpose to address, will hinder us from entering into an analysis of the antiquated objections to which we have thus referred. The futility of them indeed is apparent. Do not such objectors allow that one man excels another, in the shop, in the farm, or the manufactory? Why, having observed what makes one man to excel, should we not convey the same faculty to as many as we can? Why, having observed what would raise the whole to a greater degree of excellence than that which is now attained by the most successful, should we not be anxious to bestow this advantage upon them? One man in the shop or the farm excels his neighbour in the shop or the farm, by what? By turning to better account the circumstances of the shop or the farm. How does one man turn them to a better, another to a worse account? By two things; by an attentive observation of the course of the circumstances as they pass; and by accurately judging of the nature and consequences of each circumstance.

That the habits and faculties of mind subservient to those important purposes are conveyed by education, is acknowledged by the objectors themselves as matter of general experience. Why else do they make preference of the youths who, in well-regulated families, are brought up to habits of attention, habits of thought and consideration, to youths who, in ill-regulated families, have been habituated only to examples of giddiness and precipitation, have been abandoned to their own inexperience, and have only dissipated their attention and time?

The grand advantage of the higher branches of education is to generate these master faculties, the faculties of keen and unwearied attention, and of prompt and unerring judgment, in a degree in which nothing else can impart them. It is well known that no exercise of the mind requires so intense and unbroken an application of *attention* as the mathematics and other superior sciences; and habits of attention are formed in the acquisition of such branches of knowledge, which are turned with singular advantage to the active pursuits of life.

On what, again, does *good judgment* of necessity depend? On a knowledge, assuredly, of the circumstances to be judged of. But in what line of business are these circumstances not so numerous, and connected with so many other circumstances, in other departments, that nothing but the highest education can give a competent knowledge of them all? It follows that the men who are without the advantage of such an education; who are obliged to form their judgments upon partial views; to draw conclusions from a certain number of circumstances, which form only a part of those upon which the result they are in quest of depends, because on account of the narrow views

which a narrow education implies, they are not acquainted with the rest; must be perpetually liable to the formation of wrong judgments; and wanting in those means of clear and correct judgment which the more enlarged knowledge derived from a liberal education can alone supply.

This is a difference fully recognised in the remarkable case of medicine; and as the reason extends to every system of action, which must be founded upon a system of knowledge complete or incomplete, the case of medicine ought to have suggested, much more generally than it has done, the difference between the quack artist and the instructed artist, in every department of human action. What is the difference between the quack doctor and the enlightened physician? Only this, that the one uses all the knowledge which a complete education bestows; and the other, without the knowledge derived from a liberal education, knows only what his own practice has suggested to him. Wherein, therefore, is he inferior to the well-educated physician? In this, that he is a less accurate judge of the circumstances on which health and disease depend. He looks only at a few circumstances, when the result depends on a great many. He knows not the connexions among circumstances; which it is above all things the business of an enlightened education to teach. The grand object of an enlightened education is to render familiar to the mind of the pupil the laws of nature; which is, in fact, to make him acquainted with the connexions among circumstances. By an enlightened education he is taught to combine these connexions into groupes; to give names to the groupes; to bring in this manner the greatest number possible of such connexions within the grasp of the mind, and to hold the knowledge of them always ready whenever there is occasion to use it.

There are few, we trust, of our readers who cannot make the application of this very obvious but most important doctrine to the general occupations of the middle rank of life. How many, for example, and recondite are the laws of nature which are concerned in the operations of him who cultivates the ground; the gardener, the farmer, the grazier! These laws of nature are the connexions among the circumstances on which the results pursued by him depend. These results will most assuredly be attained in greatest degree, and with greatest certainty, where the knowledge of the causes on which they depend, that is, the knowledge of those connexions above-mentioned, those laws of nature, is the most perfectly enjoyed. How many advantages, to mention but one of the numerous branches of knowledge with which the business of the farmer is connected, must he possess, who is fully acquainted with the laws of vegetation, who knows the structure and habits of plants, the elements, combinations and properties of soils, the food of plants, the circumstances which stimulate, and those which retard their growth, and who, knowing the powers with which he has to operate, has acquired habits of forming new combinations of those powers, adapted to the varying circumstances in which he has to apply them,—over the man who, without any knowledge but that of a blind routine, ploughs the ground and throws in the seed, merely because his father did so before him, and in the self-same manner; and who looks upon all improvement as a sort of injury to the dead, and hardly differing from a sin!

Without stopping to shew how many combinations are involved in the proceedings of the manufacturer and the merchant, and how impossible it is for any but the man who has all the knowledge which it is the business of the most complete education to bestow, to be master of all those combinations, and capable of turning them to his own advantage, we shall only speak of one other happy result of a generous education, and that in few words;

its effect in raising the mind ; the importance to a man's inward self of the feeling that he is an intellectual being ; that he has acquired something which takes him out of the class of inferior animals ; the animals, whose only guide is their senses, which have no range of ideas beyond the objects they have seen and touched and tasted, and are condemned to move in one unaltered and unimproving track from the beginning to the end of their career. Compared with the dull, the monotonous, the gloomy existence made up of this narrow circle of sensations and ideas, tiresome because perpetually recurring, and less and less exciting as the sensibility of the organs decays, how infinitely superior, even as a thing to be enjoyed, as a companion, as the inmate of the breast, the dearest and most important of all companions, counsellors, and friends, is the mind, so furnished, and so instructed, that it looks behind and before, and on every side ; the mind that can bring before its possessor the vast spectacle of nature, and the laws by which its mighty operations are guided, the astonishing powers which man has acquired over the events of nature, from observing philosophically the laws by which they are produced ; and the greater, unspeakably greater, power which he is yet destined to acquire, by the improved application of his intellect to the same important course of observation ; in fine, the mind which, not confined to the events and objects of the physical world, can trace the history of man, from his first rude beginnings, through the varied series of acts in the different regions of the earth, to that state of improvement in which, in the more favourable circumstances, he is now to be found ; and which can even anticipate his future history, and exult in the progressive happiness which, through a long train of improvements, he is yet to attain ! Such a mind is a perpetual feast. No source of pleasure, no antidote against misery, worthy to be compared with it, is found in the lot of man. If we did nothing by enlarged education but open this source of happiness, no exertion would be too great to confer the blessing on as many as possible of our fellow-men. But this is not all ; this is a small portion only of the inestimable advantages it bestows. This, and this alone, is the mind which marks the circumstances by which human improvement is accelerated or retarded, and exerts its powers for the aggrandisement of the one, the extinction of the other. This, and this alone, is the mind which takes rational cognizance of the institutions by which the order of society is more or less perfectly preserved, which marks the principles whence the good, the principles also whence the evil effects proceed, and can form a salutary notion of what ought to be done to render perfect the social institutions of man, and yield to him all the advantages which his union with his fellows is calculated to afford.

The last which we shall mention of the salutary effects of an instructed mind, is the improvement of private morals. No fact of human nature is better ascertained than this, that the classes of men whose range of ideas is the narrowest are the most prone to vice. Of the labouring classes it is commonly observed, that those who have the most monotonous occupations, who are confined to the constant repetition of a small number of operations, and whose senses and thoughts, for almost the whole of their waking hours, are chained to a few objects, are the most irresistibly drawn to intoxication. In truth, it is not easy for a man who has no experience of a mind sated with the endless repetition of the same few ideas, to have any conception of the pleasure which men with minds in that unhappy state derive from the stimulus of strong liquors. This it is which alone gives any variety to the irksome sameness of their minds, which imparts intensity for the time to images and feelings become dull from perpetual recurrence, and affords a

rapid flow of ideas to men whose habitual state of consciousness is the oppressive feeling, as it were, of a mental stagnation. Nor is this all. The monotony and dulness of this life gives a craving for excitement. Hence, the adventures of crime, the risks and dangers which attend it, are often to such people a positive pleasure, and they are hurried to the more daring violations of the order of society, to escape from the sameness of a vacant mind. As few things are more remarkable than the many points of resemblance between the extreme classes, the highest and lowest of all, none of these points is more worthy of attention than that which we are now considering, the narrow circle of ideas and its effect upon morals. In the narrowness of the circle of ideas no class comes so near the lowest of all as the highest. Few individuals in that class can endure books, or have profited by the ceremonies and forms of education through which they have passed. Being exempt from the cares of life, they have none of those ideas which the occupations of the middle classes force them to acquire. The circle of their ideas, therefore, is confined to their amusements and pleasures, the ceremonial of fashionable life, and the private history of a few scores of families which associate with one another only, which they call the world, and which in truth are the world to them, because they are acquainted with no other part of it. Horses and dogs and wine and women form but a narrow circle of ideas, even when the trappings of state are combined with them. After a time the monotony of this life becomes intolerable, and more intense excitement is required. Noblemen take to the gaming table for relief from the anguish of a monotonous mind; degraded workmen rob and steal. It is to a great degree from the same cause, that the chase becomes a passion to the one and poaching to the other.

With these convictions deeply stamped upon our minds, the reader will anticipate the opinion which we have formed of the projected institution for the higher branches of education in this metropolis. If this project be carried into execution as it may be, and as we think there is great reason to suppose that it will be, the foundation of the University of London will constitute an era, not only in the history of England, but in that of human kind. There is hardly an event which we can contemplate of greater importance to the species at large, than the right education of the middle classes of Englishmen. From them as from a centre would radiate knowledge and civilization to the ends of the earth, and with a rapidity and efficacy which no other place as a centre could possibly bestow.

The situation of London is altogether, in this point of view, without a parallel. The immense population and immense wealth of this metropolis exhibit a greater amount of persons who may be considered in the middle rank of life, than is to be found assembled in any other spot on the face of the earth. If the middle rank of Englishmen be the rank on which the prosperity and glory of England more peculiarly depend, that portion of the middle rank who are assembled in London, and in whose hands the active business of the capital is placed, is the portion who exert the greatest influence on the rest, and from whom the character of the whole is to a great degree derived.

Hitherto the means of education provided for this the most important of all portions of the British population, have been most imperfect; hardly more than sufficient to communicate those elementary acquirements which the lowest departments of business require. How much the country has suffered from this misfortune may be inferred from what we have already advanced. It is not possible to tell, nor easy to conceive, how far this nation would have

been advanced in all that constitutes the prosperity and happiness of human society, had a better education been earlier bestowed upon the population of London.

The University of London starts in circumstances which afford the highest promise. It is bound by no antiquated forms and rules. It receives its formation in an age of the highest illumination, and must be adapted to the circumstances and ideas of the time. It has for one of the very elements of its composition the most important of all elements, the principle of perpetual improvement. It will profit by its own experience, and by the lights which are shed upon the arts of instruction in every quarter of the globe : and whatever is found to be best for training the human mind to its highest state of excellence, it will hasten to make its own. An institute which is not progressive, for training the human mind, whose highest attribute it is to be progressive, is the worst and the most glaring of all absurdities.

The public possesses the highest possible security that the University of London will go on to deserve the approbation of the public ; because it is by the approbation of the public alone that it can exist. This is an advantage of unspeakable importance. The University of London possesses no independent funds on which it can subsist in luxury and splendour, whether it deserve the esteem or contempt of the community. The University of London, therefore, must act up to the highest ideas of the enlightened men of the age. Every individual connected with it will have the strongest interest in acting so as to command the approbation of the public. By the important principle of paying the professors wholly or in greater part by the fees of the pupils, the motive to make the instruction of every class admirable, in order that it may be admired, is raised to its greatest height. And as the only reward which the conductors and superintendents of this organ of instruction can propose to themselves, is the approbation of the public, and the spectacle of the great good which they produce, they are happily so situated that in order to obtain their reward they must effectually deserve it.

The commencement of the London University is fortunate in another respect ; that eminent men in all the walks of instruction abound ; that the metropolis is the great mart of intellect ; that men of talent are almost always eager to make considerable sacrifices in order to enjoy a residence in the capital ; that the teachers in the London University will be placed most conspicuously in the eye of the public, and that from all these circumstances the institution will have the inestimable advantage of choosing men eminently qualified for their duty in every department of instruction.

Having dwelt with so much satisfaction on the advantages resulting to the middle class as a body from the University of London, in which middle class the Dissenters form a conspicuous portion, we must not forget the advantages which are peculiarly afforded to the Dissenters.

It is a source of deep regret, that, up to this hour, no adequate means of an intellectual education have been provided for the teachers of religion among the Dissenters. Certainly, it is a matter of the greatest importance, that as many as possible of those who teach the people religion, who shape their moral sentiments, and apply, with all the skill of which they are masters, the hopes and fears of futurity to multiply acts of one kind, restrain acts of another kind, should be enlightened men, and possessed of the virtues of enlightened men. Well do we know, and these pages, we trust, are not wanting in proofs, that there are highly enlightened men among the Dissenting clergy. But this is the merit of the individuals. These are men who have educated themselves. Had the proper discipline and instruction

been afforded to all, the greater number would have been what the few at present are, and the few would have been still more distinguished.

That it might afford the benefit of its tuition to all classes of the people, and that it might avoid the evil, so much to be deprecated, of excluding from that advantage any portion of the community, the University of London was obliged to leave the teaching of religion to be provided for by each sect in conformity with its own views of that sacred subject. The obvious expedient, to which the plan of the University of London most happily adapts itself, is, that the leading denominations of Christians should establish theological schools, each for itself, consisting of as many chairs as it might deem expedient, with merely such a local connexion with the University, as might enable those who were studying at the one to resort conveniently to the other. Such young men as were destined for Dissenting ministers would begin with the literary and scientific studies of the University, and when the course of those disciplines was at its close, or drawing towards its close, they would resort to the appropriate schools of divinity, and would continue their attendance on such as they might choose of the lectures in the University, and their connexion with such of their former companions in those studies, as their mutual improvement might suggest.

We have spoken so largely of the benefits resulting to the middle class from the University of London, not that we are not satisfied that advantages will redound to the higher classes, as well by their attendance on its instructions, as by the improvements it will force upon the institutions to which they have hitherto resorted, and the demand for a higher degree of intellect which it will render general in the nation; but because it is a new thing for the middle classes to have the means of intellectual education brought within their reach. To them it is therefore a peculiar opening. It is a source of good which they may be expected especially to prize, not only because it has hitherto been shut up from them, but because they may draw from it with advantages peculiarly their own.

We see, and we see with satisfaction, that the council of the University have not affected a logical precision in distributing the field and classifying the subjects of tuition. While our knowledge is far from enabling us to arrange with accuracy the subjects of human inquiry, no distribution could be made which would not be liable to objections; and every man would hold that mode defective which did not present the subjects in the same point of view in which it was customary to him to look at them. For the purposes of teaching, common sense directs that the convenience of teaching should be the ruling principle in distributing the subjects to be taught. To this it is essential that the entire enumeration should embrace all that is required to constitute a full and perfect education. It appears to us, that the catalogue of subjects presented in the prospectus of the London University fulfils this condition. And with respect to the breaking down of this whole into its most convenient parts, it is evident that utility will be most consulted by leaving it unfixed and variable according to varying circumstances. The most important of those circumstances undoubtedly will be the qualifications of the teachers. It will often happen among the related branches of knowledge that one man may be well qualified to teach a certain portion, but not so large a portion as another man. It would be expedient to make a different distribution of subjects for each of these two men; including more in the course if the one, less in it if the other, were to be the teacher. If two men lectured on two sections of a great science, it might be expedient to include more in the one, less in the other, upon every change of the professors.

Thus, if at one time the professor of natural philosophy had made a particular study of electricity and galvanism, at another time the professor of chemistry, it would in the one case be highly proper to include electricity and galvanism in the course of natural philosophy, in the other to include them in the course of chemistry. If such a man, for example, as Mr. Leslie, the Professor of Natural Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh, held the same chair in the University of London, it might be better to include in that course the doctrine of heat, of which Mr. Leslie has made so profound a study, than in the department of chemistry, to which that difficult subject seems more properly to belong.

The project of the University of London, fortunate in so many respects, was not fortunate, as far as its funds were concerned, in the circumstances of the time when it was first presented to the notice of the public. It was a time of great commercial distress, when the anxieties and difficulties of the classes from which its support was chiefly to be derived, not only contracted their means of yielding it encouragement, but to a much greater degree contracted their own estimate of their means, and so fixed their attention upon the train of events in which their fortunes were involved, that their minds could not easily be diverted to any other object, and all sources of a more general and distant good were for the time neglected. From this cause chiefly, as it appears to us, and not from any want of a due appreciation of the benefits offered to them, which would be so disgraceful to the numerous and important body who are to profit most by this grand undertaking, the subscription to the London University has only reached the minimum of the capital which the council deem necessary to attempt the execution of the plan on the most contracted scale. We cannot, however, entertain any apprehension, when the fears attendant on a period of distress, and the reluctance to part with any portion of the funds which contract an imaginary value in times of distress, have passed away, that the value which ought to be set upon a good education will be seen to be fully understood by the present generation; and that funds will not be wanting to accomplish every thing which utility, apart from frippery of every kind, demands in a scheme of liberal education for the metropolis of England.

L.

SONNET.

“For thou comest far short, that thou shouldest be able to love my creature more than I.” 2 Esdras viii. 47.

IN the deep visions of the midnight hour
 My soul was wrapp'd;—methought my spirit stray'd
 O'er the wide earth,—its darkest scenes survey'd,
 And all the littleness of human pow'r
 Felt with a force it never felt before:—
 Sad visions came of mortal misery,
 And thought of tears I would, but could not dry;
 Faith droop'd, and Hope her cheerful song gave o'er.—
 “And who art thou,” a gentle voice replied,
 “Who think'st to love my creatures more than I?
 Shall not the hand that made them, well divide
 To each the portion of his destiny?”
 Yes, thou benignant Being!—To the dust
 Hurl our vain hopes—but Thou shalt have our trust.

E.

OBSERVATIONS IN DISPROOF OF THE OPINION THAT ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL WAS NOT THE ORIGINAL COMPOSITION OF THAT EVANGELIST, AND IN VINDICATION OF THE AUTHENTICITY AND CONSISTENCY OF THE PRELIMINARY CHAPTERS IN MATTHEW AND LUKE, AGAINST THE REMARKS OF DR. SCHLEIERMACHER IN HIS CRITICAL ESSAY ON ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL, AND OF MR. BELSHAM IN HIS CALM INQUIRY CONCERNING THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

THE very able Review of Dr. Schleiermacher's work, distinguished as that Review is for great acuteness and nice discrimination, cannot fail to be highly gratifying to the readers of the Monthly Repository. But it is not more for the display of talent than for its beneficial usefulness that it so strongly recommends itself, inasmuch as its tendency is to vindicate the character of the Evangelist and the authority of that work which bears his name, against the depreciating influence of the German Doctor's notion, that, "with the exception of the four introductory verses, and an occasional connecting particle or phrase, the Gospel of St. Luke was not his own composition; but, on the contrary, that he is from beginning to end no more than the compiler of the written documents of others, which he found in existence, and which he allowed to pass unaltered through his hands." Were the truth of the learned Doctor's conjecture satisfactorily established, it would obviously operate to diminish the weight and reputation of the Gospel according to Luke, in so far as a work which is merely made up of a number of detached pieces by various authors—and those authors too unknown—must necessarily be less influential on the mind of the Christian reader, than the original composition of an independent historian, who had really derived the information which he professed to detail from the first and purest sources. Only let it be conceded that this part of the critical essay of Dr. S. is in any degree well founded, and in the same proportion will the credibility of the evangelical historian be lessened; since in his introductory observations he distinctly asserts, that "those things which he *writes* in order to Theophilus, he *had from the first* a 'perfect understanding of,' from those who were 'EYE-WITNESSES AND MINISTERS of the word.'" That St. Luke's Gospel in many places bears indications of having been written in detached portions may be admitted, without compromising the veracity of the Evangelist in the least: and what could have been more natural in writing to a correspondent a long history of a person's life, than to do so at different times, and in different portions, rather than to have performed the whole in one communication?

There is, however, one supposition advanced by Dr. S., which the Reviewer rather seems to acquiesce in. That "ch. iii. 1—20, was originally part of a memoir relating exclusively to John." But, had that been the case, is it to be believed that such memoir would have concluded as it now does with John's imprisonment? On the contrary, would it not have gone on to narrate another (and assuredly not an unimportant) incident in the Baptist's career—the *loss of his head*?

Clearly it is the chronology of John's history abstractedly considered, and not that of Jesus, which is given in the first 20 verses of the 3rd chapter; but then it is given as the history of a subordinate character only, as one who was to "prepare the way" for that chief and glorious personage "whose shoes' latchet John was not worthy to unloose." Although the part alluded to treats of the ministry of John, and although mention is made of the impri-

sonment of John before the baptism of Jesus, yet do not those circumstances prove that it originally formed part of a memoir relating exclusively to John, or part of any separate memoir at all; for it is in entire accordance with the "order" which Luke observes from the beginning, bringing up the histories of John and Jesus alternately to a certain period. Thus in ch. i. 5—25, he treats of the promise to and conception by the mother of John. Then from 26—38 the promise to and conception by the mother of Jesus. In the next place, John's history is again taken up, his birth and circumcision mentioned, and that "he was in the deserts until the day of his shewing to Israel." Then the history of Jesus is again adverted to, and his birth and circumcision related, as well as a brief account of his early years, and that he increased in wisdom and stature. Having again for a time dropped the history of Jesus, he reverts once more to that of John, resuming it where it had been discontinued, viz. his manifestation to Israel, and carrying it on to the period of John's imprisonment; when the history of Jesus is again recurred to, and continued to the end.

Now here are not less than five breaks in the histories of Jesus and John: and Luke's mentioning the imprisonment of John before the baptism of Jesus, is no more evidence of its having originally been a memoir relating to John exclusively, than doth the circumstance of John's history being brought up to the period of his manifestation before even the birth of Jesus is mentioned, constitute (as the Doctor contends it does) proof of an originally independent narrative; and in refutation of the latter notion, the reasoning of the Reviewer is unanswerable. It may, however, be inquired further—If the first chapter of Luke formed of itself originally an independent narrative, as Dr. S. asserts, pray whose history is it that it purports to relate? If the history of John, does the reader think that it would have said nothing of his receiving the command of God whilst in the wilderness; nothing of his subsequent preaching; of his baptism; of his imprisonment; of his decapitation? Would it have stopped short at his birth; adding only a general statement that the child grew, waxed strong, and was in the deserts? If too, as alleged, the separate narrative ended there, and was unconnected with any other, whence the necessity or utility of mentioning at all Mary's salutation to Elizabeth, or the prophecies of Elizabeth, of Mary, or of Zacharias concerning Christ? If the supposition be, that it was originally an independent narrative relating to Jesus, surely his biographer would at the least have gone so far as to introduce him into the world. Why, credulity itself would not tolerate so absurd an idea as that any person writing another's history would relate events comparatively insignificant, many of them too having no connexion with it as an independent narrative, and yet altogether omit all those grand and momentous facts and incidents for which the life under consideration was so remarkably distinguished. But, on the other hand, assuming that the chapter in question was written, not with the view of forming a separate and independent narrative as Dr. S. fancies, but, on the contrary, that it was originally framed as an introduction to, and as only intended to form the leading portion of, the more important part of the all-important history which was to follow; why then, the whole contents of that chapter are (if the writer may be allowed to use the figure) in perfect keeping with the other parts of the Evangelist's performance, and favour the opinion that the design, composition, and execution of the whole is by one and the same master. But Dr. Schleiermacher doth not content himself with merely denying that St. Luke was the original author of the work which bears his name, but he endeavours to detract from the historical cre-

dibility of the two accounts of Matthew and Luke relating to the miraculous conception, arguing and insisting that "the taxing by Cyrenius (ch. ii.) is inconsistent with history as referred to the days of Herod, and that the two accounts of Matthew and Luke are utterly irreconcilable."

The writer of this article must, however, be allowed to contend, that the inaccuracy and incongruity of those accounts is not so well established as the ingenious Doctor and many others would represent: on the contrary, he hopes to shew that they are perfectly consistent and correct; and in that expectation, it will be attempted to be maintained that the true signification of the first five verses of the second chapter of Luke, on which the question arises, is not that the decree of Cæsar, or the journey of Joseph and Mary to be taxed, was when Cyrenius was Governor: nor is it asserted that the taxing during Cyrenius' governorship was in the days of Herod: for the supposition that all the events mentioned in these five verses are by the Evangelist referred to one and the same period is erroneous. The truth is, that four out of the five verses relate to *preparations* for taxing only, and it is the second verse alone which speaks of an actual taxing having been "MADE." "This taxing was *first made* when Cyrenius was Governor of Syria," and history accords with and sanctions that distinction; for although the decree of Cæsar Augustus was issued in the days of Herod, and although in the same days the people repaired to their respective cities to be taxed, yet it amounted in its temporary result to a record or registering of the people only, inasmuch as it was not practically acted upon by an *actual* taxing, either immediately or for a considerable period after: in fact, the "taxing was not *made*," or in other words, the real levy of the tax did not take place, until Cyrenius was the Governor of Syria, and Herod was dead. Notwithstanding, therefore, it is stated in Matthew, that Jesus was born in Bethlehem in the days of Herod the King, Mary having, according to Luke, gone thither with Joseph to be taxed; and notwithstanding Luke states that the taxing was "*first made*" when Cyrenius was Governor of Syria, at which time Herod was dead; still there is not any contradiction, because *two different* and distinct eras are spoken of. One, the decree for taxing and the journey of Mary and her delivery in the days of Herod, and the other, the taxing subsequently "*made*" or carried into actual practical execution in Cyrenius' governorship. Luke doth not say that the decree of Augustus, which caused the journey of Mary to Bethlehem, was when Cyrenius was Governor of Syria, but, on the contrary, it is to be inferred from his statement that it was in the days of Herod, for he introduces that decree by the words, "It came to pass in *those* days." What days? Why surely those with which he had just before commenced his history, namely, "the days of Herod, the King of Judea."

That the Evangelist, in his 1st and 2d verses, contemplates two distinct periods of time, may be argued from this, that if only one had been alluded to, he would have said, "There went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, when Cyrenius was Governor of Syria; or, Cyrenius being Governor of Syria; in the same way as in the 1st verse of the ensuing chapter he mentions the governorship of Pontius Pilate, in the reign of Tiberius. The words, "This taxing was *first made*," are wholly superfluous and unmeaning, if a different time from the decree itself had not been referred to: and, indeed, the 2d verse is inclosed within parentheses, to mark that its contents are a digression from, and not essentially connected with, the regular chain of the narrative. The Evangelist might have omitted the 2d verse, in which Cyrenius is mentioned, without the least prejudice to his main object; and, pro-

bably, it was only introduced lest, having spoken of the decree for taxing, the person he addressed, and for whose information he wrote, might otherwise suppose that the actual taxing was immediately consequent thereupon.

Yet the opinion of Dr. S., as to the degree of credibility which the two first chapters in Matthew and in Luke are entitled to, is moderation itself when contrasted with the overwhelming demolition of Mr. Thomas Belsham, who tells us, in his "Calm Inquiry," 2d edition, p. 8, that "from Luke iii. 1, compared with verse 23, it appears that Jesus was born fifteen years before the death of Augustus; that is, at least two years after the death of Herod; a fact which *completely falsifies* the whole narrative contained in the preliminary chapters of Matthew and Luke." Here, then, are not less than 176 verses, relating chiefly to the birth of our blessed Saviour, rooted out of the sacred volume by a single superlative stroke of our "Calm Inquirer's" magical weedhook! This is, in verity, the very loftiest sublimity of critical legerdemain; no petty carping at a phrase; no puny wrangle about a date; but, taking the field of controversy, like a great literary tactician, he at once leaped to his resolve; and, by one transcendent master-dash of generalship, consigned to reprobation as base impositions, all those statements concerning our Lord's nativity, which the Christian world has for ages received and revered as authentic and pure. Let it henceforth be imbibed as an axiom, that where, in one of two histories, independent also of each other, there happens to be a date which is apparently at variance with the period at which they are stated to commence, the whole of those histories for the next thirty years must necessarily be utterly false! Let not the reader exclaim with Partridge, that is a *non sequitur*, for we have the authority of a professor of divinity as to its logical accuracy. Critics, possessing a daring less lofty, or more sobriety of thought, would probably think it not unreasonable to presume, that there might be some mistake in one of the two figures which represent the age alluded to, rather than gratuitously to *assume* the correctness of that; and upon that assumption *alone*, imperiously pronounce 176 verses to be "*completely falsified*:" more especially where mention of the age is preceded by a word (*about* thirty) indicating that the person using it was not positive as to the exact age; and more especially also, when, in all likelihood, the very accounts respecting Herod in these identical histories, supplied the Evangelist with the only data for computing such age.

The narrative, however, relating to the birth of Jesus as contained in the preliminary chapters of Matthew and Luke, will, it is believed, be found not only to accord perfectly well with his alleged age, but to be established on too firm a basis to be shaken either by the author of the Calm Inquiry, or any other of its oppugners.

To the young reader, it may perhaps be of some use to attempt to set the point in question in a more perspicuous position. It must be borne in mind, then, that the birth of Jesus is stated in the preliminary chapters of Matthew and Luke to have been in the days of Herod the King, and also, that Augustus, the predecessor of Tiberius Cæsar, died A. U. 767: therefore, say they, the 15th of Tiberius mentioned in Luke iii. 1, must have been fifteen years more, or A. U. 782. If, then, as stated in Luke iii. 23, Jesus was thirty in A. U. 782, he must have been born thirty years before, or in A. U. 752, and consequently not in the days of Herod the King, because Herod died in A. U. 750 or 751 at the latest; and, therefore, (they continue,) there cannot be any truth in those accounts which, like the preliminary chapters, represent Jesus to have been born in the days of Herod

the King. Such is the conclusion of Mr. B. and others, and such the process of reasoning by which that conclusion is arrived at.

Now, certainly, it must without hesitation be admitted, that on a superficial view of the matter, there doth appear the semblance of an irreconcilable variance. But the fact is, that a little deeper inquiry, truly calm, will evince that there exists no contradiction in reality; neither would there have been the appearance of any, if Luke had not been interpreted by his translators in a sense which he himself never expressed; for it is to be observed, that Luke iii. 1, ought to have been rendered, "In the fifteenth year of the *government or administration*," (ἡγεμονίας,) and not "reign" of Tiberius Cæsar. In the very same verse he uses a word of similar derivation and signification, (ἡγεμονεύοντος from ἡγεμονεύω, *dux sum*,) to express that Pilate was "Governor" of Judea; whereas, when he means to speak of any thing relating to REIGNING properly so denominated, Luke makes use of the proper derivative from βασιλεύω, *regno, rex sum*, to be a king, to reign. Thus, in Luke xix. 14, "to reign," βασιλεῦσαι: and in twenty places, both in Luke and in the Acts, βασιλεία for kingdom, and βασιλεὺς for king, are used. But when, on the contrary, he speaks of a person being *governor*, then he makes use of a word derived from the same root as the word in question, (ἡγεμονίας,) viz. ἡγεμῶν. For example, in the same verse, Acts xxvi. 30, ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ὁ ἡγεμῶν, the king and the governor.

By the word ἡγεμονίας, therefore, in Luke iii. 1, it is impossible not to understand that he meant to express the *government or administration* of Tiberius, as contradistinguished from his "reign." Now, then, as Tiberius was admitted to the government or administration A. U. 764, which was three years before the death of Augustus, and in strictness three years before the *reign* of Tiberius, therefore the fifteenth year of the government or administration of Tiberius was A. U. 779; and supposing Jesus to have been then "about thirty," (as stated and not disputed,) then he must have been born in A. U. 749, which was one or two years before Herod's death: so by merely giving to the word ἡγεμονίας, which Luke hath used, (and upon the true meaning of that word the whole question turns,) the identical signification which other words of a similar derivation unquestionably and invariably bear, wherever that Evangelist hath introduced them in other places; and, on the other hand, by rejecting that meaning which, in other places, the same writer employs a totally different word to express, (and surely it is a fair test by which to try the real import of any author's language,) the preliminary chapters of Matthew and Luke, and the stated age of Jesus, are caused perfectly to harmonize.

What then is the result but this? That it is Mr. Thomas Belsham's "*Calm Inquiry*" into the subject which is "COMPLETELY FALSIFIED," and not the narrative which is contained in the preliminary chapters of Matthew and Luke.

(To be continued.)

UNIVERSALISTS IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

To the Editor.

SIR,

Hackney, Jan. 15, 1827.

I REQUEST permission to lay before your readers part of the contents of a letter which I have lately received from a respectable minister of the gospel, before unknown to me, residing in the United States of America. This

gentleman is the Rev. Thomas Whittemore, pastor of a Universalist Society in the town of Cambridge, near Boston. He informs me that, in connexion with his ministerial brother, the Rev. Hosea Ballou, second of Roxbury, (a town which adjoins Boston on the South,) he is engaged in collecting materials for a history of the doctrine of Universal Salvation or Restoration; and he entreats answers to a number of biographical and historical questions relating to this work, some of which I may hereafter propose, on behalf of my correspondent, to your readers.

Mr. Whittemore tells me that the American Universalists were originally the disciples of Mr. Rely, who, I believe, deduced the doctrine of Universal Salvation from the high Calvinistic scheme. The doctrine was introduced into America by Mr. Murray, a follower and zealous admirer of the founder of the sect. The following account of the present state of the Universalists of the United States, in the words of my correspondent, is a pleasing proof of the natural tendency of serious minds towards scriptural truth, when they are not checked by the influence of institutions bearing a mingled civil and religious character.

“The denomination to which I belong is composed of upwards of three hundred societies, and about two hundred preachers. These numbers are continually receiving accessions. We have increased most in New England, New York, Ohio and Pennsylvania; though there are Universalists scattered all over the United States. It will, perhaps, be pleasing to you to learn that this sect is, with indeed a very few exceptions, entirely Unitarian. I know of but three ministers, in the whole order, who are Trinitarians; and I believe the greater proportion are Humanitarians. With the few exceptions just mentioned, we concur in rejecting, as absurd and unscriptural, the old idea of Atonement; believing that this scheme of man’s redemption from sin originated in the Father of all, who sent his Son to commend his love to mankind.—Devoted to the interests of this order in the United States, are ten or twelve periodical publications. We have six societies in, and within fifteen minutes’ ride of, Boston, each accommodated with an elegant, commodious house, and each maintaining a preacher.”

My friend, as the tenor of his communication allows me to call him, apprizes me that the ministers of his denomination in Boston and its neighbourhood, have sent me a package of their publications, “presuming that it will be agreeable to the Unitarians in England to become acquainted with the numbers, doctrines and arguments of the Universalists in the United States.” Of these, when they arrive, I may perhaps furnish you, Sir, with some account.

In the package, I am informed, is a “Treatise on Atonement,” by Mr. Ballou, whose labours, Mr. Whittemore says, have greatly promoted the change which has taken place amongst the American Universalists, with regard to the Atonement and the character of Christ. Of this “Treatise” and its author, he further says,—“that it is the first American work in which the doctrine of Unitarianism was ever advanced and defended. Here you find it distinctly stated and argued. This work was first published about the year 1803, two years before Sherman’s Treatise, which has generally but erroneously been considered the first public attack on Trinitarianism which America afforded; Dr. Priestley, being an European, I except. Mr. Ballou’s work is the fruit of his own mind, aided only by the Scriptures. He never read an author, either on Atonement or the Unity of God, till after he wrote. He is now fifty-six years old, in good health, and joint-editor

with myself of the Universalist Magazine. He is also a decided Humanitarian."

I believe I have now extracted the whole of the intelligence relating to the Universalists, furnished by my highly-valued correspondent, which would be interesting to your readers, and remain,

Your obedient servant,

ROBERT ASPLAND.

THOUGHTS ON THE PROGRESS AND FUTURE PROSPECTS OF UNITARIAN CHRISTIANITY.

THOSE Christians whose peculiar tenet is the worship of one Supreme Father through Jesus Christ, have sometimes been reproached for the want of that fellowship and co-operation which distinguish most other sects, and for the little zeal which they appear to exhibit in the active propagation of their opinions. Without attempting to justify these deficiencies, so far as they arise from indifference and worldly-mindedness, I think a brief survey of the history and circumstances of Unitarianism may serve at least to explain them.

Most sects have passed off at once in a considerable body from the National Church on the ground of some disputed point of discipline and practice, which interested the prejudices and excited the imagination of the multitude, and became the broad and distinguishing badge of a party. Unitarianism, through a gradual change in the belief of individuals, has grown up imperceptibly in the bosom of a religious body with which it owned no necessary or original connexion. The spirit of Puritanism, to which, with all its extravagancies, England is deeply indebted, and which may be shortly characterized as a spirit of *ultra* opposition to Catholicism, embodied itself, as is very well known, in the course of the seventeenth century, in three leading sects, alike distinguished for their hatred of episcopacy; which, after the Revolution, were recognized by the laws as the three denominations of Protestant Dissenters, and jointly partook of the benefit of the Toleration Act. These three sects separated from the Establishment on the avowed principle that it was only half reformed, and that a great deal of Popery still lurked under its gorgeous and imposing ceremonial. This was a definite and intelligible principle, and it warmly interested the feelings of the people, who carried their abhorrence of the Roman Catholics to a most extravagant length. But with regard to the leaders of these Dissenting bodies, and especially of the Presbyterians, who numbered amongst them some of the nobility and many of the inferior gentry, it may be asserted, without any violation of truth and charity, that they were actuated by political as well as by religious motives, and that their contest with episcopacy was, in great measure, a contest for power. United with the Church for a time by a common dread of Popery, and in achieving the glorious work of the Revolution, the Presbyterians naturally expected, amongst the results of that event, some scheme of comprehension which should admit them to a share in the honours and emoluments of the Establishment. Disappointed of this expectation, the party still retained for a long time the political impulse by which it was originally actuated, and, together with it, an attachment to its peculiar mode of worship and ecclesiastical discipline. This impulse, however, grew feebler and feebler; persons of elevated rank disliked the stigma of belonging to an

excluded sect; while the favour shewn to Dissenters during the earlier periods of the Hanoverian dynasty, and the intimacy which subsisted between the more eminent Nonconformist divines and the Low-Church dignitaries of those days, contributed to soften the prejudices of the Presbyterian gentry, and gradually to absorb them into the bosom of the National Church. Their peculiar discipline being at length entirely abandoned among the Presbyterians, and the doctrines of the Establishment at this period being at least as liberal as those of the Dissenters, and preached with more grace and eloquence, there seemed little left to excite sectarian vigour and zeal: and the spirit of Presbyterianism, such as it ever existed in England subsequent to the Revolution, had it not been superseded by a new interest, must inevitably have died out before the close of the eighteenth century, from the mere want of definite and palpable objects on which to employ itself. The case was somewhat different with the other two bodies of Dissenters. They consisted more of the lower classes of society; their discipline was more popular; their ministers lived in closer dependence on their flocks; they had less of literature and refinement, demanded a more earnest and impassioned style of preaching, and were animated by a stronger spirit of opposition to the established hierarchy. These were sources of life and vigour that did not exist, generally speaking, amongst the Presbyterians. But, on the other hand, the situation of the Presbyterians was highly favourable to the prosecution of deep and earnest inquiries into religious truth. Their strength lay in the genteel and well-educated portion of the middle class, ennobled here and there by a lord or a baronet. Their ministers were usually men of education and learning, who diligently betook themselves to biblical studies, in prosecuting which they were wholly unrestrained by creeds and articles from following truth into all its consequences. The result was a gradual change of opinion from Orthodoxy to Arianism, and from Arianism to what is now more peculiarly called Unitarianism; perhaps first in the minister, and then in the most intelligent and inquiring members of his congregation. The ministers, in regard to liberality of opinion, were usually in advance of the majority of their people, and could not look for any sympathy or co-operation from them in the promotion of views which they were not yet prepared to receive. To demand union and zeal from such a scattered few, who had rarely opportunities for interchange of thought, and who, for the most part, were men of retired and studious habits and averse from publicity, and to expect that they should exhibit all the ardour and activity of a sect, would be absurd: and the dilemma, in which they found themselves placed, of being unable either to preach any longer the orthodox system, or to carry the feeling of their congregations along with them in the open avowal of new views, drove them to occupy a sort of neutral ground, in which they followed the example of the more liberal clergy, and to preach almost entirely on moral topics, enforced by the general sanctions of Christianity. The sermons of our most celebrated Presbyterian preachers, forty or fifty years ago, evince the correctness of this remark. This style of preaching was ill suited to the multitude, and hardly compatible with that affectionate warmth and scriptural unction of manner which is found so interesting to their feelings; and as for the more wealthy and ancient families, amongst whom the old spirit of Presbyterianism might have been expected to survive, they were every year passing over in increasing numbers to the Establishment. The Presbyterian interest was almost extinct: its ambiguous and unmeaning character, the aversion which it fostered to an open avowal of Unitarianism, and the consequent want of plain and scriptural

preaching, had brought many of our congregations to the verge of dissolution, in which they would inevitably have sunk, had not the intrepidity of Dr. Priestley awakened a new spirit and given a new impulse to the public mind. The timid and undecided policy of a former period was abandoned. Associations were now formed amongst Unitarians for their mutual support and encouragement: preaching on their peculiar tenets became frequent and was sometimes popular: they, who had hitherto been only scattered and insulated individuals, were drawn together, and began to assume the solid consistency and definite movement of a sect.

Nevertheless, with the strongest conviction of the scriptural truth of Unitarianism, and with the most confident expectation that it will at length prevail universally, I much question whether it can ever become the rallying word of a very enthusiastic and closely united party; whether, in short, it be capable of being made subservient to the purposes of violent sectarianism: and I ground this opinion on the superior importance of Unitarianism itself, on the more vital character of the doctrines which are its essence. Did it insist on any minute rite or particular discipline; did it impose some outward badge, or gratify that unaccountable fondness for extravagance and singularity for which the weaker portion of mankind are so remarkable, I should expect to see it spread through a numerous and zealous sect, and excite the greatest enthusiasm in its adherents. For, however humiliating a confession for human nature it may be, it is nevertheless perfectly true, that, in the present state of society, a certain degree of secular feeling seems essential to the activity and zeal of a religious party. Only touch some worldly prejudice or gratify some political antipathy, and, dull and sluggish as its movements may have previously been, you inspire it at once with an almost preternatural life and energy. I have observed, that the preaching even of Unitarianism has sometimes been most popular when it has flattered a feeling of imaginary superiority above other Christians, and coincided with that propensity to inveigh against political and ecclesiastical abuses which is always prevalent in a free country, but is not very closely connected with religion. In genuine Unitarian Christianity, such as it was professed and adorned at a very early period by a Firmin, and in later times by a Lardner and a Lindsey, there is nothing to gratify either personal vanity or political prepossession; it leaves the individual no ground of merit, no means of distinguishing himself above his fellow-christians, but what consists in a more patient and exemplary fulfilment of every moral and religious duty. It admits of no substitute for virtue, nor will accept the zeal of proselytism and sectarian activity in place of doing justly and loving mercy and walking humbly with God. Let not these remarks be understood as discouraging popular and zealous exertions, or as intended to deter our ministers from scattering as widely as possible the precious seed of sacred truth. We believe ourselves to be the holders of a most important doctrine, a doctrine which we trust will finally spread, for the blessing of mankind, over the whole earth. Most certainly then does it behove us, by every means of writing and preaching, to make this doctrine extensively known to the public, and in such a manner as most effectually to promote those moral and devotional ends on which, when properly conveyed, it bears with the directest force, and from which it derives its only value. But we should beware of confounding the nominal increase of a sect with the extension of the vital influence of pure Christianity, and of mistaking the bare recognition of past errors for the practical adoption of new and living truths. Our ministers ought not to be discouraged if numbers do not embrace Unitarianism

immediately on its first announcement: let them trust to the sure and silent progress of knowledge and intelligence, and provide for its future interests by fixing the principles and confirming the faith and deepening the moral and religious sensibilities of the rising generation. There are a thousand circumstances to deter men from the open avowal of Unitarianism; but its friends have accomplished a great part of their object, if by their appeals to the public they have made their principles known; these principles, fostered by the influence of knowledge, will work in secret, and be ultimately productive of the most lasting and powerful effects.

In some respects, Unitarianism is a truth of too grand and universal a character ever to form the bond of a single sect. It is the form towards which I believe Christianity to be tending in all sects. Some minor question of doctrine or discipline may give birth to a sect and inspire it with delirious energy, till it has so far partaken of the intelligence of the age as to abandon first the reality, and then the very name, of its former errors. But a truth of deep and essential character cannot be confined by the trammels of a sect; it will assume a diversity of outward forms, and suit itself to every variety of taste and disposition. The great principles of the Reformation were soon dispersed among a number of sects, each of which, with some distinguishing peculiarity, retained a portion of the celestial substance and immortal vigour of truth. And so it will ever be with all those doctrines which God intends to survive the transitory caprices of opinion, and to work important changes in the moral condition of mankind.

I do not expect, therefore, I do not even wish, to see Unitarianism diffuse itself into an immense sect, distinguished by a perfect uniformity of doctrine, discipline and outward worship. In its susceptibility of various outward forms, I fancy I can discern some indications of its being destined to live for ever, and to spread through all nations as the universal character of Christianity. By the adoption of more enlightened principles of scriptural interpretation, by the prevalence of juster notions of the moral and intellectual nature of man, and by the wider diffusion of general knowledge, it will grow up imperceptibly in the bosom of various sects, as it did formerly in this country under the cover of Presbyterianism, as it has more lately in the Calvinistic Church of Geneva and amongst the Independents in America, first prompting a modification of the hereditary creed, and destroying the power, before the name, of orthodoxy; till some unforeseen occurrence shall call for an explicit declaration of opinion; when Christians of very different denominations will be astonished to find how nearly, in their real and inward convictions, they were agreed.

To me, I confess, it is delightful and encouraging to believe, that the glorious truths of the Divine Unity and Benevolence may hereafter be recognized in a form, and invested with an outward worship, suited to the genius of different characters and the temperament of various climes; here, solemn, imposing and majestic; there, simple and unadorned, or perhaps cherished with devotional enthusiasm and inculcated with all the ardour of popular eloquence; but, under all these forms, inspiring with equal fervour whatever is most sublime, touching and consolatory to the heart of man, and breathing that deep feeling of devotedness to God, that glowing sentiment of universal charity, which shall soften the now harsh and jarring tones of sectarian bigotry into the distinct, though harmonious, accents of a hymn of praise to the universal Father.

MORNING HYMN.

My earliest praise, my earliest prayer,
 To God alone belong :
 To Him my grateful song I bear,
 Who hears my grateful song.

When helpless on my bed I lay,
 Sweet peace my pillow blest :
 He made the darkness safe as day,
 He gave the weary rest.

He watch'd my slumbering solitude,
 Guarded the unguarded hour ;
 The springs of being he renew'd,
 From weakness waken'd pow'r.

He taught the curtains of my eyes
 To veil their light in sleep ;
 He bids the day in glory rise,
 Calls brightness from the deep.

'Tis Thou ! my God and Father, Thou !
 My life, my all is Thine ;
 Be Thine the praise, the glory, now
 Another day is mine.

The evening came—the night is gone,
 The morning beams break through ;
 Night's rest is Thine, Thou gracious one !
 And morning's duties too.

Now let Thy heav'nly grace descend
 Around my path to be ;
 And may my every footstep tend
 To Thee, my God ! to Thee.

Mark out, and guide me in my way,
 Salvation's crown to win ;
 Be Thou a Shepherd when I stray,
 A Father, when I sin.

To Thee, to Thee, O God ! I turn,
 For light, for faith I pray ;
 Give me a spirit prompt to learn,
 And ready to obey.

O lead me on from youth to age
 'Midst peace and praise and love ;
 My life, a quiet pilgrimage,
 My resting-place, above.

To chase despair, to soothe distress,
 Shall be my soul's employ ;
 My sweetest, dearest bliss, to bless ;
 My joy, to kindle joy.

So in Thy service, in Thy fear
 And favour, let me be ;
 And death, that bounds my journey here,
 Renew its course with Thee.

ARTICLES OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.

To the Editor.

SIR,

I BEG to offer to your correspondent *Clericus Anglicus*, the following solution of his questions respecting the articles of the Church of Ireland, derived from Dr. Aikin's "Lives of John Selden, Esq., and Archbishop Usher." 8vo. London, 1812.

"In 1615, a convocation of the prelates and clergy of the Irish Establishment being held at Dublin, it was determined that they should assert their independence on the Church of England, of which they had hitherto been regarded as a kind of colony, by drawing up a set of articles of religion for their own Church. Dr. Usher was the person chiefly employed on this occasion; and in these articles, which were 104 in number, the doctrines of predestination and reprobation, according to the system of Calvin, were stated in the most explicit terms. And as the keeping of the Sabbath-day holy was enjoined in one of the articles, and Usher was moreover known to maintain the opinion that bishops were not a distinct order in the church, but only superior in degree to presbyters, some officious persons took occasion to represent him to King James as a favourer of Puritanism," &c.—P. 221.

The fate which awaited the Irish articles in after times is thus recorded :

"Laud, now become Archbishop of Canterbury, was induced, not only by his personal love of power and his notions of the necessity of uniformity in religion, but by his attachment to the Arminian tenets, in opposition to the Calvinistic, to wish for the abrogation of the Irish articles of faith. At the opening of the convocation, therefore, (in 1634,) Bramhall, Bishop of Derry, was instructed to move, that the whole body of the English canons should be adopted by the Irish Church. This proposition, however, was opposed by the primate and others as too derogatory to the independence of the Irish Church; and at length, after much discussion, the compromise was agreed upon of admitting a certain number of the English canons, and retaining such of the Irish as had a particular reference to the circumstances of that church and kingdom. With this modification, Laud, in a letter to Usher, declares himself satisfied, though he would have preferred the adoption of the entire English canons.

"But his triumph with respect to the articles was more complete; for although the convocation, in the same spirit which influenced them in the case of the canons, would not absolutely abrogate their own, yet they decidedly accepted those of the English Church, as was declared in the first of the new canons, drawn up by the primate himself. It runs thus: 'For the manifestation of our agreement with the English Church in the confession of the same Christian faith and in the doctrine of the sacraments, we receive and approve the book of Articles of Religion agreed upon between the archbishops, bishops and body of the clergy in the synod of London of 1562, for the removal of difference in opinion and the establishment of consent in true religion. If, therefore, any one shall hereafter affirm that any of the said articles are in any respect superstitious or erroneous, or such as cannot be subscribed with a good conscience, let him be excommunicated, and not absolved till he shall publicly have retracted his error.' It was impossible to frame a more explicit, indeed a more submissive, adherence to the rule of faith adopted in the sister island: and the expedient employed to save the authority of the Irish Church, that of obliging the candidates for ordination to subscribe both sets of articles, was only requiring an inconsistency, provided the doctrines of the two were in any respect contradictory; which the primate, however, who understood the articles in a Calvinistic sense, probably did not suppose. But this double subscription at length appeared so irreconcilable to good sense and propriety, that it was disused, and a petition was presented to the Lord Deputy, that he

would please to suffer a confirmation of the Irish articles to pass by way of a bill in parliament. The proposal, however, was so little agreeable to his principles of government, that, if credit is given to a charge brought against him, when become Lord Strafford, by the Scotch commissioners, he threatened Usher and the rest to have the articles burnt by the common hangman, if they did not desist from their purpose. The subsequent confusions suspended ordinations in the Irish Church; and after the Restoration, the English articles alone were subscribed, as they have been ever since."—P. 247.

It might be a curious speculation, what would have been the state of religion in Ireland at the present day, had the bigotry of Laud and the despotism of Strafford permitted her to retain a national Protestant Church, allied in doctrine to that of Scotland, and not unlikely to have attracted into its bosom the Presbyterians of the North. The clergy of the Establishment would in that case have shared with the Catholic priesthood the advantage of being natives, and they would have found little temptation to become absentees; their influence on all classes would consequently have been greater and more salutary. The opportunity of providing for their sons in a church so opulently endowed, would powerfully have encouraged conversion in families of the higher ranks; and the lower orders would imperceptibly have become proselytes to a clergy by whom their wants were relieved and their prejudices conciliated. In short, had the Church of Ireland been suffered to preserve its separate and independent existence, it seems not irrational to believe that, long before the present period, it might have become the Church of Irishmen.

A.

THE CULDEES OF IONA.

To the Editor.

SIR,

YOUR correspondent "*Clericus Anglicus*" seeks for information as to ecclesiastical history in *Ireland*. Allow me to propose to your correspondents, as an interesting topic of illustration, the early history of Christianity in *Scotland*, with reference to the old church of the Culdees, their literary establishments at Iona, and the peculiarities of their church government. I am aware that this is a point of ecclesiastical history on which there has been some warmth of discussion; but I apprehend your readers will not have so much of either genuine Scotch or Presbyterian blood in them as to quarrel very stoutly on the question, whether the standard of Episcopacy or Presbyterianism was more or less approached by this venerable establishment.

Lloyd, the Bishop of St. Asaph, in his "*Historical Account of Church Government, as it was in Great Britain and Ireland, when they first received the Christian Religion*," (as I find from quotations of his works in other authors,) boasts "of having completely prostrated the adversaries of his order, and demonstrated Episcopacy to be coeval with Christianity," and has, accordingly, taken great pains to dis-presbyterize these original promoters and teachers of the Christian faith. Dr. Jamieson is equally zealous to clothe them again with the character of which the Bishop is so jealous. But not much troubling myself, as I presume you will not do, to settle what name the overseers of this primitive foundation gave themselves, or the precise mode of exercising their authority, I think a concise account of these followers of a simple and unadulterated faith, who voluntarily selected, in a barbarous land, a most unenviable position, in a worldly point of view,

favourable to nothing but the active and devoted discharge of what they esteemed their Christian duties, and who, in the midst of darkness, kept a light burning, from which Europe was illuminated during ages of gloom, would be a valuable contribution to your work, to which I sincerely wish success.

LAICUS ANGLICANUS.

THE CASE OF LOT'S WIFE.

To the Editor,

SIR,

PROFESSOR PAREAU'S work, entitled, "Disputatio de Mythica Sacri Codicis Interpretatione," may not be in the hands of many of your readers. His explanation of Genesis xix. 26, appears to me rational and satisfactory. Previously to my seeing it, I had rested in the conjectural reading of Le Clerc of *וְהָיָה נָצִיב מִלָּח* for *וְהָיָה נָצִיב בְּמִלָּח*, adopted by Dathe, and commended by Rosenmüller. A suspicion, however, always attaches to explanations which depend upon conjectural emendations or alterations of the text: I therefore prefer the interpretation of Professor Pareau: it is in substance as follows, incidentally introduced as illustrative and confirmatory of the necessity of attending in our inquiries into the meaning of the sacred text, to the following canon, "ut in libris sacris interpretandis *ratio habeatur sermonis et usus loquendi*." From not attending to the peculiar style and phraseology of Scripture, and by aiming at a too literal sense, Bauer, the great patron of the Mythic system of interpretation, has compared the case of Lot's wife with the legend of Eurydice and the fate of Niobe; and commentators of the most acknowledged talents have advanced explanations, which have afforded a too serious handle to infidels and objectors. Several of these absurdities are enumerated by Pfeiffer in his *Centuria*, Vol. I. pp. 65—67 of his *Works*. Pfeiffer's own view of the passage is then given, which is as incredible as are those of his learned precursors, and will in the present age, I conceive, have few patrons. It is given in a note below.* But to return to Pareau.

First, in reference to the expression, "looking behind," at ch. xviii. 16, the words *looking toward* Sodom, unambiguously mean to go in the way thither: this is quite clear from the connected mention in that verse of Abraham going with them, i. e. the angels or *messengers*, and bringing them on their way. The same signification of the phrase is evidently implied in the 17th verse of the 19th chapter, where it occurs again, and where "ne respicerent" must be understood as importing that Lot and his companions were to continue with all speed their retreat, and to give up every thought and purpose of returning. How the formula "*looking back*," came to signify the same as *going back*, is easily accounted for, from the circumstance of persons keeping their faces in a direction towards the place whither they are journeying. So Luke ix. 53, it is said, they did not receive him, because his *face was as though he would go to Jerusalem*, that is, they perceived *he was going to Jerusalem*: such was his design and pur-

* Decisio. Uxor Loti ob incredulitatem, extremam in re servatu facili inobedientiam et præposterum terrenorum desiderium, vere et *substantialiter conversa est* quoad corpus, seu dirigit in statuam constantem e sale minerali, sive *metallico*, ut esset ceu *marmoreum* quoddam divinæ castigationis monumentum. So Pfeiffer decides the point, "credat Judæus Apella."

pose. The wife of Lot is said to have looked **מֵאַחֲרָיו**, "hoc est," (I here give the Professor's own words,) "ad verbum ac barbarè a post eum, scilicet *maritum suum, sive marito suo relicto, ex vi, quam habet utriusque præpositionis conjunctio, cum alibi tum, Ruth i. 16, ubi מֵאַחֲרָיו* manifesto significat *te relicta.*" That Christ understood the phrase in the sense of an *actual decession* and an attempt to return, Mr. Pareau thinks is plain from Luke xvii. 31, 32, where he warns his followers, in the impending destruction of Jerusalem, to keep in recollection the case of Lot's wife, and, if in the country during that awful visitation, not to think of returning home—*μη ἐπιστρέψατω εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω.*

In regard to the expression, becoming a "*pillar of salt*," it is observed, that though no principle of grammar hinders from translating **נָצִיב** (netsib) by a *statue* or *pillar*, yet such a rendering of it does not accord with Scripture language; no where in the Old Testament is the word used in such a sense; and the term employed in Genesis to designate a statue or monument (cippus) is **מַצֵּבָה**. Why, therefore, by the gratuitous assumption of such a strange metamorphosis, expose this passage of Holy Writ to objection and ridicule? Mr. Pareau considers the word **נָצִיב** (netsib) to be the same as the Arabic **قصب** which properly signifies *constituted, established*, hence also a *part* or *portion*. Agreeably to this, he proposes to translate the passage, "She, the wife of Lot, became a *portion* of the salt water which then inundated the once fertile plain of Jordan;" that is, as a punishment for her temerity in disobeying the heavenly mandate, she perished in those waters which then broke forth, and in their overflow converted the vale of Siddim into that lake which, from its water being so strongly impregnated with salt, is called the *sea of salt*, **יַם הַמֶּלַח** Gen. xiv. 3. When she formed her rash purpose, the low grounds were inundating, and safety only could be had by escaping to the higher country. Psalm lxiii. 11, furnishes Mr. Pareau with a formula which he thinks supports his interpretation: it is there said of the wicked, **מֵנַת שׁוּעֲלִים** menat shugnalim, They shall be a *portion for foxes*, i. e. they shall be devoured by them. I shall close my communication by giving Professor Pareau's own words in comment upon the verse: "*et facta est uxor Loti portio salsuginis; hoc est, in temeritatis suæ pœnam ab erumpentibus subito et undique irruentibus salsæ paludis aquis absorpta iisque submersa interiit.*"

ΠῚ.

HACKNEY NEW COLLEGE.

To the Editor.

SIR,

ALLOW me to solicit information from any of your correspondents on a subject which I was equally inquisitive about in the Old Series of the Monthly Repository, without having my thirst for knowledge in any way satisfied. I am desirous of having, from some one competent to give it, a short history of the formation, purpose, dissolution and present disposition of the fund raised for the establishment of what was called the Hackney New College. The whole of the proceedings of this institution may be said to belong to a generation before my day. All I at present know, or at least believe from what I have from time to time heard, is, that it originated in much the same sort of generous public spirit that now patronizes the London University, that it met with noble support from the rich and powerful

of various communions, was administered by the most eminent men of their day as trustees, became embarrassed, and finally expired, leaving but a wreck of its endowment, which the rules had declared permanent and inapplicable to any purpose but the maintenance out of its income of an institution of the sort, to which wreck was subsequently added a liberal bequest in aid of the permanent fund, made previous to the dissolution, but not received till afterwards.

What is now mainly interesting to the public (and all these matters are of public importance) is, to inquire how these two branches of the permanent fund are now disposed of, and what regulations the original body of the trustees, many of whom are still living, have laid down for their security and application, and whether any meetings ever take place either of the survivors of this body, or of their constituents, the survivors of the contributors? There are, as I understand, existing (indeed they are printed with the College proceedings) the body of rules and regulations as to the fund and its objects; many of the trustees, who are of course legally answerable for it, are living; and I cannot think it can be deemed by any one an impertinent curiosity to inquire of all who can give the information, what money remained after the appropriation of the permanent fund to the debts of the College, and how, when, and where the trustees have invested it and dispose of the interest? and in the same way, what disposition is made of the bequest subsequently made, what are the precautions taken for its security and appropriation by the survivors of the trustees to whom it was given, and (if there be any doubt as to what should be the ultimate destination of these funds) what difficulty there would be in calling together the parties interested, and determining how the intent of the founders, or one consonant with it, could now be best carried into effect?

ZEBULON.

MONT-BLANC AT SUNSET.

I SAW Mont-Blanc when the glowing sun
 Flung a gleam o'er its snows from the amber West,
 When his course of toil was almost run,
 And he sunk, in his glorious bed, to rest.
 I mark'd that gleam, and its rosy hue—
 For 'twas beauty's self, that was lingering there;
 I mark'd that gleam—for 'twas presage true
 Of a day without cloud, all bright and fair.
 And I thought of the close of the Christian's day,
 When he goes to a nobler world than this,
 And no guilty cares, nor dark dismay,
 Break the peace of his spirit, that's wrapp'd in bliss.
 O thou Father of Lights, and God of Love!
 Who knowest the thoughts of thy creatures here,
 Send down thy blessing, this heart to move,
 And mould it, thy holy commands to revere!
 That so, when I'm called by thy mandate away
 From the scenes of this earth, and these mansions of dust,
 I may quit without pain this frail covering of clay,
 And be welcom'd with joy to the realms of the just.

Geneva, Sept. 17, 1826.

S. W.

MEMOIRS OF THE SOCINI.

BARTHOLOMEUS SOCINUS.

MARIANUS SOCINUS* left at his death several children, of whom Bartholomeus pursued the legal profession, and was deemed to have equalled or surpassed his father in his erudition, and his celebrity as a jurist. The precise date of his birth is not known, different authorities assigning it variously to the years 1433, 1436 and 1437.

His early education was conducted with the utmost care, and he was solidly grounded in the knowledge of the Greek and Latin languages. After he had passed, with much applause, through the usual course of elementary instruction, he applied with great diligence and success to the study of the civil and the canon laws under the ablest masters of the age. He first studied at Siena under his father and Thomas Doctius: he afterwards placed himself under the tuition of Alexander Tartagonus and Andrew Ballatius, at the University of Bologna; whence he removed to the Academy of Pisa to avail himself of the instruction of Francis Aretinus. His progress and attainments under these celebrated professors were rapid, brilliant, and profound. He returned to Siena to take his Doctors' degree, and it would appear that he commenced his professional career in his native University, where he was Professor of Canon Law in the year 1471.

The distressed situation of Florence at this period having caused the University of that city to be nearly deserted by the students, Lorenzo de Medicis directed his attention to the improvement of the Academy of Pisa, which had recently fallen under the dominion of the Florentines; and he invited to the chairs of the different faculties the most eminent men in each which Italy could furnish. In the number of these was Bartholomeus Socinus, who was appointed to the professorship of Civil, and afterwards of the Canon Law, with the liberal stipend of eight hundred florins a year.

The assembling together in one institution of so many men of distinguished talents and erudition in the various branches of literature and science, at a time when learning was comparatively a rare accomplishment, soon produced consequences upon which it is probable that Lorenzo had little calculated. A spirit of jealousy and rivalry soon sprung up among the professors, and led to dissensions that required all his discretion and authority to allay. Bartholomeus Socinus took umbrage, on this occasion, at the appointment of Jason Maynus to be his associate in the same faculty, with an equal salary. He embraced every opportunity to disparage his talents and acquirements, and to bring them to the test by provoking him to public disputations on points connected with their professional studies. The celebrity of the men gave great interest to these contests, and drew to them crowds of auditors. So much did they at last engage the public attention and curiosity, that Lorenzo himself went purposely from Florence to Pisa in order to be personally present to hear the parties. It is related, that in one of these public disputations, Janus, being hard pressed by his opponent, and unable to repel his arguments by legitimate reasons, resorted to the stratagem of feigning a text or fictitious authority, which he advanced to strengthen his case. Bartholomeus instantly detecting the artifice, feigned a counter authority to destroy it, which he enforced by a suitable commentary. Janus, astounded by the promptness and the force of the reply, demanded where

* See above, p. 23.

Memoirs of the Socini.

Bartholomeus had found his text. The latter answered that he had discovered it very near that which Janus had himself produced. The exposure of this trick brought the contest to an end. Janus, mortified by his defeat, quitted Pisa, and Bartholomeus was fixed higher than ever in the esteem and favour of Lorenzo.

Although Bartholomeus enjoyed high reputation at Pisa, he does not appear to have been at any time perfectly satisfied with his situation. This was probably occasioned in part by the circumstances of the Academy, but it chiefly arose, there is reason to believe, from the fickleness and capriciousness of his temper. The state of his mind at this period disposed him to listen to a flattering overture made to him by the senate of Venice, to accept the juridical chair at the University of Padua, which was strengthened by the offer of a large addition to his annual salary. His engagement with the Florentine Government had not at this time been completed. When, therefore, he had determined to remove, he thought it necessary to plan his measures with the utmost secrecy. He collected together his books and other property, among which were some articles of value pertaining to the Academy, which had been deposited with him in trust to be used during the term he held his office. Having carefully concealed these in some Lucca wine casks, he had them privately conveyed out of the city. He afterwards attempted to escape under cover of the night, but being betrayed to the magistrates by a Florentine servant, he was arrested in his flight, and sent prisoner to Florence. Here he was shortly after brought to trial for the double offence of violating his engagement, and purloining the property of the State, declared to be guilty of treason against the Republic, and sentenced to lose his life. Lorenzo, however, interposed to prevent the execution of this harsh sentence, alleging that he who excelled in science ought not to be put to death;* adding, that if they lost this Socinus it were vain to look for another.†

The Senese took a deep interest in the fate of their illustrious countryman during these proceedings. They sent a special ambassador to Florence to treat with the Government for the liberation of Bartholomeus. The Florentines raised every possible difficulty to obstruct and defeat the negociation, and at length fixed upon conditions that, they were well aware, would be tantamount to an absolute refusal. They demanded sureties to the amount of 18,000 florins, 10,000 of which must be obtained in Florence, and 8000 were to be procured at Siena. At the latter place, the amount was raised without difficulty, but it was found impossible to procure the stipulated sum at Florence, it being understood that the persons who might come forward to pledge themselves for it would be sure to incur the displeasure of Lorenzo. The negociation being thus broken off, Bartholomeus remained a prisoner. His confinement was, however, but of short continuance; for Lorenzo not only restored him to liberty, but in the course of three years reinstated him in his professorship at Pisa with an augmented salary of 1000 florins.

It is scarcely possible to believe that the Florentine Government, in the extraordinary severity of these proceedings against Bartholomeus, were actuated by the single view of the real offences alleged against him, whatever aggravations might have attended them. Nothing, indeed, could excuse the

* *Huic turpi judicio audacter obstitit Laurentius, illa usurpans verba,—excellentem in arte mori non debere.* Fabronius, in Vita Laurentii Medecis, p. 52.

† *Si hunc perdidiremus ubi alium Socinum invenimus.* Pancirolus in Vita B. Socini.

fraudulent abduction of the property of the Academy, and the rank and character of the man rather heightened than palliated the crime. Neither can any justification be pleaded for the violation of a solemn contract to remain a stipulated time to discharge the duties of his office. But, after all, there seems no proportion between the measure of criminality, taken in its full extent, and the capital punishment awarded it, or the exorbitant securities demanded afterwards on the remission of that punishment. There is ground to suspect that the severity was assumed for the purpose of retaining Bartholomeus in the Academy of Pisa, which had acquired high honour by the reputation of his talents, and depriving the other Italian universities of an accession which might raise them into formidable rivals. It is well known that other Italian states were exceedingly desirous of engaging his services, and he occasionally yielded to their importunities. Though he passed most of his time at Pisa, we find him some years occupying the juridical chair at Ferrara, at other times at Bologna, and at others at Padua, but his biographers do not fix with precision the dates and the duration of his stay at these universities.

During his residence at Pisa, which continued with occasional interruptions for about twenty years, he frequently took a lively interest and a personal concern in the affairs and politics of his native city. Whenever a sense of duty impelled him to quit the retirement of the Academy to take part in the political contests which were agitating the Republic of Siena, he always lent the powerful aid of his great talents and influence to the popular side, embarking invariably with the citizens in the defence of their liberties against the tyranny of the aristocracy. On one occasion, he is said to have entered the city more like a soldier than a lawyer, at the head of an armed body of horsemen, and by his personal influence to have new modelled the government. On several occasions he was employed by the Senese as their ambassador to other states.

Bartholomeus is to be viewed as a melancholy example of intellectual endowments of the highest order, tarnished and debased by low and degrading vices. Nothing can excuse or palliate the meanness, not to say the criminality, of his conduct in purloining the property of the Pisa Academy. Gaming was his ruling passion, and this was probably the parent of all his other moral failings and delinquences. It was his frequent custom to spend whole nights at cards and dice. His inveterate devotion to play necessarily interfered with his professional pursuits and duties, and led him to defraud his pupils of the lectures to which they were entitled. This course of life proved his ruin: he lost by it all the property he had inherited from his father, besides a handsome fortune which he had acquired by his professional practice as a lecturer and pleader. His necessities drove him in the latter part of his life to resort to unworthy expedients to raise temporary supplies of money. He died in great penury in 1507, in the suburbs of Siena, and was buried at the public expense. He was deprived some years before his death of the use of his speech by a paralytic seizure. This calamity compelled him to relinquish his public employments, and to confine his legal practice to the business of a Chamber Counsellor.

Ranciolus relates of him that his memory entirely failed him on two remarkable occasions. In the year 1492, he was appointed by the Republic of Siena to be their ambassador to congratulate Pope Alexander VI. on his elevation. Scarcely had he begun to deliver his address, which was dictated to him by Angelus Politianus, when he stopped, and was wholly unable to

The Bellman's Verses.

proceed. The Pope, perceiving his embarrassment, instantly relieved him by lifting up his hand as a signal for him to desist, and observing that he well knew the talents of the man. As a testimony of his respect, he immediately named him his Consistorial Advocate. At another time, when on an embassy to Venice, and attempting to address Augustus Balbadius, the Doge, on the subject of his mission, his recollection forsook him, and he was obliged to remain silent.

Bartholomeus was the author of many works on the Civil and Canon Laws, which were regarded by jurists as of high authority. The Consultations of himself and his father were printed together in four volumes. His writings obtained for him the title of the Papinian of his age.*

R. S.

THE BELLMAN'S VERSES FOR THE YEAR 1827.

January 14th.

A FRAGMENT.

WAN fugitives ! that at the stern behest
Of this unwontedly impetuous blast,
Athwart my window flit in crowds—where bent
Ye know not—onward still in reckless flight,
All hasting to a grave—ye bring to mind
Our *human* glories, past and gone like yours,
The *moral* wrecks of the departed year.

How comely were ye some few months ago
In all your firm luxuriance ! Ye could then
Smile at the tempest's impotent assaults,
Braving their utmost fury ; now, alas !
Its seeming pastime, as in vengeful mood
And mockery of your lost, defenceless state,
It sportive roar'd—"Where are your triumphs now ?"
And parted so each from its stay in air.
What troops of joys have mourned their parent stem,
In this our higher realm of brittle life,
While o'er their prompt divorce and fall'n estate,
The common tyrant of our kindred race
Grins ghastly, as he bids his whirlwind drive
Their shattered fragments o'er his dreary waste !
Of guilty joys I speak not—but of joys
Like gems in Nature's choicest liv'ry dight,
Gladd'ning her fair creation, and around
Dispensing health, and harmony, and peace.

A matron here—that to her throbbing breast
So lately press'd a cherub's roseate lip,
And wanton'd in his smile, has watch'd, and watch'd,
And watch'd again his little cheek grow pale

* Pancirolus, *de claris legum interpretibus*, lib. iii. Tiraboschi, *Storia della Letteratura Italiana*, Tom. VI. Part. i. Bock, *Hist. Antitrinitariorum*, Tom. II. p. 573. *Diari Sanesi di Allegretto Allegretti*, inserted in Muratori's Collection, Vol. XXIII. Roscoe's *Life of Lorenzo de' Medicis*, under 1472, note.

Upon its marble fount, how faintly pluck'd !
 Till pluck'd no more, it tells her of a sleep,
 O God ! not transient now—ne'er, ne'er to wake again.

A maiden there—whose deep blue, love-sick eye,
 Kindling in secret at the nuptial torch
 In fancy's golden vision, and the blush
 Nor yet of bashfulness when none look'd on,
 Bespoke the hour of rapture passing nigh—
 Now nightly weeping o'er a lover's grave.

Yon widow'd wretch ! the statue of a man,
 But yesterday—it seems no more—a groupe
 Of merry prattlers throng'd around his knees,
 Hung on his lips, and with responsive smile
 Look'd artlessly into his smiling face.
 And they are there to day. He heeds it not—
 He knows it not—not he !—The vacant chair
 And chilling silence of the table's top,
 Bereave him of his sense ; an alien now
 From home, (witness that speechless stare !) absorpt
 Within the circuit of the mother's tomb.

* * * * *

Sw——ys.

I. I. C.

THE TEST AND CORPORATION ACTS.

To the Editor.

SIR,

I CANNOT but offer my sincere thanks for the services you are rendering to the cause of freedom, by endeavouring to rouse the spirit of the Dissenting body to a feeling of the necessity of exertion. I am glad also to observe that you are giving publicity to the proceedings of the Deputies. They will now see that the public eye is upon them, and I hope will be as vigorous in deeds as they now and then have been in words. Your first Number commenced, it was hoped, a series of instructive essays on the legal and political situation of Nonconformists ; surely you will not abandon so fruitful a subject.

I for one have long suspected that the influence of the body of Deputies, except in their vocation of attending to secondary grievances, has been and will (unless greatly improved) continue to be injurious, instead of advantageous, to the progress of the cause in which the civil rights of Dissenters are engaged. Judging from the experience of thirty years, it does not seem that the sort of energy necessary to push on a popular object is to be expected from such a body of so long standing, and so little used to put themselves out of the way. There is a great want of unity of feeling, as you observed in your last Number. Those who would refuse Catholic Emancipation may be right or may be wrong, but it is clear that the principle of religious liberty cannot be actively pushed or maintained with cordiality where the movers are not agreed ; where one party is always checking the other lest it should go too far ; and, above all, where their parliamentary leaders will be all unanimous in not doing for them what they would not give to others. My own opinion is, that if those who wish for liberty for themselves, but (conscientiously perhaps) will not seek it or allow it for others, will not at any rate see the propriety of abstaining from putting themselves forward to

oppose their neighbours getting equal privileges with themselves, the sooner a breach takes place the better. The party of the seceders from the broad principle would be, I trust, insignificant, if not in numbers, yet certainly in talent and consideration in the country, and the others would be able to pursue an even, single handed and hearted course, without the restraints and thwartings which now paralyze their exertions and make them blush for the body to which they belong.

When we see what can be effected by a little well-directed combination on far less important subjects, one cannot doubt but the Dissenting body would soon understand their rights and relative duties, and would zealously vindicate the one and perform the other; and there are many members of Parliament of energy and moral courage enough to vindicate principles which only want to be stated and canvassed. If the Anti-Catholic Dissenters were left to themselves, we should see their nakedness, and I am very much mistaken if they would much longer be known among us.

I have always lamented the effects which the apathy and neglect of the leaders among the Dissenters have produced on the political character of the body. No opponent would wish for a result more favourable to his views. The present generation of Dissenters have never even heard the question of their rights discussed. Very many know really nothing of their political situation as compared with other countries. They have heard and believe wonderful things of what is called an Indemnity Bill; and the protectors of their civil rights have never either shewn them how degrading this perpetual pardon for offences committed is, or ought to be, felt to be by those who are conscious of no offence, or told them that this Indemnity Bill is all a farce and a delusion. What really is its operation? Nothing; except so far as the spirit of the age gives an operation to it, and would give it whether the Indemnity Bill passed or not. The Test and Corporation Acts are intended to prevent certain persons from holding offices, and this object it seeks to effect by giving a power to inflict sundry penalties and provisions; and does the Indemnity Bill relax the object in view? Not a bit, though it modifies the means. Penalties, which the country would not bear to see enforced, are certainly remitted; but the legal incapacity remains. The Dissenter cannot be elected if objected to; his votes are thrown away; and if returned, he is removeable by *quo warranto*. This is all that a persecuting spirit would dare to do at this day, and all this it can do when wanted; what it is prohibited from doing it would not dare to do, and does not want to do, for the law allows it still to do a great deal more than it ventures upon. Public feeling, then, is the Dissenters' protection, not the Indemnity Bill, which just as much accomplishes the object proposed, of keeping the Dissenter excluded when wished, as the Test and Corporation Acts themselves, only modifying the penalty, which it is found not necessary, and perhaps impossible, to enforce.

I lament exceedingly to see how much the Dissenters have lost the habit of looking to certain principles of civil liberty as belonging to, and rendered sacred by, their connexion with religious freedom. The name of Dissenter is no longer evidence, even presumptive, that the person who bears it is not and cannot, with any consistency, be the passive subject or instrument of oppression. As a political body, they can hardly be said to exist; and indeed one of the largest divisions of them is notoriously becoming every day more and more friendly to principles that look very much like passive obedience and complacent non-resistance, or at least indifference, in matters of politics.

X. A.

REVIEW.

ART. I.—*The Lady of the Manor: a Series of Conversations on the Subject of Confirmation. Intended for the Use of the Middle and Higher Ranks of Young Females.* In 4 vols. 12mo. pp. 303. By Mrs. Sherwood, Author of *Little Henry and his Bearer*, &c.

MRS. SHERWOOD writes religious tales and tracts with astonishing rapidity and great success. In the course of about ten or twelve years, she has published at one press alone upwards of fifty different works; she has been Editor of a Magazine, called *Mrs. Sherwood's Magazine*; besides employing her pen for Tract Societies. Out of the number of her tales for children, some have had a large circulation in India, where she resided for several years; some have been translated into French; all have reached third and fourth, many eleventh and twelfth, and one or two twentieth and twenty-third editions! A writer who has commanded so large a share of public attention, must be worthy of some notice: and when it is taken into the account that there is not a single tale or tract of Mrs. Sherwood's which does not contain an assertion, more or less strong, of the vital importance of belief in certain peculiar doctrines, and, moreover, that children and uneducated persons are the chief readers for whom most of her publications are intended, it is clear that she has long possessed large opportunities of doing both good and harm, and that all Christians are interested in knowing how she has used them.

But leaving Mrs. Sherwood for a while, we would briefly remark the change which has taken place in the mode of communicating religious instruction among those who hold certain religious opinions with peculiar strictness. No one could read the lives of some of our excellent Puritan forefathers without pitying from his heart the weary destiny of their children, so cruelly bereft of all *pleasurable* religious instruction. To sit out, with invincible patience or stupidity, sermons of two hours in length; to repeat Catechisms and passages of Scripture, selected with little regard to the learner's capacity; to disguise the vacancy of the mind by a look of affected solemnity,—were the *natural*, though possibly not invariable, consequences of the discipline of those times. Now, however, a better light has broken upon us, and Calvinism itself is setting an example of the adoption of more rational, more pure, more pious principles and modes of recommending piety and religion to the youthful mind. It is found out that it will not do to place religion on one side and enjoyment on the other. The power of pleasurable association—the advantage of drawing the mind gently to the obedience of the gospel by mild and winning representations, is seen, and our Saviour's example is, in this respect at least, acknowledged to be worthy of imitation. We hope the time is not far distant when the religious libraries of young people of all denominations will be better supplied with books at once interesting and useful. Hitherto, even among Unitarians, who have been less ascetic in their system, there has not been sufficient reference made to the tastes of children themselves. Books read and admired by the parents are too hastily imposed upon their children as things which they must read and admire too, and which it is a kind of disgrace not to like. This is not the way we act with regard to other subjects; we rather avoid

forcing upon young people any thing which it is particularly wished they should value; and more discretion might certainly be used in finding out, and adapting to a child's state and turn of mind, the reading suitable to encourage proper religious impressions. For instance, if learning by rote be burdensome, and to some children it is much more so than to others, what a grievous loss of opportunity is incurred, what chances run of inspiring disgust instead of relish, by compelling them to get by heart even Mrs. Barbauld's beautiful Prose Hymns! There are few children, probably, so dull as not to be touched and impressed by these compositions when judiciously read by a parent; and before the unfortunate association of learning by rote has been formed, we have been eagerly importuned by very young children to read them again and again, and have witnessed their delighted attempts to read for themselves. Nothing but forbearance on the parent's part is wanting to make such delightful books as acceptable and popular among children as among adults; nothing is easier than to make a child's association with the best things unpleasant. It would be well, too, if there were more stories unexceptionable in point of doctrine, and pleasing in style, which taught something better than mere worldly morality. It is surely not right to put tricks upon children, or to have them tutored to be good by the notion of being "always happy." It is as well, too, not to make such a motive as the love of their parents and friends, the *constant* stimulant, though it should, no doubt, have a high place in our list of worthy motives. They should, as early as they can bear it, be led to feel the ground on which they stand as candidates for immortality; they should see, as far as possible, to what point their education is tending; that it is the beginning of a discipline through which all must pass; that certain dispositions will, by a moral necessity, lead to misery, and therefore must be shunned; that others, on the contrary, as certainly will issue in final happiness; and that the directory by which we attain the knowledge of good and evil is open to both parent and child. When these principles are recognized, they may be exemplified in a thousand engaging forms, and it is not giving them a fair advantage to withhold that species of illustration which is perfectly allowable and compatible with the most accurate notions and principles of religion. Let us not, however, be misunderstood when we maintain that it is an essential point to give a child a strong feeling of interest in religion: we do not mean to say that what amounts to constant excitement is desirable. A well-judging parent will not lavish all the stores of pleasure in the early periods of instruction, and leave nothing but drudgery for succeeding years. Information must be imparted on these as on other subjects, in a more or less inviting form; and if there be one point more than another which needs the strictest attention, it is that of conducting *the understanding* and the affections together in the way of life.

Mrs. Sherwood's Tales for young people have served an important purpose in connecting pleasurable ideas with religious subjects, and on that account, their wide circulation is, on the whole, beneficial. Her stories on the Church Catechism (a closely printed 5s. volume, which has now entered the 12th edition) have, in the hands of teachers of charity-schools, not to mention parents, been the means of making that part of the "National" instruction interesting, and of communicating some ideas which it is probable never would have been formed in the mind of a child, had the Catechism been left to do its work alone. This, however, is equivocal praise. "The Lady of the Manor" is an attempt of the same kind for the benefit of the middle and higher ranks of young females; and, widely as we differ from

Mrs. Sherwood in her doctrinal expositions, as well as in her sentiments on various subjects connected with practice, both the attempt and the manner of its execution are deserving of no small praise. There are few (be their religious sentiments what they may) who do not feel pleasure in the reflection that there is a strong party in the National Church which goes beyond a feeling of attachment to creeds and formularies, merely because they are established; which labours diligently, according to its light, to point out the connexion between faith and practice, thinks lightly of the outward profession, unless the heart and spirit be profoundly impressed, and strives at least to make its members conversant with all the reasons it has to give for the hope that is in them. It is a great point to have got so far as this; and may we not venture to say, that real Christians of all denominations, if they allow themselves time to think, will uniformly recognize here the earnest of better things? Provoked to impatience, as we sometimes allow ourselves to be, by instances of narrow-mindedness which come in our way in our intercourse with Evangelical Churchmen; flattered and soothed as our vanity now and then, on the other hand, is by smooth speeches and compliments from what is called the Liberal party, we are apt to overlook the substantial good of an honest principle in education—we do not feel the advantage which is given to the cause of truth by training up the members of a church to receive its doctrines, not because they are established, not because it is genteel or expedient or liberal to belong to the National Church, but because those doctrines are, in the estimation of its teachers, scriptural. This is, at least, an acknowledgment of the only true foundation of truth; it is a great step in the way of integrity. It takes us directly from the evasive, hollow pleas of expediency, which, early infused into the mind, confound all moral distinctions. We cannot but think it a grievous error to prefer the lax concessions of those who pique themselves on their superior liberality, to the blunt honesty of those who, from conviction, not motives of policy, are members of the Established Church. There is, however, a degree of ignorance with regard to the opinions of other people which stands in the way of all just judgment; and from whatever motives this may spring, it must so far deviate from our idea of religious integrity. This, unhappily, is the case with regard to many of the instructors of the young among the Evangelical party in the Church, and the only hope for its removal is laid in the partial progress they have already made in implanting a spirit of examination, and bringing their systems and habits to the test of popular discussion. Fettered as their pupils are, deterred from rational inquiry in every direction, beyond a certain point, these restrictions will, nevertheless, cease to have much permanent force when once it has been allowed that every individual must stand or fall on his own ground; that it is not receiving the Sacrament, or being baptized in a National Church, which will avail; that, in short, there is a far higher authority than that of the Church, as such.

Before we enter more particularly upon the volumes before us, it is but justice to mention one valuable characteristic of Mrs. Sherwood's writings—the fearless severity with which she animadverts on the practical errors of the party to which she belongs. Nothing can be more obvious than that it is not her desire to exalt a party by vindicating or concealing its weaknesses; but to make young people religious, according to her conscientious notions of religion. Her quick eye discerns the increasing influence of worldly motives, and she spares no pains to get rid of all that is defective in the principle or practice of obedience. The deceitfulness of sympathy, the proneness of the mind to prefer noisy efforts to do good, to the slow process

of self-subjection and submission to domestic and homely difficulties; the love of human praise, the willingness to give it, the danger of mere irritation without deep conviction, these,—and the minor foibles of spiritual gossip, exaggerated expressions, &c., are all duly and sensibly animadverted upon.

There is a great deal of shrewdness, and occasionally considerable talent, displayed in her works; but her spirit of severity would tell much against her with young people who have been brought up according to modern ideas. She evidently wishes to bring back the days of Richardsonian authority and formality; she is too violently opposed to the manners and spirit of the times. Had she gone only half as far as she does, she would have a better chance. But to a certain extent she is perfectly right. Modern education is, as far as respects the discipline of forms, too lax; and in this concession we are strengthened by the authority of one whose kind and benevolent spirit is as far removed from the desire to make the duties of filial obedience galling and oppressive, as is his deportment from the uncourteous manner which he reprobates. (Dr. Carpenter—*Principles of Education*, pp. 195—197.) Mrs. Sherwood is herself, we understand, the mother of a large family; and cannot, therefore, be addressed as a theorist in education; but her manner of imparting religious instruction would, it must be confessed, appear little likely to effect the desired purpose. The doctrine of the Trinity is with her the beginning and the end. It is the prime, grand truth apparently upon which all the rest hangs. Instead of beginning, like most orthodox teachers, at what may be considered as of personal application, namely, the propensity to evil, or corruption of human nature, she mostly presupposes the fact of the self-devotion and sacrifice of the Deity, and then proceeds to inquire how or why this was necessary. This is the basis of all her doctrinal instruction. Is a sinner to be converted?

“That striking peculiarity of the Godhead which is revealed in Scripture, namely, the Trinity in Unity, is pointed out as the means and motive of his conversion. The word of God,” Mrs. Sherwood continues, “shews the believer how God the Father, who foresaw the fall of man before the foundation of the world, (brought about by the malice of Satan,) provided for him a Saviour, who should have power to overcome his spiritual foes, and to present him before the bar of Divine justice, clothed in unblemished and spotless righteousness. It points out also how God the Son, the second person in the Godhead, coequal and coeternal with the Father, undertook to become the Saviour of mankind, and to endure the utmost weight of the Divine anger against sin, in order that he might bring the sinner to glory; and, finally, it shews the nature and offices of the Holy Spirit, the third person of the ever-blessed Trinity, by whom the redeemed are convinced of sin, and taught their need of a Saviour, having their dead souls regenerated and quickened by his infinite power.”—I. 65, 66.

But this is nothing to the “scriptural” instruction given to a young child by its mother:

“At one time, she would point out to him the first appearance in Scripture of the second person of the Holy Trinity, under the type of light, which, at the command of the Creator, poured itself upon the dark face of the earth: and then she shewed him how this light was embodied, on the fourth day of the creation, in the substance of the sun, that heavenly luminary thus becoming the image of God incarnate, who in the fifth millennial was revealed to man in human flesh in the person of Christ. Hence she led him to trace this emblem through Scripture in all its various bearings, until she brought him to the completion of all things, when the man Christ, having finished his office,

and delivered up all things to the Father, it shall be said, 'The city hath no need of the sun to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof.' (Rev. xxi. 23.)"—IV. 10.

Now, as Mrs. Sherwood has sometimes put the case, the doctrine of the Trinity, taught in early life, and received as an important part of Christianity, *may* afterwards be turned to some practical account. Suppose, for instance, a mind powerfully acted upon by a sense of guilt and danger; and then let the doctrine in question, with its usual concomitants, *previously believed*, be brought home and impressed on the mind. Let the threefold relation in which the Almighty is supposed to stand to his creatures, as Father, Son and Spirit, be present to the mind—the Father as the dispenser of justice, the Son as Redeemer from the punishment of sin, the Spirit as purifier and restorer of the erring soul; and there is no doubt but a mind piously disposed, and deeply persuaded of the truth of these doctrines, may not only derive comfort, but strong moral impressions from them. Mrs. Sherwood may have seen cases of this kind, and she devoutly thinks that without this belief other faith is nearly valueless. Hence it is her first aim to fix the practical, if she can, but at any rate the speculative belief in this doctrine in the minds of young people, trusting that it will one time or other produce its effect. Now, however judicious in other respects Mrs. Sherwood may be; though *she*, perhaps, may by various means contrive to awaken the minds of her pupils to a sense of the value of religion, others will feel nothing but fear for the result, when a system like this is pursued by inferior teachers. There are doctrines, abstractedly solemn, interesting and impressive,—doctrines which it requires no learning to explain, no subtlety to apply, no human skill to modify. There are simple, gentle, wholesome teachings in the Scriptures, which ignorance on other subjects, and moderate capacity even on these, cannot widely abuse. There is the example of Jesus, who communicated knowledge to his followers but "as they were able to bear it," and yet there are teachers who make a point of commencing with darkness and mystery. Incomprehensible and unscriptural as the passages we have quoted from Mrs. Sherwood appear to be, our readers must remember that *they* are selected from a work containing much that is good and calculated to impress—but were it not for this, what would become of the pupil? Where would be his religion if these and the other doctrines of Calvinism were less enlivened by passages of practical worth? Where would be his morality, if he were left to deduce it from what Mrs. Sherwood thinks the all-important points? If no practical impression be made, in connexion with these points, positive harm would be the more probable result; not that harm only which may accrue from the reception of an unscriptural creed, but the deeper evil of a hardened and disgusted mind.

After these very general observations on Mrs. Sherwood's writings, we proceed to give some account of the "*Lady of the Manor*." "*The Lady*," then, is an inhabitant of the manor-house in a country village, and, being well known to devote much of her time and thoughts to religious studies, is requested by the clergyman of the parish to undertake the preparation of some of the most respectable young females in the place for confirmation: this charge, after some modest doubts, she accepts; and, accordingly, the young people are assembled at her house. After some preparatory observations and inquiries as to the state of their minds in the prospect of ratifying the baptismal vow, the Lady relates a story, designed to exemplify the necessity of early preparation for death, and concludes with some passages from Richard Baxter, not at all judiciously selected, and prayer. The succeeding

conversations, as far as Mrs. Sherwood has proceeded, (for she is not yet half through the task she proposes to herself,) are on the different clauses of the Catechism, including the Ten Commandments.

The last-mentioned portion of her work is much the best; she has often powerfully enforced the claims of the Deity to man's obedience, and disclosed the fallacy of his evasions. None of these stories, however, are without passages of a very objectionable nature. The quaintness and formality of the style are occasionally very annoying, and the artificial language put into the mouths of the young ladies and gentlemen who are her pattern characters, is equally so. The best story, on the whole, perhaps, is that of Anna Williams, which is a very close, practical application of the Third Commandment to the cases of a multitude of religious professors of our day.

The extent to which the name of God may be "taken in vain," by an affectation of feelings never experienced, by mere giving into the slang of a party, is extremely well shewn. The danger, also, of deserting homely duties for such as are more noisy and fashionable, is pointed out, and several characters are sketched with a very clever hand. As a specimen, may be selected a scene, in which the heroine, a quiet country girl, is introduced into an evening party of religious professors.

"Mrs. Humphreys, addressing herself to Miss Parker, inquired if they were not to have the pleasure of their dear minister's company that afternoon?"

"Miss Parker answered, that he had certainly promised to come; but he had begged her not to wait tea for him, as his time was never at his own command.

"Several persons now echoed Mrs. Humphreys' voice, who had just expressed her fears that their beloved pastor would ruin his constitution by his labours; adding, that no man could, uninjured, long support such a round of duties, or answer such constant calls upon his time.

"Many voices very instantly raised in admiration and pity of this excellent man, whom all represented as undergoing, in addition to his labours, mental and bodily, the severest persecutions which the enemies of religion could inflict. And so touching were the outlines which these good people drew of their beloved minister, that Anna, whose imagination had been very busily, and very injudiciously, at work the whole of the day, had just finished a picture in her own fancy of this respectable pastor, in which she had blended together such symptoms of suffering and Christian resignation, as one should naturally expect to discover in a portrait of David Brainerd, or the venerable Swartz, when a loud rap at the street door was the immediate forerunner of a brisk step in the hall, which speedily brought into the room a well-looking, ruddy, boyish-faced young man, in a genteel clerical dress.

"The joy expressed by the greater part of the company at the appearance of this young pastor, brought up some old-fashioned blushes into Anna's face, particularly as some of the ladies, who had expressed so much delight, were quite as young as herself, and therefore could not claim the privilege of years for their freedom of manner.

"In the meantime, Mr. Burton, (for such was the name of the young clergyman in question,) politely refusing several chairs offered to him in different parts of the room, stepped up to Miss Parker and Mrs. Humphreys, who were sitting near together; and having paid the usual compliments, was going to sit down quietly, when Mrs. Humphreys called him to account for being so late.

"To which he made answer, that his time was not at his command; and that his calls were so numerous that he hardly knew in what way to answer the one half of them; but that he could not deny himself the pleasure of joining

the present party, 'although,' added he in a whisper to Mrs. Humphreys, 'I shall be obliged to sit up half the night in consequence.'

"Mrs. Humphreys immediately repeated his whisper aloud to Miss Parker; adding, that she hoped Miss Parker was sensible of the favour done her party by Mr. Burton's present appearance among them. And then, without waiting for the young lady's answer, she proceeded gravely to caution the young clergyman against over exertion in the way of duty, telling him how many persons had ruined their health in order to embrace a larger field of usefulness, and beseeching him particularly not to deprive himself of his rest at night.

"She spoke so largely on these subjects, that Anna, who had been kept in a state of amazement all the day, could not help looking up again to the young gentleman's face, to see if she could observe there any symptoms of fatigue or lassitude; but the placid and blooming appearance of the supposed sufferer, and the liveliness of his eye, induced her to suppose, that his labours and trials, like her own, had only existed in Mrs. Humphreys' imagination, and that the young man had not more to do than what conduced to his health and the promotion of his robust appearance. She was soon, however, disturbed from her quiet reflections on this subject, by Mrs. Humphreys' requesting that she might have the pleasure of introducing their dear minister to Miss Williams; adding, that Mr. Burton was fully acquainted with her piety, her filial affection, and all the trials to which she had been called, as well as the wonderful manner in which she had been supported through them.

"Anna had no time to recover from the confusion into which she was thrown by this sudden address, before she found it necessary to answer the bows and fine speeches of the young clergyman, who, upon being thus called upon by Mrs. Humphreys, thought it incumbent on him to say something civil to the young stranger, particularly as her appearance was agreeable, modest and unaffected, and such as is generally looked on with respect, if not with admiration.

"The tea-table being arranged, and Miss Parker placed at it, with several of her young friends to assist her, Mr. Burton was making his escape towards it, when Mrs. Humphreys, addressing him again, said, 'that she had another subject of complaint against him, and that she must call upon him, in the name of all the company present, to defend himself. This heavy charge,' said Mrs. Humphreys, 'is, that you left us last Sunday and placed a stranger in your pulpit. Now,' added she, 'we all protest against a repetition of this offence.'

" 'Indeed we do,' repeated many voices.

" 'We shall be very angry if you make such an arrangement again, without having just cause,' said Mrs. Humphreys.

" 'But,' said Mr. Burton, 'the gentleman who took my place is one of the first preachers in the county!'

" 'First or last,' said Mrs. Humphreys, 'we will decidedly not allow of any exchanges of the kind; so beware of a second offence.'

" 'But,' said a young lady who had risen from her chair at the other end of the room on the first opening of this cause, and walked up quite close to Mr. Burton, 'I am come to enter my protest against all monopolies. Are not we poor starving creatures, who live at the other end of the town, and go to a church where the old curate preaches us all to sleep—are we quite to be shut out from all that is good and animating? Mind not what they say, Mr. Burton,' added she, putting her hand upon his arm, 'but come to us whenever you can get any one to fill your pulpit.'"—III. 140.

Of the danger of self-deception and hypocrisy among young people who have been familiarized to religious sentiments and examples, Mrs. S. is well aware, and in her story of *Jenetta Mannering* (Vol. II.) she has drawn a striking picture of the bad effect of injudicious parental observation and praise of early appearances of religious or devotional tastes or habits in a

child, arising probably from mere accidental circumstances, and persisted in, in a spirit of vanity and deception, merely because observed to attract attention and applause.

It will only be doing Mrs. Sherwood justice to allow her again to speak for herself in her story of "Human Praise," given as an illustration of the First Commandment. *Story*, indeed, it scarcely deserves to be called, for the incidents are few and simple; but the characters, the scenes, and the moral, are excellent, and they furnish instances of the unsparing manner in which the errors of the religious world are censured. Mr. James Eliot is a respectable gentleman who, after residing some years in the interior of India, merely as a merchant or trader, without feeling much interest in the good, moral or religious, of the people around him, is led by a visit to Calcutta, and some intercourse with English Missionaries, to adopt serious religious views, and, on returning to the jungles, sets himself to work in good earnest upon the improvement of the poor natives around his residence. Nay, so far does his Christian charity carry him, that he gives up the idea of returning to England to enjoy the fortune he has acquired, and determines to devote himself to the work which he considers appointed for him to do.

"He established schools, and built a small place of worship, where, in default of a more duly qualified person, he read and expounded the Scripture himself in the native tongue: he provided readers to go into the neighbouring villages; he assisted the poor, sick, fatherless and the widows; and used every lawful means in his power to make himself acceptable to the untaught Heathen round him. He found in this his blessed career many disappointments and some encouragements; and though he endured much fatigue, particularly from labouring in a climate so peculiarly relaxing as that of Bengal, yet he was blessed with great peace of mind, and an entire freedom from that dejection of spirits to which he, in common with the greater part of the European inhabitants of Bengal, had formerly been very liable. It is true, that, when he read the accounts of what his Christian brethren were doing in other parts of the world, especially of the great anniversaries of the Bible and Missionary Societies in England, where thronging multitudes, made up partly of the great and noble among men, were assembled together to promote the work of their heavenly Father, he would sometimes look round from the solitary elevation on which his house was situated, on the villages with their bent roofs and bamboo porches, on the swampy plains, the tops of trees, and the vast meadows on which herds of buffaloes cropped the rank pasturage; and as he looked he would feel a momentary dejection of spirit at the thought of his entire separation from all Christian society. At these seasons he could not forbear crying out, 'Had I but one friend, one Christian brother, to whom I might open my heart, to whom I might relate my perplexities, and tell my difficulties, what consolations and encouragements should I then experience!' But while the Almighty saw good to deny him this consolation, he gave him one which was as infinitely superior, as that which is heavenly is above that which is earthly. He led him to feel that he who seeks comfort or encouragement from a fellow-creature, rests his support on that which may break or pierce his hand; but that he who makes *the Lord the Spirit* his guide, his friend and comforter, rests on that rock which is able to support him 'when all the host of heaven shall be dissolved.'"—II. 232, 233.

"After Mr. Eliot," however, "had been working for some years in his solitary situation with great faithfulness, he was visited by a gentleman who had much the same Christian views with himself; this gentleman was, of course, much pleased with what he saw and heard of Mr. Eliot's conduct; and, on returning to his friends, failed not to give a relation, though with much simplicity, of the blessed work which was going on in the jungles. This relation was by far too interesting to be slightly passed over by those who take

delight in such sacred reports, and, in consequence, it soon spread from one to another, till at length it reached the mother-country, where it offered a desirable article to many of the religious periodical papers of the day. In this manner, though unknown till a long time afterwards by the person himself, the name of James Eliot became celebrated in the religious world; and he was particularly commended for his conduct, at a time when his people were visited with a severe and dangerous fever, during which he hazarded his own life by visiting the miserable huts of the sick."

Meantime, this good man himself, quite unconscious that his name and deeds have been sounded so far, goes on quietly working among the natives of his retired jungle. At length a severe illness attacks him, and he is ordered, as his only remaining chance of life, to return to England. On his arrival in his native land, it occurs to him that, having two cousins, elderly single ladies, residing in a small town in one of the inland counties, he cannot do better than fix his residence near them for the present, and accordingly he writes to them requesting their assistance in procuring him lodgings. Now, it happens that these two ladies, the Misses Clinton, have very recently, in consequence of the example and admonitions of a certain fashionable religious neighbour, a Mrs. Essington, become very desirous of establishing their own character for attention to these subjects; they "declared that they begun to see things in a new light, spoke of their past lives as a dream of sin and folly, lamented the wickedness of their hearts, and gave notice that they should thenceforward give up dancing and renounce whist: and, in accordance with these professions, they were observed to take the artificial roses from their bonnets." On the receipt of Mr. Eliot's letter, two causes of satisfaction were opened to these ladies: the one, that they might supply certain deductions which unforeseen circumstances had made in their own regular incomes, by letting apartments to their cousin; the other, that they should obtain some portion of éclat from the circumstance of having such a well-known religious character as Mr. James Eliot beneath their roof. "It was marvellous what pains they took to state the high character which he bore in the Missionary world; the great benefits he had rendered to the Church in India; his exalted piety," &c.: and, to crown all, they took care to have the before-mentioned publication, relating to Mr. Eliot's exertions, always lying open on their parlour-table, by which means, and with the assistance of Mrs. Essington, whose energies were presently all excited on the occasion, they raised such a commotion among the religious professors in the town, before Mr. James Eliot could arrive from London, that every window of the street through which he must pass, might have been expected to overflow with young and old, had the hour of his arrival been exactly known. In the meantime, the good old gentleman, who was altogether a plain, unassuming man, with as little pretensions as possibly could be to any thing out of the common way, or in the heroic line, was travelling down from town in the inside of a heavy coach, perfectly unconscious of all the expectations he was likely to excite, and occupied with some schemes of his own for making himself of use in the place of his future residence. We hope there are none of our readers so entirely sceptical about the existence of characters who "do good by stealth, then blush to find it fame," as to regard the confusion, and almost ludicrous vexation, of the worthy man, at the first discovery of his own notoriety, as exaggerated or unnatural. We cannot make room for the scene,—and, besides, it is a good deal spoiled, as almost all Mrs. Sherwood's best scenes are, by a very laboured and learned doctrinal harangue, which, besides wandering egregi-

ously from the mark, is out of all the bounds of ordinary conversation. We prefer extracting the meeting with Mrs. Essington, who takes the earliest opportunity of making acquaintance with the celebrated Mr. James Eliot.

“While the gentlemen were discoursing, several shrill voices were heard on the stairs, among which one was distinctly heard, exclaiming, ‘Where is he? I am all agitation. Where is the dear old gentleman?’ A moment after which, Mrs. Essington entered with an air all impatience, and without ceremony rushed forward with her hand extended to Mr. Eliot, at the same time pouring forth such a profusion of compliments, that the astonished old gentleman evidently drew back confounded, though he failed not to bow with his usually respectful and modest air. ‘Is there no one here,’ said Mrs. Essington, ‘to perform the ceremony of introduction? Miss Clinton, Miss Esther, how you forget yourselves!’ turning to the ladies; ‘I am very angry at your slowness. You have compelled me, all impatient as I was, to shock this gentleman by my forwardness in introducing myself. Come, come, since none of you will speak for me, I am under the necessity of introducing myself; my name is Essington, and for the last two years I have been dying, absolutely dying, to see Mr. Eliot. I should have been here on Saturday or Sunday, but these hard-hearted ladies would not suffer it; and now I am come, they leave me to say all for myself.

“‘Well, but now,’ added she, sitting down, ‘now we are met, you must tell me, Mr. Eliot, indeed you must tell me, how you left all those dear good creatures in India, all the good people in the jungles. Aye, jungle; that is the word; O that delightful account in the Magazine! Dear Mr. Eliot! do tell us all about it! How could you part with them? How could they part with you? Well! but it is a perpetual feast for you to think how you have laboured among the Heathen, and how many are and will be the better for your exertions! Well! what a privilege! what an honour to have been employed in such a work! You have lived to some purpose, Mr. Eliot! you are a happy man. What sweet reflections you will have on your death-bed! I absolutely envy you.’ During this time the old gentleman remained perfectly silent, but eyeing, with mixed wonder and curiosity, the fair, faded, fashionable creature who thus addressed him with such a mixture of vanity, thoughtlessness and good intention.”

A good deal more to the same effect passes; but our Indian Missionary is not yet initiated. After some time has elapsed, during which he has been allowed to follow his own inclination, and bestow his time and attention on such objects as he thinks most deserving, a Missionary Meeting takes place in the town, and the clergyman requests he will favour them with his presence and a speech. Somewhat to the surprise of his cousins, he accordingly comes forward, though with some reluctance, yet without perturbation, and gives a plain but interesting account of the state of the people among whom he had resided so long, their wants, and the degree of help which had been afforded them.

If Mrs. Sherwood's own friends do not quarrel with her for her report of the concluding proceedings of this meeting, we have no business to do so; but, in fact, we believe her severity will offend very few. It is, we believe, acknowledged by the most judicious and truly religious among the Evangelical party, that a great deal of harm has been done to their cause by the lavish panegyrics upon individuals connected with that cause, which have been bestowed by speakers at public meetings. They have not only *begun* to feel, they have for some time felt, sensible that the effect of these panegyrics is particularly bad, as far as respects the female character, and they will heartily thank Mrs. Sherwood for her assistance in counteracting it. We must make room for Mr. Anthony Beverley's speech.

“He first, in a florid and elaborate, yet common-place style, complimented his country on her missionary exertions and her indefatigable labours, her mighty works of self-denial, and the glorious pattern she exhibited before all nations. He spoke of her Bible Societies and her Missionary Societies; he congratulated her on her valiant sons and her beautiful daughters, the greater part of whom, he said, were engaged in one mighty labour of love, viz. the conversion of the Heathen, the spread of the Bible, and the relief of the afflicted. He then passed some very well-turned compliments on his own town; and next he proceeded to utter a high panegyric on a certain individual, whom he did not name, but whom he described as having spent a long and laborious life devoted to missionary labours, in a voluntary banishment from his country, his home, his friends: subjecting himself to endless privations, excessive fatigue under the burning sun of a tropical climate, and exposed to every kind of indignity; and he called on his town to receive and reward this Christian hero with every testimony of love, honour and approbation, and to hold him up as a burning and shining light to their sons and daughters.

“While the young orator was thus vehemently labouring his point, in a manner, and with an expression, to which I despair of doing justice, the Misses Clinton, as parties nearly concerned, were hiding their blushes with their fans, while the good old gentleman, to the astonishment of Mrs. Essington and her party, sat perfectly unmoved, looking at the speaker, and not being in the least able to comprehend what he meant. At length, being struck with some very extraordinary expressions, of which he could make neither head nor tail, he turned to Mr. Sandford, who sat next to him, and very simply asked him the name of the extraordinary person of whom the young gentleman was speaking. Mr. Sandford smiled and said, ‘Do you know any man to whom this description answers?’ ‘In some points,’ said Mr. Eliot, ‘it might suit David Brainerd, but in others, no mere man can deserve such praise.’ So saying, the good old gentleman settled himself in his chair, hemmed twice, took a pinch of snuff, and prepared himself to listen again with undisturbed curiosity. In the mean time, the young panegyrist finished his harangue, and retired gracefully to his seat; while Mrs. Essington’s party excited a second thunder of applause, which lasted long, bursting forth again and again, while every eye was fixed on Mr. Eliot, who sat, as I before remarked, perfectly unmoved, except that on the clapping continuing somewhat too long, he turned to Mr. Sandford and said, ‘Too much of the theatre in this business, Mr. Sandford! too much of the theatre! Are not you of this opinion, my good Sir?’”

Mrs. Sherwood has occupied a large space, but another point or two must be remarked. It is, perhaps, not extraordinary that she should record so confident an opinion respecting the acceptance and available repentance of a profligate sinner, of whose sincere conversion no proof whatever is given; but can she think it judicious to bring forward in so prominent a manner, as she does in the story of Altamont, (Vol. I.,) what she is pleased to call an instance of the power of Divine grace, not for the purpose of comfort to the despairing sinner, but for the sake of instruction to the young? We must add, that there is abundance of womanly decorum in her advice to young females, but so great an absence of womanly tenderness, that it is questionable whether her counsels will have weight where they would be most valuable. In drawing broad lines of distinction between the converted and the unconverted, she seems to have lost sight of all care for the differences of natural disposition. Every thing, however amiable in itself, is bad, if it be not directly religious, in her uncompromising sense of the term: there is no help to the feeble and halting Christian.

To conclude; it is sincerely to be desired that some writer for the young might come forward, endowed with equal or superior talent, impressed as

deeply with the importance of religious truth, to counsel, guide and interest the heart, and equally earnest in its inculcation, but disposed to give it a more amiable and engaging form, and to feed the understanding with a wholesomer and purer aliment.

Y.

ART. II.—*Recensio Synoptica Annotationis Sacræ, &c., &c.* By the Rev. S. T. Bloomfield, M. A., &c.

(Continued from p. 61.)

WE have already laid before our readers a general account of the plan and execution of Mr. Bloomfield's work.

In the present article we propose to review a few of those annotations, which, from their own interest or the importance of the subjects to which they relate, seem to have the strongest claims on our notice; and if amongst these we have most frequently selected comments in which we cannot agree with the learned editor, we hope that this will be attributed to a desire of rendering our remarks more useful, not to any disposition to depreciate a work which we consider as upon the whole truly valuable.

We are happy in being first called upon for the expression of our approbation. The note on Matt. i. 21 ("He shall *save* his people from their sins") is too important, as illustrating the character of the work, to be passed by in silence. It is chiefly derived from Wetstein and Dr. Maltby. We translate a part of the passage from Wetstein. "By *salvation*," he says, "is here understood a remission of sins, not such as could suggest to the sinner the hope of impunity and license, but such as requires serious repentance and purification of the mind from former vices, from which arises a perfect security and assured hope of eternal felicity; all which things, as they are in their nature closely connected together, are included in the word *salvation* or deliverance, not imperfect and temporary, but complete and worthy of God." The extract from Dr. Maltby is much to the purpose: "The verb *σώζειν*, to preserve or save, and *σώζομαι*, to escape, to be preserved or saved, occur perhaps more than one hundred times in the N. T. The significations may be classed under four general heads.—I. To *preserve generally* from any evil or danger whatsoever. II. To preserve from sickness or any bodily disorder; *to heal*. This sense is the most easy to distinguish, yet it has not been duly attended to in every instance by our translators. III. To *preserve* from the *temporal* anger of the Almighty, such as was manifested in the destruction of Jerusalem. This notion appears to have been originally founded upon expressions in the Jewish Prophets. IV. To give future *salvation in heaven*."

It might have been added that the two last senses are not always clearly distinguished; salvation sometimes meaning all the blessings of the gospel, both with respect to this life and that which is to come; both peculiar to the first age and common to all believers. It is worth notice, as explanatory of the IVth and, theologically speaking, principal sense of the word, that the expression of the angelic messenger is, "He shall save his people from *their sins*," not from the wrath or vengeance of God.

On Matt. i. 22, there is also a useful note derived from Knapp and Wetstein, the substance of which should be fixed in the minds of those who would be intelligent readers of the New Testament.

“The Jews,” says Knapp, “were accustomed to prefix prophecies even to statements of facts, and to connect and accommodate to their prophecies unexpected occurrences, and they were very fond of speaking in words and phrases derived from the Old Testament, especially when some kind of resemblance existed between the passage of the Old Testament and the subject of discourse. Hence the expressions, *to be fulfilled, to be accomplished*, occur in various senses in the Rabbinical books and in the New Testament; and the oracles and declarations of the prophets are said to be *fulfilled* or *accomplished*, not only when that very thing which was predicted has occurred, but also when any thing similar has happened which brings those words to our recollection, and in any manner confirms and illustrates them.” Knapp apud Kuinoel.

There is, in fact, a great similarity between our own common practice of expressing our thoughts on any subject of discourse in the appropriate words of a favourite poet; and the Jewish applications of their prophecies, and the formula, “that it might be fulfilled,” &c., frequently meant nothing more than “to use the words of the prophet.” It is not, therefore, without much caution, that we must press applications of passages from the Ancient Scriptures, as expressing the real and original sense of the authors, and we should not improve, as interpreters of the Old Testament, by adopting indiscriminately the explanations of its words which are to be found in the New.

Matt. iii. 11, “He shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit and *with fire*.” On the much-disputed question, whether the *fire* be *explanatory* of the Holy Spirit, or *contrasted* with it; whether it refer to the tongues of flame on the day of Pentecost, or to the punishment of the unbelieving Jews in the destruction of Jerusalem, our author has thrown little light, nor is it easy to discover his own opinion. At first he seems to express approbation of the former interpretation; yet we should suppose him to incline to the latter, when, without any censure or caution, he says, “This *purgation* (by fire) Wetstein explains of all those *calamities* which the Jews soon after experienced in the burning of the temple and the destruction of Jerusalem, and of the state.” We think the question will be set at rest, if, attending to the ambiguity of the word πνεύματι, *spirit* or *wind*, we consider that the following verse is a mere explanation of the words now before us, the image of the threshing-floor having been already in the Baptist’s mind when he mentioned the *two* means of purification, *wind* and *fire*; by the former of which, the Holy Spirit, the good should be distinguished from the bad, as the wheat is from the broken straw and chaff, by the blast from the winnowing fan; by the latter the bad should be consumed, as the straw and chaff are in the fire which is prepared near the floor. “Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly cleanse his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner, *but* will burn up the chaff with fire unquenchable.” The gifts of the Holy Spirit were bestowed as a distinctive sign on the true believers. *Fire* is the appropriate representative of dreadful calamities of whatsoever kind, and was surely never more justly applied than to those which befel the unhappy Jews who obstinately rejected the proffered salvation.

The word ἀσβέστος, unquenchable, is explained by ἀκαταπαύστος, not to be restrained or appeased, and manifestly refers to the rapid burning of the broken straw and chaff, so that when once lighted it could not be extinguished; so when once God’s judgments should overtake the opposers of the Messiah’s kingdom, no means of escape would be afforded them, the destruction would be neither to be restrained nor resisted. Since then this word here refers only to *temporal* judgments, and our author himself so explains

it in the above quotation from Wetstein, he need not have told us, that “the remark of Theophylact *deserves notice*: ὥστε φλυαρεῖ ὁ Οριγένης λέγων ὅτι ἔσται τέλος τῆς κολασέως.

Ch. iv. On the temptation, Mr. Bloomfield seems to adopt the hypothesis of Farmer, referring to Maltby's Sermons for a particular explanation. He takes no notice of the common notion of the personal presence of the Devil, whether in his own form or disguised as a good angel. We are glad to see that a learned and orthodox divine of the Church of England, does not consider this notion as any longer deserving notice: of course, nothing is said of the opinion that the narrative is a figurative mode of expressing what passed in our Lord's mind, since that may be thought to imply his simple humanity; but a curious speculation is slightly mentioned respecting which many readers would have thanked him for more particulars: “Among the diversity of opinions entertained on this passage, I must notice one recently devised by some German theologians, who maintain, that the διάβολος here mentioned was either the Pontifex Maximus, or one who had passed the office of High-Priest, and had considerable influence with the people, and who, at intervals, as occasion offered, had a mind to try Jesus—whether he was really the Messiah and would deliver the Jews from the Roman subjection.”

On iv. 24, the first mention of demoniacs, Mr. B. gives a very useful epitome of Wetstein's note, shewing that demoniacs were persons afflicted with madness and various other diseases, and that these diseases were not really produced by the Devil or any spiritual beings, but that the name *demoniac*, like *lunatic*, merely expressed the vulgar opinion. A farther examination of the subject, with due notice of what has been written by Mede, Farmer, &c., is promised in a future note, but if any such is to be found, it has escaped our careful search. We were a little surprised to find Mr. B. (on Mark xvi. 9, “Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven demons”) speaking as if he believed in the reality of possession:

“Markland observes,” he says, “that this seems to be one of those places of the New Testament of which no satisfactory account has yet been given, viz. what is meant by ἑπτὰ δαιμόνια (seven demons). For my part I see not in what the difficulty consists, at least according to the *common opinion* on the subject of demoniacs. The difficulty can only be found by those who adopt the new hypothesis. They are fain to interpret the expression of curing a dangerous epilepsy or melancholy. Or they take it of a person in whose mind an opinion had been fixed, that seven demons had occupied her body, which is yet *more* harsh. Neither can I bring myself to admit with Kuinoel, that *seven may* be taken, by a certain figure of speech, as a certain for an uncertain number.”

We cannot profess for ourselves to feel much of Markland's difficulty. The Jews, it seems, spoke of those who were afflicted with violent madness, or epilepsy, as being possessed by a number of demons: thus the madman, cured by our Lord in the country of the Gadarenes, conceived himself to be possessed by a whole legion of evil spirits; and Mary Magdalene was spoken of, on the same principle, as having had, not only one, but many demons. We agree with Kuinoel as to the use of the number *seven* to express an indefinite number. Examples of it are cited from the Old Testament, but we refer to Schleusner's article, which seems to us satisfactory. The Hebrews, from the earliest times, regarded the number seven as a perfect number, and used it in various ceremonies to express the completeness of the action, as, bowing seven times to mark entire respect, sacrificing seven animals, mourning seven days, and other similar instances; what then could be more natu-

ral, according to their ideas, than expressing complete or violent madness by the possession of *seven* demons?

The learned note on Luke xiii. 11, (*a woman having a spirit of infirmity,*) also relating to the same subject, is of a very different character from that on which we have now remarked, certainly implying disbelief of the reality of possession, and thus leaving us in doubt as to our author's real opinion. It shews that the Jews attributed presiding spirits to almost every thing, especially, that they believed diseases to be inflicted by demons; and it concludes with the remark, (from Hardt and Moldenhauer,) that the Evangelist speaks according to the opinions of his countrymen.

Mr. B. has two annotations relating to the important phrase *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* "the Son of Man," Matt. viii. 20, xii. 8. It is disputed whether this is to be accounted a title of *dignity* or of *humility*, and what is the precise idea on which it is founded. Our author takes it as a title of dignity, equivalent with *Messiah*, and seems to adopt the opinion of Heinsius, Scholten, and Rosenmüller, that it denotes "him who is said to be the second after Adam; for in the Jewish writings there is frequent mention of the first and second Adam; and Jesus was accustomed to signify his dignity thus obscurely." But *Son of Man*, with the Hebrews, was an expression of depreciation, applied to the human race as contrasted with the eternity and perfect holiness of the Deity, and to those in a low and wretched condition as opposed to the great and powerful. No reason can be given for connecting the phrase with any thing which is said in Rabbinical writings of the second Adam. It is observed that the title is applied to our Lord in a prophetic vision of *his glory*, (Dan. vii. 13,) "I saw in the night visions, and behold one like unto a son of man came with the clouds of heaven and came unto the Ancient of days." But surely the meaning here is to mark, that, notwithstanding the great power and dignity which was to be conferred upon him, and the glorious manner of his appearance, the object of the vision was in his personal appearance like to other, and even to very humble, mortals, and made no outward show of the superiority which belonged to him, a circumstance peculiarly applicable to the voluntary humiliation of our blessed Lord; so that, even if it be allowed that the title was in part, at least, founded on this passage and conveyed an obscure intimation of Messiahship, it would still express humiliation, not exaltation. Two passages (Matt. xvi. 13—16, and xii. 32) are often referred to as proving "the Son of Man" to be of the same meaning with "the Christ;" but the same passages are also generally produced on the opposite side to illustrate the difference between the two phrases, and we think with much more reason. We would seek then the *rationale* of the title in the meanness of condition, want and sufferings, voluntarily submitted to by our Lord for the accomplishment of the ends of his mission, which rendered him pre-eminently *the humbled and afflicted one*. We are satisfied that Jesus employed it as a modest and unpretending way of speaking of himself, and we think its having, with a single exception, been used by none but himself, strongly confirms this view of the subject. If any reference was intended to the passage in Daniel, it was as the most humble, and, at the same time, as *an obscure* method of implying his claim to the high dignity which belonged to him. Considering the nature and use of the corresponding Hebrew phrase, we cannot conceive with what propriety this title could have been applied to any but a *human being*, and the contrivances resorted to for evading this conclusion, though various and perhaps ingenious, have always appeared to us far-fetched and unsatisfactory.

But we must recall our attention to Mr. Bloomfield, and quote a remark to which he appears to attach importance :

“ I must deny,” he says, (on Matt. xii. 8,) “ that the formula $\delta \text{ υἱος τῆς ἀνθρώπου}$, ever signifies merely man or a man. I think I may venture to maintain that it always signifies *the Son of Man*, the Messiah; and I defy the Unitarians, who have always strenuously battled for this sense as lowering the dignity of Christ, to prove that it ever does.”

We cannot help thinking that Mr. B. is right in enforcing the distinction between $\delta \text{ υἱος τῆς ἀνθρώπου}$ and υἱος ἀνθρώπου . The article marks the appropriation of the phrase as the *title* of an *individual* to whom it was peculiarly applicable, and is therefore always employed when Jesus is intended; but this does not alter the sense of the formula: and let it be remembered, that the interpretation, which we join our author in disapproving, of the Son of Man being lord of the Sabbath, though adopted by some Unitarians, belongs not exclusively, or even generally, to them, and has the high authority of Grotius and Kuinoel in its favour. Mr. B. has here strangely forgotten himself. He makes profession of candour and liberality; yet here, because some Unitarians, *in common with some learned and distinguished men of orthodox sentiments*, prefer an interpretation which he and *many Unitarians also* disapprove, he can accuse the Unitarians *as a body* of being guided in their explanations of Scripture by a desire of *lowering the dignity of Christ*; and all this in reference to a phrase of which the Unitarian interpretation is so decidedly the most obvious and natural, that they might well reserve their arts, if capable of using any, for some occasion on which they might be more needed.

We do not observe any similar accusation of Mr. B. against the evil spirit of Unitarianism, where it would be quite as judicious and well-timed, in his comment on Mark xiii. 32, (“ Of that hour knoweth no man, no not the angels, *nor the Son*, but the Father only,”) where, indeed, he seems at a loss which of three attempts at an orthodox explanation of the passage to prefer, and modestly says, “ On this *most difficult* question I dare not venture to offer an opinion.” We wish, though his note is already somewhat long, owing to the “ *extreme difficulty*” of the passage, that he had favoured us with the SATISFACTORY PROOF which, he assures us, is afforded by Muller, Kidder, and Masch, that our Lord’s ignorance in this instance does not detract from his divinity. Truly, the Unitarians must be possessed by a very determined purpose of *lowering* the Master whom they profess to honour and serve, or they could never understand such passages as these as interfering with his divine nature or omniscience.

Matt. xxi. 2. The account of our Lord’s triumphant entry into Jerusalem is given by all the evangelists. Matthew is peculiar in his mention of *two* animals, as well as in quoting the words of Zechariah. We have no hesitation in understanding the passage in Zechariah of *one* animal, “ sitting upon an ass, even a *young ass* ;” and the exact fulfilment of the prophecy is marked by two evangelists, who mention that it was one “ on which never man sat.” It is *possible* the young ass may, as described in Matthew, have been taken from its mother, and that the mother may have followed, whilst the expression “ upon them,” twice in ver. 7, may be used vaguely, the writer not undertaking to say upon which Jesus rode; but a suspicion arises in the mind of the narrative used by Matthew having been somewhat conformed to a mistaken view of the prophecy of Zechariah. The various readings respecting the twice-repeated word $\alphaὐτῶν$ in ver. 7, and even, probably,

the reading adopted by Griesbach in the 3d, ἀποστέλλει for ἀποστελεῖ, seem to us to have arisen from a desire to bring Matthew into better harmony with the other evangelists. We should therefore adhere throughout to the common reading, but should be disposed to give ourselves little trouble in explaining the circumstance of there being *two* animals, on which we cannot implicitly depend. Our author has some good remarks on this passage, but seems, from his note on ver. 5, and the pains he takes about αὐτῶν, ver. 7, to have been a good deal embarrassed by the mention of the two animals.

The note on Matt. xxviii. 19, is remarkable for passing in silence the argument for the Trinity, probably as being, in our author's opinion, too plain to need illustration. It does, however, after a dissertation on infant baptism, on which we shall not now dwell, introduce a very important question, which has an immediate bearing on the doctrinal application of the text, whether the words of our Lord contain a formula of baptism prescribed by him, or whether they indicate the *end and purpose* of baptism—we should rather say, the *subjects* of the instruction to which baptism was the introduction. Our readers will perceive that the argument of Trinitarians is founded on the first supposition. It is acknowledged that the mention, in one place, of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, cannot establish their united and equal deity, nor even the *personality* of each; but it is contended that the baptismal *formula* implies a dedication to all three, or a joint invocation of them. Supposing a formula, we should be content with the explanations of it which Mr. B., after Wetstein, has given from the Apostolical Constitutions and Canons (supposititious works, probably of the fourth century): "The Father is mentioned as the cause, the Son as the messenger, the Spirit as the witness. We make known to you that there is one only God, the ruler of all things, with whom is no other, and that you should pay religious homage and worship to him only through Jesus Christ our Lord, in the Holy Spirit," &c. These passages clearly recognize the supremacy of the Father, and leave us to form our opinions from other places of the nature of Christ and the personality of the Spirit.

Mr. B. decides in favour of the formula; we must confess that our judgment greatly inclines against it. Our author's is the more common opinion; ours is that of "Piscator and Gataker, and, in our own day, of many German theologians, especially Kuinoel." A statement of the arguments on both sides is given from Kuinoel, which will shew many who had before no conception of it, the great uncertainty, to say the least, of any formula being given; it does not, however, entirely express our views. We should say that the leading object of the passage is to direct the apostles as to the *subjects* of their teaching, and that baptizing is but incidentally named as the ordinary method of receiving disciples for instruction in the doctrines of the master whose *authority*, by submitting to that ceremony, they acknowledged. With Schleusner we take ὄνομα to be redundant. Such expressions as "baptizing into Christ" and "into Moses," "into the name of the Lord Jesus," "into the name of Paul," fully justify us. Being *baptized into the name of*, or *into*, any messenger of God, is acknowledging the authority of that person to teach, and being introduced into instruction concerning him and his doctrine—to be baptized *into any thing, doctrine, or subject*, or into the name of it—is to be admitted to instruction by those who baptized upon that subject. The Samaritans circumcised into the name of Mount Gerizim, i. e. they used the rite of circumcision as an admission to a religion distinguished by the doctrine that this mountain was the place to worship God. So we may understand what the Apostle Paul says, (Rom. vi. 3,) that "as many of us as were baptized

into Christ Jesus, were baptized into his death." If we have at all entered upon Christian instruction, the death of Christ must have been brought before us as a subject of such leading importance, that it might be said to be for the sake of that subject, with express reference to it, that we were baptized, whence we are led to the following allegorical representation of the change produced by the reception of the Gospel. Now we observe, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, may be very well taken for doctrine or instruction upon those subjects, which in fact are those upon which instruction was particularly needed—the mutual relation of God and Christ illustrating the character and dealings of the Father; the dignity and authority of the Son; and the gifts of the Holy Spirit, which were promised to the faithful as the means of convincing others, and a constant witness to themselves of the truth of what they had believed.

These were the subjects respecting which the apostles were to instruct their converts, or *into the name of* which they were to baptize them, and thus the text is, we think, best understood, not as a formula for administering a rite, but as a direction to the first ministers of the gospel, which recognizes baptizing as the ordinary mode of receiving disciples. "Go ye and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit;" the particulars respecting God and Christ, expressed by the words *Father* and *Son*, and the promised gifts of the Spirit being the points respecting which instruction was most needed—"teaching them to observe" (this is part of the same sentence, and the word *teaching* expresses nearly the same as *baptizing into the name of*) "whatsoever I have commanded you." We should think that an attention to the connexion of the twentieth with the nineteenth verse might sufficiently prove that the latter cannot be accounted a formula.

ART. III.—*Observations on the History and Doctrine of Christianity, and, as historically connected, on the Primeval Religion, on the Judaic, and on the Heathen, Public, Mystical, and Philosophical; the Latter proposed as an Appendix to the Political and Military History of Greece.* By William Mitford,* Esq. 12mo. pp. 192 and 198. Rodwell and Martin.

THIS little volume has been some time before the public; but we are induced to take this late notice of it, on account of the many valuable criticisms and remarks which it contains, and which derive weight from the learning and celebrity of the author. Mr. Mitford is the well-known historian of Greece. His merits in that character are disputed. All admit his erudition; but his prejudices in favour of the aristocracy, which he scruples not to avow, have given an evident bias to his pen, and determined his estimate of characters and events. He writes Grecian history as an English Tory, and as if he were fearful that his pages should be soiled by mechanic thumbs or turned over any where but in the drawing-room. A greater fault could scarcely be attributed to an historic writer. Still, his learning, his independence of former historians, and his earnestness and laboriousness, give no small value to his work, which will always be consulted by scholars, though, if we read the book of fate aright, it will never be much used by the

* Whilst we are reading this proof-sheet, we learn with regret the death of Mr. Mitford. His death is rather oddly announced as a loss to his brother, Lord Redcliffe.

people. The author's style is indeed a bar to its popularity; for he affects involved sentences and crabbed phrases, as if he wished to warn off the public liking, and to inscribe upon his composition as well as upon his sentiments the motto of *Noli me tangere*.

Now this very character of Mr. Mitford as a writer enhances in our view the importance of the present work, which he wishes to be considered as supplementary to his historic volumes. We have here the reflections which he made and the conclusions which he drew in his long and laborious course of Greek reading. He is no reformer, but he is too aristocratic to submit to the dictation of the priest. He is not a student of theology, properly so called, and indeed confesses his unacquaintedness with some English books which we are too prone to regard as known of necessity to every man who is in any degree entitled to the name of a scholar. For this very reason, some of his observations are of more value: though not uncommon, they are original as to the writer, and from this circumstance serve to confirm more strongly the reasonings and conclusions of preceding writers. So far from wondering at this gentleman's little knowledge of theological works, we may well be astonished that, amidst the active duties of the military profession, he should have been able to acquire such stores of Greek learning, and to have digested his extensive reading into such profitable order; and we are really surprised that with his occupations, and what we may, without offence, we hope, call his prejudices, he should, in so many instances, have formed such a rational scheme of scriptural interpretation and so liberal a system of religion. His is the testimony of a layman, and is on every account to be hailed by that large and happily increasing number of scholars and Christians who place that which is agreeable to evidence and reason above that which is acceptable with the multitude, and who regard orthodoxy as lighter than air when placed in the scales against truth.

Mr. Mitford's book is divided into two Parts, and these again into Sections. Following these, and in what is paged as another volume, are some Letters to a Friend, partly in apology for, and partly in explanation of, the preceding Observations.

The First Section of Part I. is entitled, "Apology for the Undertaking—Foundation of Faith." Here we find some remarks savouring of a truly Protestant spirit: the Bible alone is represented as the authority for matters of faith, and the Bible only, as every one, with such instruction as he may obtain, can understand it. (P. 4.) The author wishes to avoid offence both to sectaries and to many of the Church of England, especially ecclesiastics, but this he fears is impossible: he avows himself a member of the Church of England, but disclaims the persuasion of her infallibility. (Pp. 6, 7.) He further makes up his mind to incur the disapprobation of those of our legislators that are in favour of Catholic emancipation, which in his judgment is wholly incompatible with the safety of our Protestant establishment. Why he should have thus deprecated the displeasure of liberal statesmen, we can hardly conjecture. Possibly, he felt that he was about to surprise some of his admirers with his free private thoughts, and hoped that he should quiet their apprehensions in part by declaring beforehand that he reserved one at least of his former habits of reasoning. Then follow some sensible, or, as in the phrase now in vogue they may be called, philosophical, reflections upon Theism.

Section II. is "Of Creeds and Prayer." Under this head the author makes some excellent remarks upon the Apostles' Creed. He points out the additions that have been made to this venerable symbol, which have, he

thinks, injured it greatly; and pronounces, that were it reduced to its original purity, it would be unexceptionable, and for the great body of Christians, even at this day, useful. A passing remark discloses his small valuation of the creed "called of St. Athanasius" (pp. 17—19), his full judgment on which we shall hereafter have the pleasure of laying before the reader. He complains of the tediousness of the Liturgy of the Church of England, in which the frequent repetition of the Lord's Prayer, objected to by some churchmen, is to his mind a relief (pp. 20, 21); an exculpatory observation, for which the regular eulogists of "the best-constituted church in the world," will, assuredly, not thank him.

The IIIrd Section is "Of the Lord's Prayer," a subject partly anticipated in the conclusion of the Second, where he quotes some of the sentiments of Socrates, who, in one of his well-known prayers, nearly approached the spirit and even the language of this admirable form. The several phrases of the Lord's Prayer are here commented on and shewn to teach the justice and goodness of the Almighty; and the use of the whole of "this short but comprehensive prayer, declaring our belief in Almighty God, to whom it is addressed, implies also" (says the annotator) "our faith in the birth, doctrine, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, as related in the Gospels which give us the prayer." (Pp. 31, 32.)

The heads of Section IV. are "The Old Testament. History of the Creation. Probation the Purpose of Man's being on Earth. Fall of Man." The author speaks his mind freely concerning the book of Genesis:

"If, then, under all the circumstances known of a book so old as that describing the creation and the immediately following events, order occasionally fails; if repetitions here and there seem to mark some derangement of the narrative; if omission or transposition of some words may appear indicated; if the sense of a word or a phrase is occasionally disputable; I esteem these to be proofs of the honesty of those who, having found a work, so altogether valuable, in that state, scrupling to use their ingenuity for its correction, have given it to posterity exactly as they found it. With the great critic of antiquity, (supposed a heathen, though how far, or whether at all, disapproving the better doctrine of Christianity, which must have been known to him, none can tell,) I can admire the occasional sublimity of the account of the creation, and say with him, that 'its author was no ordinary man,' notwithstanding that the very first words, 'In the beginning,' as they stand in the English and Septuagint translations, are to me unintelligible."—Pp. 36, 37.

On the origin of evil, Mr. Mitford could not be expected to throw any light. He is in doubt whether the account of the fall of our first parents should be taken according to the letter, or as allegory and parable. What is clearly stated by the historian, and confirmed by frequent reference to it in following passages of Holy Writ, is (he says, pp. 44, 45), "that our first parents were subjected to trial, in which they were found failing; and for their failure were punished *in this life*."

Section V. is entitled "Death of the Body. Institution of Sacrifice." Mr. Mitford understands the threatening against the disobedience of Adam and Eve to imply only natural death. He observes, "that in Sebastian Castellio's Latin Translation of the Bible, made for King Edward the Sixth, the expression (Gen. ii. 17) 'on the day' is omitted, so that the sense is simply, 'thou shalt die,' without declaring when." He says that, not being versed in Hebrew, he knows not what may warrant the omission, but the context satisfies him that the historian meant, "On the day on which thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely become mortal." (Note, pp. 46, 47.) This is a proof of Mr. Mitford's sagacity: he repeats, without being aware of it,

one of the most ancient interpretations of the words that is extant. “*Morte morieris.*” Vires tunc, sustentatæ ante per arborem vitæ, deficient: quæ via est ad mortem. Syri interpretes hic habebant, *mortalis eris*: quod notant Ambrosius et Hieronymus.” *Grotii Annot. ad loc.*

Mr. Mitford's theory of the origin and design of sacrifice will scarcely satisfy the typifying divines of our day:

“Presently, then, after the account of the fall, a matter is related altogether strongly commanding observation, but, in part, of questioned import. Sacrifice, without any previous notice of such a rite, is mentioned in clear terms as an established duty of man, and as the means still graciously afforded by the Creator for immediate communication with himself. Together with the condemnation to mortality, it had been declared that the spontaneous productions of the earth should no longer suffice for man's subsistence; by his labour he was thenceforward to earn his bread. It seems to me then enough implied that, with the institution of the rite of sacrifice, the grant, in a following part of Scripture distinctly stated, of every inferior animal as lawful food for man, was made to Adam on his removal from Paradise; thenceforward wanted, not only as of quality best supplying the failure of the life-preserving fruit, but also, as the world into which he was turned is constituted, farther necessary for maintaining the multitudes to be born in it. Man's constitution, however, remaining, as far as holy writ informs us, unaltered, animal flesh in its natural state was not suited to his power of digestion, as to that of the inferior carnivorous animals: the agency of fire, which man was endowed with ability to produce and use, with art of preparation, easy to him, but not within their capacity, were requisite.

“The combination here then is eminently remarkable. When man, sinful and perishable, was suddenly turned from the ready plenty of Eden into the wide world; not to be led, as the inferior animals, by instinct, but endowed with reason, yet reason uninformed and unexperienced, he would often want instruction, both for supplying his needs and performing his duties. Accordingly the Almighty still graciously allowed immediate communication with himself, through the rite of burnt-offering, which was to hallow the meal of meat insuing; for it is abundantly marked in Scripture, and by heathen writers, that the sacrifice, among both Jews and Gentiles, always afforded a meal. That meal, though thenceforward a main support of life and strength, must have been, till familiarity produced reconciliation to it, disgusting both in preparation and in use. But its religious purpose is obvious. Man was thus at once reminded of his degradation and of his final lot in this world; the salutary severity nevertheless being softened by the appointment of that very rite of burnt-offering, with all its degrading circumstances, for the exercise of his yet high privilege, peculiar to himself among surrounding animals, of communicating with his Creator.”—Pp. 48—51.

He points out the “near concurrence of heathen customs derived from remotest antiquity, with the law given by divine authority to the posterity of Abraham.” In both, “the meal of meat” was a sacred ceremony; inso-much that Xenophon has described cattle, taken for the subsistence of a plundering army, by the title of *ἱερά*, sacrificial offerings. In some of the Grecian states the public sacrifices furnished a principal part of the subsistence of the poor. The author might have observed, that some of the Apostle Paul's counsels to the churches were occasioned by this fact, which was not a little embarrassing to the first Christian converts in Heathen countries.

It is suggested in a note, (p. 54,) “that the word *murder* should not be applied to Cain's act, at least without explanation. The degree of favour shewn by the Almighty to Cain might admonish, that to estimate his crime we are not furnished with sufficient information, and that to define it, therefore, must be rash.”

The contents of the two next Sections, are, VI. "Length of Human Life. Pre-existence. The Flood. Renovation of Mankind, with Life shortened." VII. "Laws of God for renovated Mankind. Extensive Wickedness. A Family, to produce a Nation, selected. Severe Probation of the Selected."

It appears to the author beyond reason to imagine any other origin for the rite of sacrifice than the Divine command, as already explained by him, or any other cause for its extension over the globe than the derivation of all mankind from one family holding it sacred, as reported not by Moses only, but also by heathen tradition." (P 70.)

He thinks that the Old Testament, whilst it *remarkably avoids* giving direct assurance of a future life, nevertheless abounds with intimations of it; amongst which he reckons the severe punishment of the whole Egyptian people on account of the fault of their king. (P. 74.) Admitting the Divine justice, an argument may be founded upon this case for a life to come; but where is the "intimation"?

Section VIII. is of "Laws for the selected Nation." Here Mr. Mitford declares his faith in the divine origin of letters, which cannot, any more than that of the invaluable grain, wheat, be traced up to a human source:

"The delivery of the Decalogue being the first occasion on which writing is found mentioned by any author, it has been supposed by some that letters then had their origin, graciously communicated by God himself. But it is observable that writing is not mentioned by the inspired historian as a novelty; on the contrary, mention of it, several times repeated in his following narrative, rather marks it as already well known and in practice among the Jews, and, almost consequently, also among the Egyptians. Its real origin thus remains equally unknown with the origin of that invaluable grain, wheat, which, though, under cultivation, flourishing in widely-varying climates, has never yet been found indigenous in any part of the earth. I will venture to own that no supposed origin of alphabetical writing appears to me so probable, so little loaded with difficulty, or even impossibility, as that it was, equally with language, the gift of the Creator to the antediluvian world, and thence, together with wheat, transmitted to following mankind."—Pp. 76, 77.

He speaks in terms of high, but in our judgment not extravagant, admiration of the character and authority of the Decalogue:

"The character of this compendious digest, the Decalogue, assorts with the account of its origin. Like the Lord's Prayer, it may be most advantageously compared with all that has reached us, concerning the duties of man, from Greek and Roman philosophers; and, if any may think the addition respectable, Indian and Chinese. It is not likely to have been unknown to the great heathen critic, nor out of his view, when, as formerly noticed, he declared his opinion of the lawgiver of the Jews, that he was no ordinary man.*

"The accordance then, such as it is, of heathen memorials with the Pentateuch, concerning the origin of the world, the early state of mankind, the deluge, and what followed the deluge, together with the doctrine of some of the earliest Grecian poets concerning the Godhead and the duty of man, both to his God and his neighbour, strongly marks, to my mind, tradition from antediluvian times, and is altogether to me highly gratifying. That letters, defective as were the ancient materials for using them, should have been lost in migration and ensuing contests for settlements, while the traditions were preserved in memory, is nothing wonderful. The early poets, the philosophers of their day, were, both for notions of the Deity and for moral precept, no unworthy predecessors of the best following, in the best times of Grecian science. Poetical measure was their resource for supplying, by its assistance to memory, the want or the failure of convenient materials for any extensive

* "Longin. de sublim."

use of letters. Their age, little ascertained, is reckoned within that called the fabulous, because the earliest heathen political history, possibly cotemporary, abounds in fable. Their doctrine, however, carrying evidence of its origin, in what age they severally lived is comparatively unimportant.

"But, among evidences of its origin, some deserve more particular observation. In consonance with the first commandment, those philosopher-poets asserted the unity of God.* No such commination as that of the second against the worship of either a plurality, or of images, appears to have reached them. A plurality had already, in their time, obtained vulgar credit; but of image-worship in their country, in their age, no indication is found. An opinion of the duty of respect for the sanctity of oaths enforced by the third commandment, has obtained, in all ages, the world over."—Pp. 77—79.

For the alteration of the Sabbath, he allows that there is no specific command. It rests on unvaried custom, derived from the earliest times of Christianity, yet with *some appearance of authority* from the apostles themselves. P. 83.

We pass over Section IX., on the "Continued Severity of Trial for the selected Nation," and come to Section X., entitled "The Historical Books of the Old Testament unsuited to general Edification," where we find the following free remarks, which are, we think, upon the whole, judicious.

"To persons at this day, educated and habituated to thought and reflection, it cannot be necessary to remark that the indiscriminate slaughter of nations, the particular severity of the prophet Samuel to one of their princes, with other matters related in the Old Testament as warranted by that Almighty which can largely reward, in another life, suffering in such or in any other way, in this, have clearly not been proposed as examples for man, of his own judgment, to follow. Far from wanting Christianity to ascertain so much, those examples were not even for the Jews to follow, but only to tremble at, as admonitions of what, under divine authority, might come upon themselves. Through these, however, and other matters recorded in the Old Testament, that book is surely hazardous in the hands of the uneducated; and liable to be perverted, as, in modern instances, it has been, to ill purpose by the designing, whose views to their interest might lead them to impose on the simple. But among the Jews, their sacred book could not come readily and extensively into such hands. The art of printing did not then afford means to distribute numerous copies among those who would presently dispose of them to any for wanted food or pernicious drink. Every synagogue probably would have a copy, more or less complete. But it was only for persons appointed, under strict rule, to read and to expound to the congregation parts duly selected. Christ himself undertook this office; thus apparently affording intimation sufficiently authoritative, that, for the bulk of mankind, selection and exposition are needful. The founders of the Church of England accordingly, not inattentive probably to this admonition, with which their own judgment on the subject would correspond, have not proposed the whole, nor nearly the whole, of the Old Testament for public instruction, but have appointed only what they have properly denominated lessons, selected from it, to be read to the people."—Pp. 95—97.

We believe we speak the sense of educated pious churchmen when we say that the founders of the Church of England have left much more of the Old Testament in the daily Lessons than agrees with the modern sense of decency. But one of the evils of a National Church is, that no reform in the least important customs can take place without as great an alarm as if the foundations of the Church were about to be torn up. This is seen at the present moment in Prussia, where there is a great outcry on the revision, by royal authority, of the Liturgy. In England we are so deeply entrenched in prescription, that whatever has been must continue to be, and though the

* "Aristot. de mundo."

members of the Establishment have been for ages calling out for some changes, "since the fathers fell asleep all things continue as they were from the beginning."

The last Section of this Part is "Sequel of Jewish History." To account for Solomon's becoming an idolater in his latter years, Mr. Mitford ventures to suggest that he had become deranged! Various remarks are made in this chapter upon the ritual and civil law of the Hebrews, which will interest the thinking reader. The author's political bias appears in what he says on slavery, though he envelopes his meaning in the thickest cloud of his peculiar phraseology. He concludes this division of his book with a declaration which he deems venturous: we leave his style as we find it:

"At Rome, under the first emperors, Jews were numerous, probably some wealthy, but all, for those called their superstitions, despised. Had I been then educated a heathen there, having before me the Jewish history as delivered in the Septuagint, and therewith all the heathen traditions concerning preceding times of which I have any knowledge, I think I should have accepted the account, in the Old Testament, of the Almighty's dealings with man as a very valuable addition to all that had been received among other nations; explaining much, correcting much. Nevertheless I should be doubtful of much, as unable to see its consistency with the best human notions of an almighty, all-wise, and all-good Creator: especially the selection of one small nation, from among the unnumbered of mankind, for extraordinary favour, and for promises of peculiar protection on condition of constant obedience; that nation being acknowledged by its own historians to have been, through a course of centuries, continually refractory, often grossly rebellious, consequently suffering almost all that a nation could suffer short of extinction, yet remaining a separate nation, but in subjection to others, whose religion they were bound by their own to abhor, would be what I might least be able to bring my mind to conceive; solution, as far as Almighty Wisdom appears to have thought fit for our state of trial, remaining for the next period in the history of the world."—Pp. 115, 116.

The conclusion of this passage is agreeable to Mr. Mitford's favourite theory of explaining all difficulties by man's probationary state, and of referring them to the solution of a future world. Piety in the closet frequently requires the submission of the soul to the hidden decrees of Infinite Wisdom, which eternity only can reveal; but we more than doubt the propriety of raising objections in order to lay them by this charm. In fact, they who can admit the answer have never felt the difficulty. The author has evidently undergone the process of doubt and inquiry, but he has never allowed himself to mingle with doubters and inquirers, or to read their works; and whilst he belongs to this class, he writes for another, for thorough church-goers and believers, who never stumbled at an article of faith or sighed for more evidence. Had he trusted to his own powers of mind, he might have found reasons for the peculiar calling of the Jewish people, and moral uses in their separation from the nations, which would have satisfied him even in this world; though undoubtedly in every case of perplexity, and all moral cases are as yet more or less perplexed, it is not unreasonable to believe that there will be a more ample development of the Divine wisdom, and a more complete explanation, for the satisfaction of the human mind, in the state in which "that which is perfect will be come, and that which is in part will have been done away." To this extent, we agree with the author in the sentiment which he has quoted from Erasmus, (in the Second Part of his Observations, the notice of which we must leave to the next Number,) "We may talk of referring difficulties to the next general council: in my opinion it were better to refer them to that blessed time when we shall see God face to face."

CRITICAL NOTICES.

ART. IV.—*Notes and Reflections during a Ramble in Germany, by the Author of "Recollections in the Peninsula," &c.* London. 1826.

THIS is a sensible volume; the work of a soldier, though no man of blood; but of liberal and Christian tastes and feelings. From such an observer we are glad to quote the following commentary on Mr. Rose's observations on the State of Religious Opinion in Germany:

"The German youth have a solidity of thought and sincerity of heart which colours all their conversation on subjects of a deep moral interest. They are largely tolerant on religious matters; not, as some have unfairly forced the inference, from indifference to religion, but from a holding fast of what is essential in it, and declining all controversy, all bitterness and quarrelling about the rest.

"The Roman Catholic of Germany is unlike any of that great family elsewhere. The Calvinist and the Lutheran love each other as Christians; all are inclined to mysticism in some slight degree, save the Rationalists, who are as inconsiderable in numbers as they are uninfluential on the mind of the public at large. The school of the Rationalists has not been without its use; for man never appears so weak, so helpless, so ridiculous, as when he lights the feeble taper of his reason to examine and pronounce upon the credibility of the facts related, and the mysteries revealed to us in the Bible. 'To live and move and have our being,' a miracle to ourselves, and among created miracles of every possible variety; to find our reason baffled by the first pebble we pick up beneath our feet, all the properties of which we can most scientifically describe, but of the essence of which we know nothing; and then to explain away the less wonderful miracles of Scripture, *because* our reason refuses to give credit to them, is a something so palpably absurd, that even the patient, inquiring German could not listen to such lectures long, if they did not sooner drive him forth by inflicting a severe wound in his heart.

"I was present in the great church of Leipsic at the administration of the

Sacrament. The communicants stood in long files and advanced reverentially towards the altar; they received the holy elements standing, and passing round the altar, again rejoined the congregation. The congregation, whether composed of those who were about to communicate, or had done so, or of those who merely assisted at the ceremony, sung a hymn or hymns throughout the whole service. After deducting largely for the effect produced on me by the sweet and solemn singing of this assembled multitude, and by the black skull cap, the ancient ruffs, (like those of the Elizabethian æra,) and the reverend aspect of the officiating ministers, I certainly was impressed, and that strongly, with the feeling and sincere devotion of the communicants. We *kneel* at the altar; another church *sits* at the communion table; these *stand* and sing a hymn. We all do it in remembrance that Christ died for us, and he knows in all those congregations those who are his, those who feed on him in their hearts with thanksgiving."

"The Roman Catholic of Germany in his church seems quite another being from *that* [the Catholic] of Italy; and the character which Goldsmith has so beautifully and faithfully given of the latter applies in nothing to the German. He is seldom careless or irreverent at the mass; seldom timid, or formal, or slavish, in his acts of devotion. There is a something staid in his outward performance; but 'the soul's sincere desire' is perceptible, and plainly so, in the expression of his countenance when engaged in prayer."

Of the statue of the Emperor Joseph II. he says,

"Considering the shortness of his reign, I think it doubtful whether his condemned precipitancy and enthusiasm are to be regretted. Whatever he had attempted against the civil power of the Church of Rome, the priest would have worked step by step in counteraction of his measure: whereas he stripped her of immense and irrecoverable influence, when he opened the treasures of his convents, dispersed their wealth, drove forth the corrupt and idle members, and alienated their wide possessions. The half of what he suppressed never have been

and never can be re-established. Perhaps no one individual of the Austrian Empire has more deserved a public monument; and it is to the credit of his nephew to have erected this statute to his fame."

The inscription is,

"Saluti publicæ vixit non diu sed totus."

ART. V.—*Three Months in Ireland.*
By an English Protestant. 8vo.
London, 1827.

THOUGH this volume issues from the loyal storehouse of Mr. Murray, it tells only the unvarying tale of Irish wrongs. We can afford space for but a few short extracts as to the state of feeling towards the Protestant Establishment, that most monstrous and scandalous anomaly in the history of political and ecclesiastical misgovernment.

"To a Protestant it certainly is a melancholy task to have to contend with men so much entitled to respect from their sacred functions, however blameable in their private characters; and in a prudential point of view nothing can be more impolitic and dangerous than to censure any amongst so strong and powerful a body as the clergy, which, as one of its own members well observes, 'always unites in defence of the person attacked, and butts against the offender with a very extended front.' But are we to pardon all delinquencies on account of the veneration due to the delinquents, and shall that sacred rank, which is the chief aggravation of their faults, be the excuse for leaving them unnoticed? Is it not, on the contrary, our duty to prevent, as far as in us lies, so great a source of scandal to the Protestant and triumph to the Roman Church, from lasting any longer? It will scarcely be believed what feelings of shame and mortification I endured on my first arrival in Ireland, from finding the general unpopularity and dislike under which the Protestant clergy labour, and still more afterwards when I perceived how justly the majority deserve it."

"One of the stratagems to which the Irish clergy have most frequently recourse to repel their assailants, and still more to prevent attack, is to charge with irreligion and impiety all those who presume to blame them. '*Touchez aux Dîmes, les voilà qui crient à l'Athée*,' is a French saying completely verified in this instance. * * * Were the Irish Church really as poor and as irreproachable as

it would wish us to believe, it would rejoice in any proposed investigation, as the best means of securing its adherents and silencing its adversaries. But no:—they are too well aware of the truth: they shun—they deprecate examination; they shroud themselves in convenient darkness, and will not unveil their proceedings or possessions to uninitiated eyes. They endeavour, on the contrary, to prevent all inquiry, by asserting the inviolability and sacredness of their situation, and raising the cry of sacrilege against all audacious intruders."

The author proceeds to shew that Catholicism has of late "prodigiously increased."

"Indeed this increase is admitted by every one, even by those who carry the supposed number of Protestants at present to an extravagant height; and the only questions in dispute are, the extent of this increase; and, whether it continues at present; which I am sorry to say there is too much reason to believe. Now then, I ask, to what cause can we attribute this admitted growth of Popery in Ireland? The Catholic will answer, 'To the force of truth.' But this reply will not suffice to us Protestants, who believe truth to be enlisted on the opposite side. To what cause, then, can be attributed this increase of the Catholics in spite of the force of truth? 'To the superior allurements of Popery,' say some persons. No doubt, it must have been peculiarly alluring to be exposed to the pains and penalties, to the persecuting rigours of the most atrocious penal laws that ever blackened the annals of this or any other country! No doubt peculiarly alluring to resist the richly-baited conversion-traps offered, in charter-schools and pensions to converts, of forty pounds a-year! No doubt, it must have been a great temptation to Popery, to be excluded thereby from all places of power or emolument, and to have remained for so many years in a state of unmitigated slavery! No doubt, it must be particularly pleasing to have to fast strictly on Fridays and in Lent, to submit to severe acts of penance, and be obliged, in addition to enormous tithes and Church-rates, to pay for one's own chapel and minister besides! Were these the allurements to Popery? What then, I ask again, was the cause of its admitted increase? I assert, that the cause is to be found in the extortions, the mal-administration, and the indolence of the Protestant establishment. It is to them that the Popery of Ireland

should mainly be attributed; it is in reality the Protestant clergymen who have made, and still make, the converts to the Roman Catholic religion.

"This strong *prima facie* evidence against the Protestant clergy will be found strengthened and confirmed by all the details recorded in history, or transmitted by tradition. In former times they were the constant advocates and executors of the bloody penal laws, as now they are the chief opponents to all Catholic claims. Their ready subservience to all constituted authorities was only tempered by their hatred to those whom they were appointed to protect, and from whom their fortunes were derived."

ART. VI.—*A Charge, delivered at the Triennial Visitation of the Province of Munster, in the Year 1826.* By Richard, Archbishop of Cashel. 8vo. pp. 24. Milliken, Dublin; Rivingtons, London.

WE hail the appearance of another plea for peace and charity from the Primate of Munster. Dr. Laurence is reproached for his moderation by the bigots of the two communions, the Romish and British; but their censures proceed from the very causes that secure him the respect, esteem and confidence of enlightened and liberal men of all parties.

In addressing his Reverend Brethren the Archbishop congratulates them, that amidst the general stir on the subject of the Roman Catholic claims, since the last Visitation of the Province, there had been no meeting convened, no association formed, no addresses, persuasive, flattering or intimidating, sanctioned by the clergy of Ireland, nor any petition from them to Parliament. They had suffered the storm of discord to pass unheeded by, that they might not disturb the dearest charities of life. (Pp. 2, 3.)

Widely different had been the conduct of the English Clergy. Upon them the Archbishop passes no censure; but he gives it as his opinion that the Clergy best consult their own dignity and usefulness by abstaining from political conflicts. (Pp. 4, 5.)

Dr. Laurence is not enamoured with the fancy of uniformity of faith, nor alarmed at the existence of difference of opinions. Parties, he says, there have always been and will always be;

the more unfettered we are in the formation of our opinions, the more will parties predominate; and to parties we are indebted for our most valuable rights and constitutional privileges. (Pp. 5, 6.) He cautions his clergy, at the same time, against the excess of party-spirit—though he acknowledges the happy state of his own Province in this respect:

"It should, however, console us to reflect, that in this province, in which the proportional difference of numbers between Roman Catholics and Protestants is much greater, the irritability arising from a diversity of creeds is much less, than in those provinces in which the respective numbers are more equal. Here, with very rare exceptions, we live together in undisturbed harmony; nor is the intercourse of life constantly embittered by religious animosities. To what is this state of things attributable, but to the moderation of both parties? And while it is but common justice to ascribe herein a full share of merit to the clergy and laity of the Church of Rome, I cannot, on the present occasion, withhold from you my expression of that commendation which is so much your due. Influenced by a conviction, that there exists between you and them a perfect concord in all the great doctrines of Christianity,* and that those in which you differ from them are merely the superstitious additions of after ages to the Creed of the primitive Church, you laudably avoid a perpetual altercation with them upon points where compromise would be dishonourable, and where unanimity is impossible."—Pp. 10—12.

The Archbishop (how unlike some prelates whom we could name!) deprecates all attempts at proselytism, in the peculiar state of Ireland. The clergy of the Church of Rome, he tells his brethren, have the same right, both in reason and in law, to tamper with the faith of Protestants, as they have to tamper with the faith of Roman Catholics. (P. 13.)

An union of the two churches, sometimes contemplated by moral theorists, the Primate of Munster considers

* "Contained in the three Creeds which are received by both Churches. Some writers of our own Church, among whom was the pious Bishop Taylor, have held, that those only which are contained in the Apostles' Creed are essential to salvation."

to be chimerical ; every attempt to procure it, he suggests, must " be attended with a submission of the understanding, and with a slavery of the conscience, which the spirit of the times would not endure." (Pp. 14, 15.) We are glad to find one eminent prelate who does not teach that "the prostration of the understanding" is the first step in the pursuit of Christian truth ; who ventures, indeed, to proclaim the contrary opinion, though in so doing he may expose himself to the charge of heresy from his brother of London.

With a true Protestant feeling, Dr. Laurence disclaims the notion that salvation is confined to any pale :

" — I should lament to hear the doctrine of exclusive salvation fall from *your* lips. A high and ardent spirit indeed, disclaiming every feeling, and deriding all toleration of opinion, not countenanced by his own infallible church, may treat with contempt and proscribe as 'fulsome nonsense' the persuasion, that one Christian will not be condemned to eternal punishment for believing a little more or a little less than another ; but charity is justified of her children. Judged we must all hereafter be by our good and gracious Redeemer ; but let not theological prejudice induce us to entertain the vain conceit, that our faith in the doctrines, and adherence to the communion, of this or that particular church upon earth will prove the criterion of our acquittal or condemnation at the last day ; induce us to abandon the more rational as well as scriptural opinion, that our final doom will be determined, not by our participation in certain creeds and communions, but by the sincerity of our faith, and by the holiness of our lives."—Pp. 17—20.

In agreement with this admirable passage, the Archbishop laments that some Protestants, alluding to the "Evangelical" party in the Church, have "narrowed the terms of acceptance with God more than reason approves or scripture warrants." He portrays to the life the extravagance of this busy sect, whose worst feature is their uncharitableness (pp. 20—23) ; and concludes with this exhortation, worthy to be inscribed on every Christian pulpit,—

"Under whatsoever religious denomination, therefore, we may be classed, where Providence has been pleased to assign our lot, there let us live together as brethren, and be kindly affectioned one to another ; satisfied, that we all are worshipers of the same God, be-

lievers in the same Redeemer, and heirs of the same Salvation."—Pp. 23, 24.

ART. VII.—*A View of Rome at the present Period.* 8vo. pp. 56. Edinburgh, Oliphant : London, Nisbet. 1826.

THIS pamphlet does not answer to the title. It is a farrago of "No-Popery" exclamations, indictments and prophetic calculations, brought together to prejudice the cause of Catholic Emancipation. Can such a publication find readers in the Northern metropolis ?

The compiler might probably have made a readable publication, for he would appear to have visited Rome, but he should confine himself to facts and not attempt theories. Almost the only passages of any interest in his pages are the two following, which fight against the purpose for which they were penned.

"Pius VII., as an act of courtesy to the English, permitted them to open a chapel in Rome ; and Leo. XII., for political reasons, reluctantly permits its continuance. Before the door is placed a sentinel, which may be intended as a mark of respect ; but there is a sentinel also placed to guard the Jews, whose residence is confined within gates, in an obscure part of the city. The present Pope is as much averse to toleration, as were ever any of his predecessors in the holy see. It is his aim to revive the superstition of centuries, and to reduce the people under stricter subjection to their priests. He has granted privileges to the Jesuits, and restricted the Jews : he is an enemy to Christian education : he forbids the admission of any religious Protestant books into his dominions, with the exception of Cobbett's late work on the Reformation, which was immediately reprinted, and advertised against the walls : and he fulminates against the Bible Society ; for he hoards the Scriptures like the miser his treasure, which he will neither use nor disperse."—Pp. 4, 5.

" — it may excite surprise that the present Pope should have ventured last winter to make such an observation as follows, which rests on the word of the gentleman to whom it was made : 'The best reply which can be given to so prejudiced a speech as that of the Duke of York in the House of Peers, is the constant fidelity of the Catholics to the British throne ; and I hope that they will persevere in shewing their loyalty.'"
—P. 54.

OBITUARY.

WILLIAM GIFFORD, Esq.

ON the 31st of December last, at his house, in James Street, Buckingham Gate, in the 71st year of his age, WILLIAM GIFFORD, Esq., author of *Baviad* and *Mæviad*, translator of *Juvenal* and *Persius*, Editor of the *Quarterly Review*, &c.

Mr. Gifford was a native of Ashburton, in Devonshire, where he was born in April, 1756. His paternal ancestors had been persons of property and respectability, but the family had fallen into indigent circumstances through the wild and extravagant conduct of his father and grandfather. His father settled as a plumber and glazier at South Molton, and his mother was the daughter of a carpenter at Ashburton. A foolish attempt to create a disturbance in a Methodist chapel compelled his father to go to sea; and after his return, at the end of eight years, habits of dissipation kept him in poverty, and brought him to a premature grave. His mother followed shortly afterwards, leaving himself, at the age of thirteen, and a brother, only two years old, in destitute circumstances, "without a relation or friend in the world." His little brother was sent by his godfather, on whom the charge of them had now devolved, to the almshouse, and he was himself sent to a farmer to drive the plough, an employment for which his constitutional weakness unfitted him, and which he quitted in disgust after one day's trial. His mother had given him some instruction in spelling and reading, and he had now picked up a little knowledge of writing and arithmetic. These attainments were thought to qualify him for a situation in a store at Newfoundland, which his godfather hoped to procure for him, but failed to obtain. This kind protector then sent him to sea, and put him on board a small coasting vessel at Brixham. Here he continued for twelve months, enduring all the hardships incident to such a condition. Whilst in this employment he nearly lost his life by drowning. He was now eager to add to his scanty stock of knowledge; but having no books on board his master's vessel, he was in the habit of resorting to other ships in hopes of obtaining the loan of some. In attempting to get on board another vessel, with this view, his foot slipped, and he fell into the sea. He was

taken up in a state of insensibility, and with difficulty recovered.

The remonstrances of persons to whom Mr. Gifford's family had been known, prevailed on his godfather to take him from his degrading employment, and send him to school to qualify him for something better. Young Gifford had been but a dull learner hitherto, but his proficiency was at this time more rapid. His favourite study was arithmetic, and with such success did he prosecute it, that he was soon able to assist his master in teaching the other children. He now formed the idea of devoting his future life to the business of school-keeping, and indulged the hope of succeeding a schoolmaster of the place, who was grown old and infirm. But his godfather treated his scheme with contempt, and, to young Gifford's great mortification, apprenticed him to a shoemaker for the term of seven years. His master was a rigid Presbyterian, whose only reading extended to the tracts published on one side of the Exeter Controversy, and on these he was a very pertinacious controversialist.

At the time of his apprenticeship Mr. Gifford had read nothing but the romance of *Parismus* and *Parismenus*, a few loose magazines of his mother's, his Bible, and the *Imitation of Thomas à Kempis*. He hated his new profession, and therefore made no progress in it. He still indulged his favourite idea of becoming a schoolmaster, and to qualify himself applied every leisure hour he could command to the prosecution of his studies. At this time he had but one book, a *Treatise on Algebra*, which had been given him by a young woman, into whose hands it had accidentally fallen. But as it supposed a knowledge of simple equations, it was to him an useless treasure. One of his master's sons, who was intended for a schoolmaster, had purchased *Fenning's Introduction*. Of this he obtained possession for a short period, and he made such good use of his time as completely to master its contents, and to qualify himself to enter on his own book. Difficulties, however, still opposed themselves. He had no pens, ink or paper; as a substitute for these, he beat out smoothly some pieces of leather, and on these worked his problems with a blunted awl.

At this time he had not thought of poetry. His attention was drawn to it by a clumsy attempt of another youth to lampoon a village sign-painter, who, in endeavouring to delineate a lion, had drawn a dog. Gifford thought he could make more of the subject; wrote some verses, and was pronounced the superior bard. After this he composed some other short pieces, which he used to recite for the entertainment of his neighbours, who recompensed him by small collections of money. This was to him a most valuable return, for it was the first money ever placed at his own disposal. He immediately applied it to furnish his wants of writing materials and books. But his literary pursuits interfering with his business, his master obtained possession of his little stock, and put an end to his studies.

Whilst driven to despair by these severities, his poetical compositions attracted the notice of Mr. Cookesley, a respectable surgeon in the town, who from this time became his friend and patron. This gentleman having informed himself of his affecting history, made his case known among his friends, raised a subscription to purchase his indentures, and to pay for his education for two years. At the end of this period he was pronounced qualified for admission to the University, and through the interest of Mr. Thomas Taylor, of Denbury, he obtained the place of *Bib. Lect.* at Exeter College.

His pecuniary means being scanty, it was proposed that he should publish, by subscription, a translation of Juvenal, and his friends in the country warmly promoted the design. He proceeded, however, with the work but slowly, and at last abandoned it, and returned most of the subscriptions, postponing the publication till he was able to undertake it more to his own satisfaction, and under more favourable auspices.

Accident obtained for him an introduction to the late Earl Grosvenor, who immediately became his warm and zealous patron. In corresponding with a College friend, who occasionally resided in London, he sent his letters under cover to Lord Grosvenor. Having forgotten to direct one of his letters, his Lordship, supposing it meant for himself, perused it; the contents interested him. He inquired into the history and prospects of the writer, and then declared that he "charged himself with his present support and future establishment." And his Lordship generously acted up to his promise.

Mr. Gifford after this travelled with

Lord Belgrave, the present Earl Grosvenor, for several years on the Continent, and on his return, retired, as he writes, in competence and peace. He now prosecuted his long-abandoned project of a translation of Juvenal, which he published, with a dedication, just before his death, to the late Earl Grosvenor, and a sketch of his personal history, from which these facts are extracted. To the third edition of his Juvenal, which appeared in 1817, he added a translation of Persius. He had before this published his *Baviad* and *Mæviad*, a severe and able satire on certain fashionable poetry of that day. This, perhaps, is the ablest of his works. He edited the plays of *Messenger* and *Ben Jonson*. At his death he had just finished printing an edition of *Ford's Works*, and nearly completely an edition of *Shirley's Works*. On the establishment of the *Quarterly Review* he was entrusted with the Editorship, which he held till within two years of his death, when he was compelled to relinquish it by the growing infirmities of old age. It is understood that he received to the last a handsome pension from his steady friend, Earl Grosvenor. He held the office of *Comptroller of the Lottery*, with a salary of £600 a-year; he was also paymaster of the band of gentlemen pensioners, with a salary of £300 a-year. He died in opulent circumstances, and left behind him a select and valuable library.

HENRY CLINE, ESQ., F. R. S.

Jan. 2, at his house in Lincoln's Inn Fields, aged 76, HENRY CLINE, Esq., F. R. S. His death was occasioned by a gradual bodily decay, consequent upon an intermitting fever under which he for some time laboured more than three years ago. During his decline, which was attended with extraordinary emaciation and weakness, he retained his mental powers in a remarkable degree, and possessed a vigour of intellect and liveliness of fancy, and a cheerfulness of disposition, which made life desirable.

During the active part of his life, he was for a great number of years one of the surgeons of *St. Thomas's Hospital*, and gave lectures there upon *Anatomy and Surgery*; and by his professional skill maintained the high character which former surgeons had given to the Hospital, and by his talents as a lecturer increased the reputation of its school of *Anatomy and Surgery*.

He was eminently successful as a pri-

vate practitioner. It might be invidious to say, that he was the first of the London surgeons of his day, but it is apprehended, that every person competent to form a judgment will readily admit that he had no superior. It is believed that no such person will maintain that he was inferior to any one of them, with respect to acuteness in discovering and ascertaining disease, soundness of judgment, skill in operating, the number, together with the rank of his patients, and, above all, with respect to the confidence with which he inspired them. He was regarded by his professional brethren with good-will and esteem and respect in a remarkable degree; and his patients looked upon him as a friend as well as a professional adviser. It would, perhaps, be difficult to name a person whose intercourse, in the way of his profession merely, gave occasion to an equal number of private friendships.

He was indebted for this success very little to adventitious circumstances. It was principally owing to his skill and knowledge; it was owing likewise in a considerable degree to his general talents, to his strength of mind, and to the mildness of his manners.

His feelings, both selfish and social, were ardent, his imagination lively, his intellectual faculties powerful; but the exercise of all his feelings and powers was under the complete controul of his will, so that he was able to exhibit, and he did exhibit habitually, in his countenance and deportment, an equanimity not to be disturbed by accident, and a mildness and kindness of disposition which conciliated people at first sight. This early prepossession in his favour was strengthened by a further acquaintance, which discovered his patient attention, his caution and prudence, his knowledge and skill, his fruitfulness in resources, his dignified self-command, and that calm and well-grounded confidence in himself, which universally excites the confidence of others. Thus the favourable opinion of him, which was at first a prejudice, became afterward a reasonable ground of attachment and of earnest recommendation.

He distinguished himself as a surgeon, and a teacher of Anatomy and Surgery, but he was a person who would have distinguished himself, whatever had been his situation and calling. His strong intellect, his self-determination, his steady adherence to his purpose, and his consummate prudence, would have ensured him success in any career of honourable ambition.—*Gent. Mag.*

J. MASON GOOD, M.D.

Jan. 2, at the house of his daughter, at Shipperton, after a few days' illness, JOHN MASON GOOD, M. D. F. R. S. M. R. S. L. [We shall feel obliged to any friend for a memoir of this able and voluminous writer.]

DR. JOHN JONES.

— 10, at his house in *Great Coram Street*, JOHN JONES, LL.D. M. R. S. L., author of the Greek-English Lexicon and other learned works. We shall give a memoir of this eminent scholar in our next Number.

JOHN EVANS, LL.D.

— 25, at his house, *Islington*, the Rev. JOHN EVANS, LL.D., for more than thirty-five years Minister of the morning General Baptist congregation in *Worship Street*, *Finsbury Square*.

Born at *Usk*, in *Monmouthshire*, Oct. 2, 1767, Dr. Evans traced his descent, through an almost unbroken line of Baptist ministers, from a Thomas Evans, one of the ministers ejected by the Act of Uniformity. He acquired at Bristol the elementary parts of his education, and in November, 1783, became a student in the Bristol Baptist Academy, over which his relative Dr. C. Evans then presided as Theological Tutor. About this time, being convinced of the obligation of a personal profession of Christianity, he was baptized with twenty-seven others by his relative Dr. C. Evans. Dr. Evans preached his first sermon before the age of seventeen, and on various occasions before he finally quitted the Academy he exercised his talents in supplying the places of several ministers in different parts of the country.

After remaining some time at the Academy, Dr. E. went to Scotland in 1787, where he passed three winters as a student at the College at Aberdeen, then adorned by the talents of Drs. Campbell and Gerard; a fourth winter was spent by him at the University of Edinburgh. Having attained the degree of A. M., he returned from Scotland in June, 1791.

Although educated in those tenets which are designated *orthodox*, it would seem that his liberal and feeling heart shrank from the unamiable views of God and man which they presented. Entertaining serious doubts respecting the truth of several of the Calvinistic doctrines, he in 1791 accepted an invitation from the morning congregation of General Baptists, at *Worship Street*, in London, where, after officiating a few months, he was chosen pastor, and or-

dained May 31, 1792. This his *first* proved his *only* pastoral engagement, and, after thirty-five years of uninterrupted harmony, terminated but with his existence. Of his friends and associates, Messrs. Evershed, Kingsford, David, Worthington and Winter, (now Dr. Winter,) who assisted at his ordination, all except the last have passed before him to their long rest.

Deeply impressed with the truth and importance of the leading principles of the denomination he had thus joined, and actuated by the laudable desire of reviving the cause Dr. Evans upon his settlement drew up an Address to the General Baptists, and an Appeal to Young People on the Necessity and Importance of Religion, both of which are contained in the recently published collection of his Tracts.

His ministerial labours, however, were by no means exclusively confined to his own immediate denomination. For fourteen successive winters, from 1795 to 1810, he and his intimate friend the late Hugh Worthington, in conjunction generally with various other ministers, but during one winter by themselves, carried on a series of lectures on the Wednesday evenings at Salters' Hall, upon practical subjects. During several years also he had a permanent engagement as afternoon preacher at the Presbyterian Meeting-house in Leather Lane, Holborn, since converted into a Trinitarian place of worship.

The Sketch of the Denominations of the Christian World, by which the name of Dr. Evans, to adopt the words of the preacher of his funeral discourse, "has become identified with the history of religious opinion," first appeared in the beginning of the year 1795, in the form of a shilling pamphlet. The circumstances that gave rise to this production are curious, and are narrated in the later editions of the work. The rapid sale of the first impression called for a second edition in July of the same year, and during a period of about thirty years, fourteen successive editions, comprising in all 100,000 copies, have been circulated: and a fifteenth edition, now in the course of publication, had been completed by the author immediately before his last illness. The book has been translated into Welsh and various continental languages, and several editions have appeared in the United States of America. In his dedication of the fourteenth edition to his friend the late Lord Erskine, the author, after noticing the extensive circulation of his work, thus adverts to the impartiality by which it is so singularly distinguished, and to the

inconsiderable sum for which he parted with the copyright: "Its impartiality has been the basis of its popularity. That it is altogether free from religious bias the author does not aver—but he has strove to divest himself of prepossession. The zealot has complained that in the perusal of the Sketch the opinions of the writer cannot be developed. This is a flattering though involuntary testimony to the accuracy of the work. Were vanity, my Lord, the object of the writer, it has been satiated; but a philosophy inferior to that of his Divine Master would have taught him to suppress so ignoble a passion when desirous of informing and improving mankind. Were filthy lucre the end in view, then indeed he has been disappointed. Unfortunately, the author sold the copyright of the Sketch for ten pounds; but his friends have administered to him a negative consolation, by reminding him that a similar sum was paid for the copyright of Watts's Hymns, as well as of that gigantic product of human genius, Paradise Lost."

In August, 1795, Dr. Evans married Mary, one of the daughters of the late Rev. John Wiche, for nearly half a century General Baptist Minister at Maidstone, and the friend and associate of Foster and Lardner. Of this union, productive to both parties of the most solid and lasting domestic happiness, three sons now live to cherish the remembrance and emulate the virtues of their father. Shortly after his marriage he opened a seminary, which, after conducting it first at Hoxton Square, and subsequently at Islington, with continued respectability and success for about thirty years, he ultimately relinquished in 1825, to enjoy that honourable leisure to which his previous exertions had so justly entitled him.

The observation, however trite, that the happiest portion of a man's life is that which affords the least material for the pen of the biographer, may be correctly applied to the long series of years which followed Dr. Evans's settlement and marriage, during which the uniform tenor of his life, marked by the constantly recurring duties of his pulpit and his school, was interrupted by few events beyond the preparation and publication of those numerous works on which he delighted to employ his intervals of leisure. The cultivation also of his numerous friendships constituted another favourite relaxation after the duties of his school. But about the year 1815, the symptoms of a complaint appeared, which, baffling all medical and surgical skill, gradually advanced upon him, and

terminated after a few years in the loss of the use of his lower limbs. This afflictive malady, rendering him wholly dependent on the assistance of his family, materially interfered with that active personal intercourse which he had been in the daily habit of enjoying with his various friends. It, however, enabled, or rather compelled, him to apply himself with increased ardour to his literary pursuits, and to the cultivation of those friendships which, from the distant residence of the parties, many of them beyond the Atlantic, admitted only of epistolary intercourse.

In September, 1819, a gratifying testimony of the estimation in which his character and talents were held in the United States of America, was evinced in the degree of Doctor of Laws, then conferred on him by Brown University in Rhode Island.

A twelvemonth, however, had scarcely elapsed before he had to sustain one of the heaviest afflictions to which humanity is liable. His third son, Caleb, whose strength of understanding was equalled only by his sweetness of disposition, after completing his education at the University of Edinburgh, became an efficient coadjutor of his father in the instruction of youth, and shortly afterwards also devoted himself to the Christian ministry. His services had been listened to in various pulpits, as well in the country as in the metropolis, with great admiration and interest: the reviving hopes of the General Baptist denomination, to which he had from deliberate conviction attached himself, had already anticipated in his rising talents a brilliant ornament and powerful champion of their depressed cause: and the fond wishes of his exulting father had already beheld in him his probable successor in the pulpit and in the school: when by an inscrutably mysterious providence all was marred by death—and by death rendered more awful by its suddenness and its origin. This beloved son died Dec. 6, 1820, after a few days' illness, in consequence of having swallowed a scarlet bean. The spirit of the parent was indeed wounded: the hopes of Christianity alone supported him; and on resuming his pastoral duties he delivered an affecting discourse on resignation, which was listened to with painful interest.

For the last few years, although his regular discharge of the duties of his pulpit and, while it continued, of his school, might have prevented his friends from inferring any peculiar decline of his bodily strength, closer observers perceived that his fragile existence depended

on the unremitting attentions of those about him, and that his debilitated frame must inevitably sink under any material accession of indisposition. He had on the last Christmas-day exhibited an extraordinary degree of cheerfulness in the society of a few cherished relatives and friends, and on the Sunday which closed the year, he preached with more than his wonted animation. But on the next day a severe cold, which confined him to his bed, gradually wore down his scanty strength, until at last he tranquilly expired on the 25th of January, in the 60th year of his age.

His remains were on Thursday, the 1st of February, followed to the tomb by a numerous train of relatives and friends, and the funeral procession received a peculiar interest from being attended from his house to the grave by the children of the Wood-Street School, an institution supported by four congregations, that of Worship Street being one. His friend, the Rev. James Gilchrist, pronounced an impressive address at the interment before a large concourse of assembled spectators, and on the following Sunday morning delivered an affectionate funeral discourse from Heb. xiii. 7, to a crowded and deeply attentive audience.

The death of this estimable man has left a void in the religious world, and particularly in the denomination to which he more immediately belonged, that will not be speedily or easily filled up. Besides his pastoral connexion at Worship Street, Dr. Evans occupied various important stations among his own denomination. For upwards of twenty years he filled the office (now held by Mr. Smallfield) of Secretary to the Annual Association of General Baptists, holden at Worship Street on the Tuesday in Whitsun-week, under the appellation of the *General Assembly*. He was likewise for many years Tutor of the institution supported by that denomination for the education of young men for the ministry, and which, since his resignation in 1818, has been ably superintended by Mr. Gilchrist. For many years preceding his decease, he was a member of the General Baptist Committee. When requested to take his part in the late Lectures on Baptism, suggested by that Committee, the sense of his corporeal debility almost deterred him from the task: but his enthusiasm being soon roused, no lengthened persuasion was requisite: and the vigour and ability with which he fulfilled the duty assigned him, left an indelible impression on his hearers. Designed as these lectures were to induce attention, especially among the more enlightened

portion of Christians, to a question for which a full and fair discussion had long been sought, but in vain, the interest excited by their delivery, and the discussion occasioned by their subsequent publication, gave Dr. Evans the highest gratification, and added to the last few months of his life a spirit and zest to which his family still look back with a pleasing recollection.

Besides the Sketch of Denominations, Dr. Evans was the author of numerous works, some topographical and others of a miscellaneous character, but all breathing that spirit of charity of which he was so ardent an apostle and so conspicuous an example. His detached Sermons and Tracts were in 1825 collected by him into a single volume, enriched with a portrait. He likewise contributed frequently to the periodical journals, and particularly to the former series of this work, in which his recent articles on Milton evince an unabated vigour of mind. He had read with peculiar interest the newly-discovered theological work of that immortal bard, and felt no common exultation in claiming brotherhood with him, not only as a Unitarian, but also in the more specific character of a General Baptist. For the Christian Moderator he lately contributed a series of biographical memoirs of several leading deceased Arian ministers.

Few words may suffice to describe Dr. Evans's theological sentiments. As a Baptist, he maintained the essentially personal nature of Christianity, and the right and duty of private judgment and individual conviction in matters of religion. As a General Baptist, he warmly advocated the unlimited, unpurchased goodness of God. Resting on these two great principles, he seldom wandered into controversial discussion upon topics less immediately connected with practical religion: for he considered real religion as depending on what we *do*, rather than on what we *think*. In his estimation the greatest *heresy* was a WICKED LIFE. But he was not without his opinions on the various subordinate topics that divide Christians, nor was he backward, on proper occasions, to declare and maintain them, as his sermon entitled "The Christian Minister's Retrospect," and his "Letter to Dr. Hawker," testify. A firm believer in the personal unity and paternal character of God, he claimed the appellation of Unitarian in its wider, and, as he contended, only correct application. On the person of Christ, though he never attained, nor perhaps desired to attain, that confidence professed by many, he never appears to have seen

reason to give up the doctrine of our Lord's pre-existence. Of Universal Restoration he was accustomed to say it was what every good man must wish to be true, but he seemed to think it wanted that conclusiveness of scriptural evidence which could justify a full conviction of its truth. To the theory of philosophical necessity he was no friend.

The great principles of civil and religious liberty ever found in Dr. Evans a firm and consistent advocate.

In the pulpit his chief characteristics were animation and simplicity. His melodious voice and easy delivery, joined to an extraordinary fluency of extemporaneous composition, eminently qualified him for pulpit eloquence.

The constant affection with which Dr. Evans discharged the several duties of a husband and a father, can never be effaced from the recollection of those to whom he bore those endearing relations. The benevolence and charity he so earnestly inculcated from the pulpit and the press, were fully exemplified in his own life, and few have left a more widely extended circle of sorrowing friends, among whom were many who held the most opposite theological sentiments. Notwithstanding his close connexion with a religious denomination, small in its number, and differing in many particulars from their fellow-christians, the exclusive spirit of party, the *odium theologicum*, found no place in his heart: and though a minister, he had nothing of the priest about him; and his exhaustless fund of general information and anecdote enabled him largely to contribute to those delights of intellectual intercourse which his cheerful temperament and social disposition eminently qualified him to enjoy.

His general character exhibited a rare assemblage of the nobler qualities that adorn humanity. His piety was without a tinge of bigotry, his charity without the shadow of ostentation. He was manly, generous and frank; and in him the elements were mingled so happily, that they constituted in their combination a beautiful symmetry and consistency of character. His amiable virtues, indeed, can be fully and adequately appreciated by those alone who were united to him by the ties of conjugal and filial affection: and with them the unavailing tear can only be dried by the prospect of a blessed reunion in that immortal state where the wise and good of every age and clime shall be assembled, and death and separation be known no more. "They that turn many to righteousness shall shine as the stars for ever and ever."

J. E.

INTELLIGENCE.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

Test and Corporation Acts.

THE Committee have come to the following resolutions; and from the movements which we hear are making in several quarters, we trust that no long space of time will elapse before this question of Religious Liberty, on its broadest basis, will cease to be the only one forgotten and neglected by both friends and foes in the British Legislature.

Resolved,

That the Secretary be instructed to write to the Secretary of the Deputies, requesting to know whether a further meeting is contemplated of the united Deputations appointed two years ago; and communicating the strong feeling of this Association, that immediate and zealous attention ought to be given by the Dissenters to procuring a motion for the Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts; and that longer delay is not only prejudicial to the cause, but injurious to the character of the Dissenting body.

That it be submitted to the Deputies whether it be not expedient to endeavour to arrange for a public meeting on the subject, at which some of the leading Members of each House of Parliament, friendly to the establishment of the principles of religious liberty, might be requested to attend.

Unitarian Marriage Bill.

THE Committee have requested, and are promised, an audience with the Earl of Liverpool, previous to determining the mode in which the application to Parliament should be renewed.

THE DEPUTIES.

First General Meeting for 1827. 26th January.

WM. SMITH, Esq., M. P., in the Chair.

THE Minutes of the last General Meeting being read and confirmed, Mr. WAYMOUTH proposed the re-election of Mr. SMITH as Chairman, which was carried by acclamation. Mr. SMITH having returned thanks, and Mr. WAYMOUTH and Mr. COLLINS being reappointed Deputy Chairman and Treasurer, the usual annual vote of thanks was passed to the Trustees of Dr. Williams's Library for their permission to have the Registry of Births kept there, and to Mr. COATES, the Librarian, for his care and attention thereto.

Mr. RUTT then, after alluding to the discussion on the subject at the last General Meeting, moved that the Auditors' report on the Treasurer's accounts be read: which motion having been seconded, Mr. MONTGOMERY expressed his gratification at the proposition, which would much influence his vote on the subject which he understood was next to come before the meeting.

A DEPUTY expressed his wish that, before the motion was put, some explanation should be given of its effect. There must have been some ground for the practice, which had long prevailed of not making the accounts public. Legal difficulties might, perhaps, be the result of publicity; and he thought, at all events, that some reasons should be given for adopting a new course.

The CHAIRMAN was not aware that it could be properly said that there was any settled practice of concealment. The fact certainly was, the accounts had never been produced, and it was equally true that they had not been called for. There was a sort of tacit secrecy observed, to be sure, in which, perhaps, there was no harm or no good. It was quite competent for the meeting to follow any other system.

The motion was then put and carried almost unanimously. From the Report it appeared, that the present fund consisted of £7100, three per cent. Consols, and £3000 Reduced—that the income of the year consisted of the balance of last year's account, and the dividends on this stock, which, after sundry disbursements of the year, consisting mainly of the expenses of the room, the Secretary's account, and the annual vote to the Librarian at Dr. Williams's Library, for keeping the Registry, (amounting altogether to £127. 3s. 2d.) left a balance of about £250 cash in hand.

Mr. E. TAYLOR then moved the further consideration of the adjourned motion made by him at the last meeting. The printed Report, and the discussion on the former occasion, fully explained the views of the Committee in recommending the application of part of their funds (which it now appeared were ample) in assisting the University of London, as an object consonant with the views of this Society. He had only now to explain that, on reconsideration, the Committee had thought it best to suggest that the shares should not be taken altogether in the names of the present Trustees, but in distinct names, so as to secure as many votes as possible in the University.

instead of leaving all in one hand, as would be the case by the rules of that institution, by which the first name on a joint account was the person recognized as entitled to vote. He therefore moved the resolution in an amended form, which, after some suggestions from different Deputies, finally was put as follows :

“ That this meeting authorizes the investment of a competent part of the funds of this Deputation, in subscribing for ten shares of the University of London, in the names of persons to be nominated as Trustees for the purpose ; and that it be referred to the Committee to settle the most convenient method of such investment.”

Mr. RUTT never felt a higher gratification than in seconding this resolution. No appropriation of a portion of their funds could be devised more consonant to the views and objects of their institution. Dissenters were most deeply interested in the establishment of the London University. We asserted our right to form and exercise variety of opinion, and nothing was more important than to be able to find a place of education where that right was not interfered with.

Mr. ALERS HANKEY opposed the motion. Though wishing success most cordially to the London University, he still doubted, on general principles, the propriety of involving in it any portion of their funds, which he considered appropriated to different purposes. Those funds he considered intended for the keeping up of a permanent income for carrying on the objects of the Society, and ought not to be hazarded. He wished to hear from the Treasurer, as a lawyer, his views as to the propriety and legality of such a measure.

Mr. COLLINS said, it was his intention, even if he had not been so directly called upon, to have submitted a few thoughts on the questions, 1st, Whether this was an expedient disposition of the money ; 2d, whether it was a legitimate application of the funds ; and 3d, whether there were such inconveniences as would render it undesirable. As to the first point, he thought it would occasion a deficit in income for general purposes for some time at least. He stated the yearly balances for some years to shew that the amount of the interest of this money could not conveniently have been spared. As to the second point, he contended that the motion departed from the intent of the founders of this fund, which he considered a trust. The Deputation was founded to support the civil and religious rights of Dissenters, and their funds must be intended for that purpose. The ques-

tion then was, whether the object in view was embraced by their institution. In his opinion it was not, and the appropriation to it of the money, therefore, would be a misapplication, and (though, to be sure, nothing of that sort was very likely here) would, strictly speaking, render the Trustees liable in law. In the third place, he thought there were inconveniences attending such an investment that should prevent it. The persons holding the shares might cease to be Deputies, or might die intestate, and great trouble and expense might ensue.

Mr. BENTLEY was surprised to hear it asserted, that it would be illegal to dispose of the fund in the hands of the Deputies, to any object which they should decide to be for the protection and extension of the rights and interests of Dissenters. He had himself brought considerable contributions to the fund, and was confident that all intended them to be applied as the Deputies thought proper in the furtherance of their interests. Was there any one object, except the Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, of more vital importance to Dissenters, than to redress the proscription to which they are liable, in the means of education, on account of opinion ? Even supposing this vote should cripple their present funds, could there be any difficulty in getting more ? They had ninety-eight congregations connected with them, and if each sent only a sovereign a-year, it would repay it threefold.

Mr. WAYMOUTH contended, that the object of the Deputation being the protection and extension of the civil rights and interests of Dissenters, it must be competent to the meeting to say what is or is not a right or interest to be protected or extended. If they were not to decide that question, who should ? It was a mere question of discretion, which no one could doubt was entrusted to them, and which they were to exercise and determine as they saw fit. As to the diminution of income, even that was not clear, for though at present the shares would pay no interest, they might reasonably be expected to do so hereafter. The shares being vested in Trustees, there could be no more difficulty in transferring and dealing with them than there was as to the stock now held.

Mr. WILKS was still decidedly opposed to the motion. Their equal rights were, no doubt, invaded by the arbitrary system of the Universities, but on that very account he withheld his concurrence in such a half measure as this. He described the feelings which always agitated his breast on reflecting that they were debarred from entering the academic groves,

by a system of despotic controul over the rights of conscience; but he would sooner meet the great evil directly at once. The more deeply he felt on the subject, the rather would he prefer to strike a blow at the system altogether; to call on this Society to unite their efforts to open their way where they were unjustly proscribed, than thus mitigate and palliate the evil by supporting the new institution. He would say, with Mr. Hankey and Mr. Collins, with perfect good-will to the London University, that the merit of that institution was not the point before them. For himself, he was one of the first to join in and support that University. He hoped, and would earnestly recommend to all in their individual characters, to support so laudable a work; but as a member of this Deputation he asked, what was the advantage to those civil rights which they were there to support, to be derived from co-operating with such an institution? It appeared to him, that there were many reasons against it arising out of matters of detail, but it was sufficient to shew that it was not necessary to press this plan forward on such a Society as this. Gentlemen should recollect that this was, after all, only a joint-stock company, and brought with it all the liabilities of such undertakings. He had that day seen individuals torn from their homes and families for the engagements of such companies, and how could they then ask persons to take upon themselves such risks as their Trustees? The patronage never could be of any value. As many pupils, they might be sure, would be taken as could be sent or come from any quarter. But his great objection was, that there was no obvious unity of design between this Society and the proposed University. It was not a Dissenting institution. As connected with it, he should strongly deprecate such a patronage as injurious to it. It would be injured rather than advanced by the public assistance of Dissenting bodies. If they were to give money to institutions of the sort, let them give it to their own Dissenting Academies. The unity of purpose of those institutions with this Society was obvious, but he could see none in the present case.

Mr. RICHARD TAYLOR was sensible at how great disadvantage any one must follow the eloquence of the last speaker. But eloquence, however splendid, was sometimes a dangerous talent. It might lead its owner into gilded sophistry and adorn views which were only founded in fallacy. Let them take two of the learned gentleman's eloquent pictures, for instance, and he was much mistaken if they did not completely answer one

another. He had painted in the most gloomy colours the dangers to which a person taking a share in the University as Trustee for a Society like this, where there was £10,000 to back and indemnify him, might be exposed of being torn from his family and home, and consigned to a prison; yet another highly ornamented part of his speech had called upon all those who had the means to enter singly and individually, at their own risk, into this undertaking, so fraught with ruin and dangers. Eloquent as were the two pictures, he had only to observe, that they were both equally so, and therefore were an exact answer one to the other.

Mr. WILKS explained. He thought it was a very different thing for individuals to run hazards in a meritorious pursuit, and for a society to ask persons to expose themselves to the risk as trustees.

Mr. R. TAYLOR left it to the meeting to estimate the alleged distinction at what it was worth, and would proceed to notice another objection made by the learned gentleman. The object of the University, he had contended, was foreign to those civil rights and interests of Dissenters which this Deputation was appointed to support. For his part, since both reason and scripture taught us that knowledge was the most precious of our possessions, he considered the right of obtaining knowledge, and of obtaining it in the best and most effectual manner, by a public education, to be the most valuable of all rights. Of the enjoyment of this right, as regarded existing English Universities, Dissenters were unjustly deprived. They were deputed to protect the civil rights of Dissenters; the right of all to public education was therefore one of the most legitimate objects of their care. How then was this right, whose value was admitted, to be attained? The learned gentleman himself had dwelt long and eloquently on the classic shades of academic groves; but how were we to get there? He had advised them to unite in some effort to take these retreats by storm. For his part, he was content to take the more easy course of providing as good a substitute as he could. But then it is said, You are Dissenters; do not therefore subscribe or assist this University, for it is not intended for Dissenters *alone*. Why this, he contended, was the very reason that it deserved their support. He liked it because it was not sectarian. Because it was not so, and because it did not adopt a system of exclusion for opinions, this Deputation, whose object it was to protest against proscriptions of this sort in every form, ought above all things to countenance it. It was one of

the great misfortunes resulting to Dissenters from the existence of a Church Establishment, and the connexion between the Church and the Universities, that they were forced to acquire a sectarian character. But ought they to cherish such a character? Young men, instead of associating with others, were classed by religious systems, and became narrow and bigoted in their habits. It was the abolition of this mischievous result that gave the plan of the new University its value, and entitled it to support in preference to the limited, exclusive academies maintained by the several religious denominations.

A DEPUTY (we believe a solicitor) said he came prepared to ask several questions which the production of the accounts had rendered unnecessary. But he still wished to know something as to the *origin* of the fund; whether any of it came by will, or how? He was very doubtful, especially after what had fallen from Mr. Wilks and Mr. Collins, whether they had legally or equitably any right so to appropriate the money. He suggested that a case should be stated for counsel's opinion.

Mr. YOCKNEY did not presume to argue with legal men on legal subjects, but considered it perfectly competent to the Society to vote the money entrusted to it by voluntary contributors, for any purpose which in its discretion it considered consonant to the great principles they had in view. He was confident that they would do great credit to themselves in coming to such a vote.

The CHAIRMAN did not intend to take part in the debate on the propriety of the vote, but as questions had been asked as to the objects of the Society and the origin of their funds, he would give a short explanation on those heads. On referring to the printed history of their proceedings, it would be seen that the objects of the Deputation were declared to be in the most general terms, "for the management of the civil affairs of the Dissenters;" and the Deputies and Committee had always attended to any matters which they thought connected with the rights, interests, or civil situation, of the Dissenting body. With regard to the fund, not one penny arose from any bequest, donation, or specific appropriation of any sort. The object of it was therefore as general as the objects of their association. The Committee had from time to time made appeals to congregations and the public for subscriptions for their general purposes, and the money which was sent was disposed of at the will and pleasure of the Deputation and their Committee. No

doubt the principal object of pursuit was always considered to be the Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts; but this had only been prosecuted at intervals, and balances had from time to time remained in their hands, which they had disposed of as seemed best for the promotion of the interests of Dissenters. Meantime, for convenience, the balance had been invested in stock. They had, it was clear, adopted a wide discretion in disposing of their money; as, for instance, they had embarked large sums in suits not affecting general principles, but the private property of congregations, as in the Dudley cause. They had in other instances employed the money in prosecutions of offenders. In short, the Society had always freely exercised the discretion freely reposed. If then there was that unity or consonance of purpose in the proposed University with their principles and interests as Dissenters, which some thought, and on which it was the province of the meeting to decide as a fair matter of opinion and discussion, he could have no doubt that such discretion must be the law and rule. It was the sole question, he must think, to be decided, and those who thought the object not consonant with their views would of course negative the motion. On that question he did not intend to offer any opinion either way.

A DEPUTY observed, that it did not appear to be necessary to sell any of the stock at all. They had a balance of cash in hand, and could pay future calls out of their dividends.

Mr. THOMAS WILSON had taken no part in originating this motion, but must, as he trusted he always should do, take the liberal side and support it. He considered it quite clear that they could do it if they wished. The money was in no way appropriated to any specific purpose; it was merely money subscribed for them to apply as they saw best in the civil concerns of the Dissenters. They lay under restrictions from holding certain offices, and they were going to petition against such laws. They lay under similar restrictions as to education; here was a plan for obviating *that* grievance. Could any one doubt that it was an object for their support if they thought proper? The London University wanted support from every quarter, and it deserved it. It offered education to all, and it was of the utmost importance, particularly to Dissenters, to encourage such a principle. In so doing we were remedying as far as we could the worst infringement on our liberties, and he was sure our ancestors would have gloried in such an opportunity.

There might be difficulties attending the investment, but he had no doubt they might be obviated; but if not, if the money was absolutely voted away, what harm was done? They had abundant resources. The zeal and public spirit of the body of Dissenters were their funds to resort to. They made no scruple of embarking their money in law-suits and chancery-suits, in which they risked much larger sums about mere private disputes, and why not risk something here on a great question? They had of late been called upon to spend little in these matters, they had an accumulation of cash in hand, and how could they spend it better? But it was said, Don't attempt to found a new institution; make a vigorous effort to compel admission to the old Universities. Could such a proposition be seriously and fairly put? The proposer must know that they might as well try to pull down St. Paul's. The only way to make an approach to it was to support this plan. If the Dissenters would not do it, who should? He gave the motion his hearty concurrence, and conceived it an honour to vote for it.

Mr. BOMPAS (a barrister) anticipated very little difficulties as to the mode of investment;—they had only to take care and keep each share or number of shares in three or four names, and there would be no difficulty about deaths. As to the right to make this appropriation, he had felt at first that there might be some difficulty; but after the explanation given from the Chair, he could not believe any lawyer, knowing how these funds arose, without any limitation as to the discretion of the Society, could have a moment's doubt. A Society was appointed to manage the civil affairs of the Dissenters, and in the course of their duty received subscriptions for the purpose, which, instead of their spending, as they might have done, had, from accidental circumstances, accumulated. Could any one doubt that what such a Society determined in its discretion to be a fit mode of pursuing the interests of Dissenters, must be conclusive on the subject? If he thought there was a pretence for doubt, he would take an opinion on the subject; but as it stood, he could not for a moment believe that they had any other than a full and free liberty to decide for themselves what

was or not for their interest; and if to decide, then certainly to act. Then the real question was, whether this institution were a desirable one for Dissenters to support? Every one who spoke acknowledged it was; every one exhorted Dissenters singly to encourage it. Why, then, if good in the eyes of all Dissenters individually, did it cease to be so to them collectively? But then they were told that this was doing things by halves, that they should attack the old Universities. Really, it appeared to him that the old proverb, that half a loaf was better than no bread, was quite sufficient answer to this reasoning. No one doubted that this institution, and the principle involved in it, deeply affected their interests, if they must not use the word rights; and why not spend some of this money, intrusted to them, after all, to spend, not to invest in the funds?

A Deputy opposed the motion at some length, under such frequent interruptions, by cries of "Question! Question!" that he broke off, and the Chairman, having put the question, and not being able to decide by show of hands, requested a division, and tellers being appointed, the numbers were declared to be,

For the motion..... 44

Against it 44

On which the Chairman gave the casting voice in favour of the motion.

The Committee then chosen for the ensuing year, were

Charles C. Bompas, Esq., Temple; J. B. Brown, Esq., LL.D., Temple; William Burls, Esq., 56, Lothbury; Edward Busk, Esq., Temple; Samuel Kayell, Esq., Camberwell; W. B. Gurney, Esq., Essex Street; James Gibson, Esq., Great Saint Helen's; William Hale, Esq., Homerton; George Hammond, Esq., Homerton; Benjamin Hanbury, Esq., Blackfriars' Road; W. A. Hanky, Esq., Fenchurch Street; Samuel Jackson, Esq., Clapham; R. H. Marten, Esq., Mincing Lane; Samuel Medley, Esq., Threadneedle Street; John T. Rutt, Esq., Clapton; Benjamin Shaw, Esq., Cornhill; Richard Taylor, Esq., Shoe Lane; John Wilks, Esq., Finsbury Square; Thomas Wood, Esq., Little St. Thomas Apostle; Joseph Yallowley, Esq., Red-cross Street; William Yockney, Esq., Bedford Street, Covent Garden.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Several articles intended for the present Number have been unavoidably postponed.—*Clericus Hibernicus* will appear in the next Number.—The Conductors will be glad to receive the remaining portion of the article from Chesterfield.—Mr. Holland's request has been complied with.