

THE MONTHLY REPOSITORY

AND

REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, No. IV.

APRIL, 1827.

ON A RECENTLY-DISCOVERED WORK OF LEIBNITZ, ALLEGED TO PROVE HIS ADHERENCE TO THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

AMONG the mass of manuscripts in the hand-writing of Leibnitz which are preserved in the Electoral (now Royal) Library at Hanover, it had been rumoured that there was one entitled *Systema Theologicum*, in which he had defended the doctrine of the Romish Church. During the existence of the Westphalian government, a Frenchman of the name of Emerg, who had heard of this report, obtained the manuscript and transcribed it with a view to publication; but he died before he had accomplished his purpose, and it was edited at Paris with a translation, after his death, in 1819. From some cause or other, the original was not sent back to Hanover in the general restitution of French spoliations after the overthrow of Napoleon; at least in the summer of 1820 it still remained at Paris. No reasonable doubt exists as to its genuineness. It has been re-published in Germany with a translation by two Professors in the episcopal seminary at Mentz, and a preface by a former professor at Heidelberg, tending to prove that Leibnitz was at heart a Roman Catholic; and has excited some interest among the members of the Lutheran Church, to which Leibnitz always professed to belong. At the present moment, some notice of it may not be without interest to the English reader. We must premise, however, that we know the work only through the medium of an article in the *Jenaische Allgemeine Litteratur-Zeitung* for November, 1822.

Leibnitz is well known to have wished earnestly for the re-union of the Romish and the Lutheran Churches, and to have been engaged in a long correspondence with Bossuet on this subject. It is not wonderful that such a wish should have been formed by many persons in Germany in the latter half of the seventeenth century, when we reflect what miseries had been inflicted on that country in the earlier part of it by the war of thirty years, the consequence of the Reformation. Leibnitz had previously carried on a correspondence, tending to the same result, with Pelisson, a converted or apparently converted Huguenot, who enjoyed at that time considerable reputation as a fine writer in France; and the Bishop of Neustadt on the part of the Roman Catholics, and Molanus, Protestant abbot of Lokkum, near Hanover, on that of the Lutherans, had proceeded so far as actually to have

agreed on twelve articles as a basis of re-union. (See Butler's Life of Bossuet, Works, Vol. III. p. 242.) Molanus having conducted the negotiation thus far, appears to have resigned it to Leibnitz. His views differed in some respects from those of Molanus. Bossuet distinctly declared that the Church of Rome, though she might shew indulgence in matters of discipline, would not yield a single article of faith propounded by the council of Trent; while Leibnitz, aware that there were some of these articles to which the Lutherans could not assent, wished that the re-union should take place provisionally, these points being reserved to the decision of a general council, to which, if fairly constituted, the Lutherans should promise to submit. After a correspondence which lasted ten years between Bossuet and Leibnitz, the plan was ultimately abandoned, and the Catholic writers charge Leibnitz with having caused its failure by his presumption and double-dealing—an imputation from which Mr. Butler, in the passage before quoted, declares that in his opinion he stands free. The correspondence to which we have referred terminated apparently in the year 1701. If we knew the date of a letter of Leibnitz to Ernest, Landgrave of Hesse-Rheinfels, we might be able to decide whether the work of which we are speaking be that referred to in it or not. "Je veux," says he, "dresser un jour quelque écrit, sur quelques points de controverse entre les Catholiques et Protestans, et s'il est approuvé par des personnes judicieuses et modérées j'en recevrai beaucoup de joie. Mais il ne faut pas qu'on sache en aucune façon que l'auteur n'est pas dans la Communion Romaine. Cette seule prévention rend les meilleures choses suspectes." There is every probability that the work lately published is that which Leibnitz here declares his intention of composing. The manner in which the doctrines of the Church of Rome are viewed, is precisely that which would be required for the concealment which he deemed necessary in order to obtain an unprejudiced hearing. The inscription "Systema Theologicum Leibnitii" was not placed on the cover of the volume by Leibnitz himself, (it has no internal title,) but was given by some one who recognized his hand-writing and designated the work according to its contents. We proceed to mention what these are.

In regard to what are called the mysteries of religion, Leibnitz had already declared his opinion in the Discours de la Conformité de la Foi avec la Raison, prefixed to his Theodice, that the doctrine of the Trinity (to which he adds creation and the distinct knowledge on the part of God of an infinity of things at once) is above reason, but not contrary to it, so that it cannot *demonstrably* be proved false. In pursuance of the same mode of arguing, he contends in this work, that the doctrine of Transubstantiation cannot be *demonstrated* to be false. Original sin he thus defines: "Peccatum originale genus hominum in primo parente invasit; i. e. contracta est pravitas quædam quæ facit, ut homines sint ad bene agendum segnes, ad male agendum prompti, obnubilato intellectu, sensibus vero præalentibus. Etsi autem anima pura a Deo emanat (neque enim adhuc animarum [probably *impuritas* is to be inserted] intelligi potest) tamen vi unionis cum corpore ex parentum vitio prave constituitur, sive per connexionem cum externis peccatum originale seu dispositio ad peccandum in eâ exoritur. Atque ita facti sunt omnes filii iræ et conclusi sub peccato et in exitium præcipites ituri, nisi magna Dei gratia subleventur; non eo tamen extendenda est vis peccati originalis, ut parvuli, qui nullum actuale peccatum commiserunt, damnentur, quemadmodum multi volunt: sub justo enim judice Deo, nemo sine culpâ suâ miser esse potest." Sins are divided into venial and deadly, under the latter being understood those "quæ malo animo et contra conscientiam ex-

pressam et virtutum principia menti insita, admittantur." The controversies respecting conversion and justification, and the merit of good works, are thus pronounced upon: "Quamvis a Deo sit excitatio et auxilium tamen in homine semper est aliqua cooperatio, alioqui dici non posset, eum egisse. Utrum autem ipsæ vires bonos motus efficiendi in irregenitis sint fractæ aut tantummodo impeditæ, valde inutiliter et frigide disputatur—omnibus hominibus gratiam dat Deus sufficientem hactenus, ut posita modo ipsorum voluntate seriâ nihil amplius ad salutem eorum desideratur, quod non sit in potestate." The Calvinistic doctrine on this subject is controverted, and the dispute whether justification consists in *imputatione meriti satisfactionisque Christi*, or in *justitudi habituali infusa*, he pronounces useless, as both are equally necessary. A similar decision is passed on the controversy respecting the relative value of faith and charity—"fides est caritatis requisitum, caritas fidei complementum." Good works are essential to salvation; "quatenus in seriâ voluntate consistunt." Of ascetic practices and monastic orders it is observed, that the world might derive great benefit from the existence of an order of men devoted to contemplation and works of mercy or public instruction, provided abuses were restrained and the controul of the Supreme Pontiff exerted to make them subservient to the design of their founders and the benefit of the universal church. The charge of idolatry is repelled from those who use images only in the way which the author allows, referring every thing to God; and reasons of prudence are urged why the attempt to put them away from the churches would be unadvisable. On the same ground, and with the same explanations, the reverence of saints and reliques may be allowed, and the use of the prayers of the former in aid of our own.

Upon the whole, it will be evident, we think, that this work is rather curious as connected with the personal history and character of Leibnitz, than valuable as throwing any new light upon the important subjects of which it treats. It proves that Mr. Butler was right in attributing to Leibnitz a sincere desire to promote the reconciliation of the Romish and Lutheran Churches; and, indeed, it is hard to see what should have prevented such a reconciliation, supposing Leibnitz fairly to represent the feelings of the Lutherans, but the unwillingness of the Romanists themselves to accept that *rational* interpretation of their own doctrines, which Leibnitz labours to devise for them. There have always been enlightened men among them, who have held the doctrines of the Church in that moderate and comparatively unobjectionable form in which they are here exhibited; but they are widely different in the minds of the generality, and even Bossuet must have found them fall short of his own standard of Orthodoxy, as the project of a re-union failed when carried on between Leibnitz and himself. We must doubt, however, if the great body of the Lutherans even in that age could have been brought to sanction the concessions which the courtly philosopher was willing to make on their behalf. Reconciliation appears to have been both in theology and philosophy a favourite scheme of Leibnitz, and he had before endeavoured to make peace between Plato and Aristotle, as now between Luther and the Pope. In the pursuit of this latter object, he labours to diminish as much as possible the existing differences and represent them as being in themselves what, in all probability, they were to him, unimportant differences in words; but though some Lutheran princes might from motives of policy wish to see the schism closed which weakened the force of Germany, and some Protestants, ignorant of the true principle of their own secession, might wish to find themselves again in communion with the ancient Church, we cannot believe that a general re-union could even then have been accomplished. Every

year which has since elapsed has shewn more strongly the impracticability of such schemes of comprehension ; and the only union to which the Christian philosopher now allows himself to look forward is in the spirit and practice of the gospel—not in rites, discipline, or even doctrine.

K.

IRISH CONVOCATIONS.

To the Editor.

SIR,

I REJOICE to see a spirit of curiosity respecting the religious history of Ireland manifesting itself so early in the New Series of your Repository ; and I am willing to infer, from your insertion in the number for February of your Correspondent's queries on the subject of the Convocation and Articles of the Church of Ireland, that you will admit into your pages such information, in reply, as may be found correct in itself, and conveyed in a spirit consistent with the tenor of your valuable *Miscellany*. Guided by these views, I therefore send you a few gleanings on the subject of the Irish Convocation.

I may be permitted to premise, that the materials for illustrating the ecclesiastical history of this country are extremely scanty. The general histories of Ireland that are published touch but slightly on this branch of the subject, and that too in a most partial manner. The lives and state papers of our chief governors, prelates, or statesmen, that have been given to the world, supply a few incidental notices that materially correct the prejudiced and defective accounts of professed historians. But this is all that an inquirer into this important portion of his country's history has to guide him in his search. We have not the invaluable treasures of unpublished manuscripts, which the British Museum presents to the student of English, and the Advocates' Library to that of Scottish History, and which so amply reward their most laborious investigations. Trinity College in Dublin, indeed, possesses a very extensive and valuable collection of manuscripts : such, at least, is the popular belief. But we must remember “ *omne ignotum pro magnifico* ;” and never was a treasure more warily guarded and more successfully withdrawn from general circulation. Even this magnificent library of books is inaccessible to the stranger or the uninitiated for any useful purpose. It is closed most rigorously on every saint's day and holiday through the year ; not a venerable martyr, or confessor, or impostor, is there in all the Popish calendar, that is not thus honoured by this Protestant university ; and before you make use of the books, an oath or two of reasonable dimensions must be first digested. But its manuscript-room is the Corinth which it is permitted to few to enter ; and if it be rich, but few of its treasures can be detected even in the works of those who had daily access to it :—witness Leland, the historian of Ireland, who was himself a Fellow of the College, but whose work presents few traces of minute or diligent research. We are, therefore, much cramped and bounded in our illustration of any portion of our ecclesiastical history on which a stranger may seek information. We can do little more than bring before him extracts from what has been already published, without pretending to add any thing new. This will appear more clearly in the following gleanings ; and it must plead my excuse if they prove insufficient to satisfy the laudable curiosity of your correspondent on the subject to

which they refer. In that case I trust this attempt will only be the precursor of some fuller and more satisfactory account than my limited reading enables me to compile.

In England, in the earlier stages of the Reformation, convocations sat regularly with each new parliament that was assembled; but it was a considerable time before any were summoned to meet in Ireland. When the Irish Parliament met in 1536, there were not in the kingdom Protestant clergymen sufficient to constitute an ecclesiastical assembly, and the statesmen accordingly legislated for the infant church with a severity and intolerance that would not have disgraced the most zealous convocation. During the reign of Edward VI. the Lord Deputy was averse to calling a parliament, and the Reformation was pressed forwards by royal proclamations alone; and the parliaments that met in the reigns of Mary and Elizabeth were deemed fully sufficient to regulate all religious matters. The reformed doctrines had, indeed, acquired such a limited ascendancy by reason of the injudicious measures employed in their propagation, that there existed no necessity for the expedient of a convocation where there were few to govern, and still fewer to assemble. At length, in 1615, the Reformation had advanced so far, and the Church acquired so much stability, that a convocation was directed by James I. to be held at Dublin. This assembly, the first of the kind in Ireland, was called principally with the view that the Church might be furnished with that necessary and inseparable appendage of an establishment—a confession of faith! The Irish clergy would not adopt that of the English church, lest this might imply a subserviency to its authority, or compromise their honour and independence. But a new confession was proposed to be drawn up, and this task was assigned to Dr. James Usher, afterwards the celebrated Archbishop of Armagh. When completed, it consisted of no less than one hundred and four articles; it was unanimously adopted, and is singular from its comprising many of those tenets that were then characteristic of Puritanism. I refer the reader to the observations made on these articles by Neal in the second volume of his *History of Dissenters*; and to the confession itself as given at large in the appendix to the same work. Leland, in his *History of Ireland*, seems to reflect on Usher for introducing his Calvinistic principles into the confession, and makes this characteristic remark—“And without any condescension to the sentiments of King James, he (Usher) declared in one article, that the Lord’s-day was to be wholly dedicated to the service of God.” Weak and presumptuous man! To dare to think differently from the Head of the Church, even on a point of such inferior importance! This certainly is high-church doctrine.

This convocation, however, left its legitimate work very imperfect. For it enacted no canons, those clerical expedients for persecution; and its only penal clause was the last, which declared, “that if any minister should publicly teach any doctrine contrary to the articles agreed upon, he should be silenced and deprived of his promotions.” What was defective, however, in the proceedings of this assembly, was not long after amply supplied. In 1633, Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, was made Lord Deputy of Ireland; a promotion which he owed as much to the patronage of Laud as to his own abilities. One of the first objects of his administration, according to the suggestion of his patron, whose abhorrence of Calvinism and Puritanism is well known, was to obtain the abolition of the obnoxious confession of Usher, and bring the Church of Ireland to adopt the articles and discipline of that of England. A convocation, the second in Ireland, was therefore

summoned for this purpose in 1634 ; and by it, through the dexterous management of Strafford, and contrary to the inclinations of the majority of the clergy, the XXXIX Articles were adopted, and a selection of the English canons, to the number of a hundred, made for the regulation of the Irish Church. In this assembly many non-conforming divines sat as members. Indeed, were it not foreign to the object of this paper, it could be easily shewn, that the majority of the clergy, especially in the province of Ulster, were of Presbyterian principles. Mr. James Hamilton, nephew to Lord Clanaboy and minister of Ballywalter in the Co. Down, afterwards of Dumfries and Edinburgh, was a member of this Convocation ; and Joshua Hoyle, D. D., afterwards a member of the Assembly at Westminster, also sat in it. Summary accounts of its proceedings may be found in Leland, Book v. chap. i., and in Neal, Vol. II. page 231, last edition. But they who would wish to look behind the scenes, and get a glimpse of the secret springs of its public acts, will find ample gratification in the first volume of Strafford's State Letters. The letter of the Deputy to Laud, describing the manner in which he cajoled the Lower House into his measures, is worthy of insertion in the Repository on several accounts, but its great length prevents me giving it a place here. In addition to its interest as exhibiting a singular specimen of political manœuvring and clerical tameness and submission, it is this letter that contains the celebrated clause afterwards produced, I believe, with great effect on his trial,—“ so as now I can say the king is as absolute here as any prince in the whole world can be, and may be still, if it be not spoiled, on that side.”

The ecclesiastical authorities were not slow in bringing into operation the penal enactments passed by this assembly. The northern bishops in particular soon began the work of silencing, fining, and imprisoning all who disobeyed their orders or refused to render entire conformity to the newly-formed canons of the church. Their dominancy, however, was of short duration. The rebellion in 1641 destroyed the influence of that party ; nor did it revive till the restoration placed them on their former footing, and gave them power to lord it once more over God's heritage. Scarcely had that event taken place, when a convocation, the third in Ireland, was summoned to meet with the Irish Parliament in May, 1661. It sat but a short time, and again assembled in July, 1662, as we learn from the following letter written to the Primate by two ministers in the city of Derry. These desired to be excused from attending the convocation—“ because of the cathedral not otherwise in this scarcity of ministers likely to be supplied, and for the herding of schismatics who run about preachers in this diocese. Some fourteen days since I seized upon a squinted fellow, one Smith, who had played his conventicling freaks in the street the week before. Examined him before the Mayor ; but such a piece of ignorance and impudence (though I have met with many thick-skinned foreheads in my time) I never grappled with before. He slipt our hands and ran the diocese ; wherever he comes I fear he is of pernicious aspect. I have heard since that he was Corbet's chaplain who was lately hanged, drawn, and quartered.” *Note.*—Miles Corbet sat at King Charles' trial, and signed the warrant for his death, for which he was executed this year at Tyburn. Of the proceedings of this convocation we have no record, though it continued to sit occasionally to 1666.

The revival of convocations in England in the commencement of Queen Anne's reign, led to the same measure in Ireland. In September, 1703, the Irish Convocation was, for the fourth time, summoned with parliament ; and

though it continued to meet at intervals for six years, its only public act was a Declaration vindicating themselves from the growing suspicions of their being disaffected to the cause of the Queen. Their sittings were mostly employed in those frivolous discussions, conducted in that intemperate tone, which is so proverbial in clerical assemblies. They were for a long time occupied in discussing the question, whether the verger or the actuary of the Upper House was the proper person to bring messages to the Lower. It is singular that the Archbishop of Tuam was the only member of this assembly who sat in the one held in the reign of Charles II. The convocation was again constituted in July, 1711, under the patronage of the Tory administration that had just entered on the government of Ireland, and their addresses to the throne, their only acts, were worthy of the party that had given them this brief existence.—When a new parliament assembled in November, 1713, the convocation was, for the sixth and last time, summoned; and on this occasion its members distinguished themselves by becoming the champions of the Lord Chancellor Phipps, the great abettor in Ireland of Sacheverell's party. They presented an Address to the Lord Lieutenant in favour of the Chancellor, in order to counteract one that had been presented by the House of Commons for his removal from office. At the presentation of this Address, a circumstance occurred which shews the temper of those times. On their entering the presence-chamber at the castle, Mr. Molesworth, a privy counsellor, who happened to be present, said to some gentlemen near him—“They who have turned the world upside down are come hither also.” He was overheard by the clergy, who took fire and complained of the aspersion to the Lords. The Lords desired a conference with the Commons on this supposed breach of privilege; but the latter treated the matter with indifference. The ministry, however, viewed it in a different light, and, to the disgrace of their party, removed Mr. M. from the privy council. Since this period I do not find that the Irish Convocation ever again met for business. The Bangorian controversy in England, in 1718, appears to have convinced the House of Hanover of the inexpediency of continuing these turbulent and unmanageable assemblies either there or in Ireland. How the rights of the Irish Church in the matter of their convocation were disposed of at the Union, I am not civilian enough to ascertain or illustrate.

In this rapid survey of Irish convocations your correspondent “Clericus Anglicus” will, I trust, find satisfactory answers to his late queries on the subject. He will learn the number and nature of the original articles of the Irish Church—the time and manner of their being summarily exchanged for those of the English hierarchy—the periods at which the Irish convocations have sat since the Reformation, and the fact of their authority, though still existing *de jure*, having been, as in England, silently superseded *de facto*.

Hoping this communication may be worthy of a place in your Repository, and be the means of exciting further curiosity respecting the ecclesiastical history of this country; I remain your obedient servant,

CLERICUS HIBERNUS.

Carrickfergus, February 17, 1827.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE CONTROVERSY AS TO THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

[Concluded from page 99.]

Not at all entering into Dr. Maltby's fears of the dangers of "the over-curious and restless spirit of research," by which "points, long since admitted by the general consent of wise and good men," are probed and tried, and being well assured with him that in the result, "the grounds of our belief will have been more completely sifted and more accurately understood; that the substantial interests of truth will have been promoted, and the purity, as well as genuineness, of our sacred records, in the end established on a still more solid and durable foundation"—we proceed to notice the mode in which he has entered upon the controversy, the previous history of which we have somewhat developed. He takes up the hypothesis of the author of the *Palæoromaica* without any intimation of its previous history or existence. "The object," he tells us, "of that paradoxical production, is to shew that almost the whole Christian world, from the time in which the Scriptures of the New Testament were composed, up to the present day, has been involved in one common and monstrous error respecting the language in which they were originally written;—and that the Latin was not only the more natural and proper language at that particular period for books designed for general instruction, but also the language in which they actually first appeared."

The principal portion of Dr. Maltby's Sermon is directed to the denial and disproval of one of the leading propositions of the *Palæoromaica*—"that it was natural and proper, and therefore probable, that the various books of the New Testament should be written in Latin, not in Greek." After observing upon the objectionable nature of this species of argument founded on antecedent fitness against a supposed historical fact, Dr. M. proceeds to shew concisely, but by a most unanswerable chain of facts, the prevalence of the Greek language among the Jews, and the absence of all proof of the use by them of the Latin in any single instance. Passing by the general and undoubted use of the Greek tongue throughout a large portion of Asia, which may, indeed, be considered as the cradle of its literature, he observes that, after the Macedonian conquest, Syria became, as it were, naturalized to the language of the conqueror; and that all the country surrounding Palestine, every city to which the Jews were carried or which they inhabited, spoke a dialect of Greek more or less pure; that every probability is in favour of their adoption of the language of the country where they resided, and that we know for an undoubted fact that they certainly did so at Alexandria; that all history bears us out in asserting, that whatever knowledge was possessed by the Jews, besides the dialects of Hebrew, was decidedly Greek and Greek only; nay, that the writers in Greek were more numerous, as well as distinguished, than those in Hebrew or Syro-Chaldaic. The apocryphal books of the Old Testament, with few exceptions, were Greek, and a version of the Old Testament itself had been called into existence by its usefulness and, in fact, necessity. The same dialect became consecrated to the service of religion, and there is evidence that the law was read in it in the synagogues, and that the Jews studied it at home and were familiarized with it in their communications abroad. One thing is certain, that there is no proof of any one work written by a Jew in Latin.

Dr. Maltby then proceeds with a concise account of a series of Jewish writers using the Greek language. The names of Philo, Josephus, and Justin of Tiberias, satisfactorily close the list. The argument on this head is thus summed up:

“ I have now brought down a regular series of Jew-Greek writers, bearing no inconsiderable proportion in point of numbers to the more celebrated Greek authors of the same time whose works are extant ; that is, from the time of Alexander to the reign of Vespasian. Surely it is a decisive proof of the prevalence of a language among those to whom it was not strictly native, if you can mention so many writers of Jewish origin among those to whom Greek was a native language. But I must extend the argument further, and say if there were, as might be expected, a far greater number of native Greeks known to have written during the same period, is there any instance whatever upon record of any writer of Jewish origin, either prior to the time of Augustus or for some centuries after, composing and publishing any one work in the Latin language ? The Greek tongue was that to which those Jews who lived in Greek cities must have been habituated. It was the language to which all Jews whatever, whether living in Palestine or elsewhere, became habituated in consequence of the translation of their ancient Scriptures into that tongue. Can any man then, knowing the actual circumstances of the dispersed Jews, contend with any shadow of probability, that *Latin* was the language in which it was most *natural*, and therefore *probable*, that any Jewish writers should express themselves ? ”

The remainder of the Discourse is directed to a brief consideration of the *reasons*, or rather of some of the reasons, by which the hypothesis of a Latin original of the New Testament is supported, in contradiction to the established fact that Jewish writers in and after the time of our Saviour, if they did not write Syro-Chaldaic, could have written, and did in reality write, in no language but Greek. In this branch of his argument Dr. Maltby very properly relieves himself at once from the onus of maintaining the *universality* of the Greek tongue, against which so much of the Palæo-romana is directed, but which really has scarcely any thing to do with the question, except in a very modified way. History certainly proves the Greeks to have been possessed of an extensive indigenous literature, which they cultivated to the exclusion of all others ; and it also proves the Latins to have been a servile race of imitators and translators, and this surely is enough to throw presumption on the side of what has hitherto been considered admitted fact. To come still nearer, to Syria and the neighbourhood of Palestine, we shall find Juvenal expressly enumerating the strangers from those parts as bringing to Rome itself the manners and language of Greece :

Non possum ferre, Quirites,
Græcam urbem ; quamvis quota portio fæcis Achæi ?
Jam pridem Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes,
Et *linguam et mores*, et cum tibicini chordas
Obliquas, nec non gentilia tympana secum
Vexit.

Sat. iii. 60.

Dr. Maltby next proceeds to deal with the grand position of his opponent, that it was proper, and therefore probable, that St. Paul should address his Epistles to the Romans in Latin. Repeating his protest against any priori reasoning in contradiction to fact resting on the concurrent testimony and assent of ages, Dr. Maltby asks, first, what ground there is for assuming that St. Paul *could* write Latin at all ? And next, why, if he could, it was so proper or necessary that he should write his Epistles to the Romans in Latin and not in Greek ? To whom did he address himself, to Jews or Gentiles ? To Hellenizing Jews resident there, it is conceived ; both as being the first converts at Rome, and as being a ready medium of communication with others ; bearing in mind also that those who contend that these residents at Rome could not read a Greek Epistle, must also contend that they were

ignorant of the Old Testament itself; for how but in Greek could they have read it?

The case of the Epistle to the Corinthians stands on somewhat similar grounds, with this difference, that there is no reason to believe that Corinth, although restored and colonized by Cæsar after its devastation by Mummius, has any title to be considered as what can be properly called a city of Romans or Latins, or as inhabited by persons speaking exclusively the Latin language, still less as remaining at the distance of a century unacquainted with the Greek language, though in the very heart of Greece and Grecians. Reason and probability will assure us, that the main population of such a city must always have been or would soon become Greek; that the Roman settlers (if, indeed, they were properly Romans at all) would soon amalgamate with the population of the country; and that the persons likely to be the earliest Christian converts would be of the same description as in the other cities, particularly of the Eastern portion of the empire.

One frequent cause of misunderstanding on the important question discussed in the works before us, appears to rest on a similar mistake to that to which we have before alluded, and which every one is apt to make, in not sufficiently distinguishing the state and uses of the books now composing the New-Testament Canon in the early periods of Christianity, from what we now see and feel. We are apt, unconsciously, to talk (as the author of the *Palæoromaica* justly observes, that the accusers of the ancient heretics for rejecting this or that canonical book always talk) “as if the New Testament in its proper form had been published at once by some Jerusalem bookseller at a cheap rate, had been advertised in newspapers and reviews,” and, we may add, read in all churches and chapels as a combined and mutually dependent code. Our Saviour and his disciples lived in Judea, and taught and talked in the vernacular language of their country; their earliest converts used that same language for the ordinary purposes of life; why, then, it is said, do we find the earliest records of revealed truth, the sacred books written for their religious instruction and for the conviction of the unbelieving multitude, in what was to a certain extent a foreign tongue? Now, what evidence is there that these sacred books were primarily intended even for such purposes as the books of the law were used for in religious exercises? As a collection it is out of the question; but even singly, are not their composition and subsequent use in the churches facts which would naturally arise only as time removed further back the period of actual oral relation from eye-witnesses of the transactions recorded, and out of a gradual analogy to the use of the ancient Scriptures in the Jewish synagogues? At the period, then, at which the necessity, the demand (if we may use the expression) for these writings would arise as evidence of the truth, what was the situation of the church? It was a rapidly increasing one among the Gentiles and Hellenized Jews scattered over the Eastern and Grecian provinces of the empire, all more or less using the Greek language, and already possessing their ancient Scriptures in that tongue; but it was a more confined and gradually declining church as identified and incumbered with the local customs, language and law of Judea. Then is not the received notion of the facts as to the Scriptures written for such a church, actually according in the strictest sense with this state of things? There was one Gospel originally written in Hebrew or Syro-Chaldee, the call for which in that form so speedily passed away; that all trace of the original was soon lost in a Greek version. There were four other historical books all written in Greek, as adapted to the then situation of the great majority of the church, and particularly of those portions of the Gentile converts for whose information, as

more distant from the scene of actual evidence, they were peculiarly wanted. There were epistles in Greek addressed to the leading divisions of the church established in Heathen countries, between whom and the expatriated Jews Greek was, as far as we can see, the only adequate medium, particularly as being the language of the current version of the Old Testament. The very doubts which have always existed about the original language of such an Epistle as that to the Hebrews, is, in our view, characteristic of the position of the members of that nation, whom dispersion in foreign countries and a relaxation from their ancient law and institutions were every day tending to amalgamate with the Christian converts from other nations to such an extent as, in a short time, wholly to efface the distinction.

To return to Dr. Maltby : we shall be happy to see the continuation of his promised series of Discourses on the Original Languages of Scripture. He intends, it appears, to give peculiar attention to the Hellenistic Greek, and no one can read the *Palæoromaica* without feeling convinced (whatever he may think of the hypothesis on which its author has chosen to hang his observations) that there is a great deal to be done in elucidating that subject, and that there are very many most important anomalies in the present text to discuss and illustrate. He will come best prepared to sift the comparative influences of foreign tongues upon this species of Greek, and to explain the process by which some of the very peculiar constructions and solecisms which the author has pointed out arose, who brings to the task the most extensive knowledge of the different languages prevalent at the time ; and in this respect we have already observed that the author of the *Palæoromaica* is, with all his industry and ingenuity, in a great degree deficient. He has, however, collected a store of interesting materials into which we have not yet entered, but the details of which we shall be glad at some future period to follow Dr. Maltby in investigating.

d.

TRANSYLVANIAN UNITARIANS.*To the Editor.***SIR,***Hackney, March 6, 1827.*

SOME literary inquiries connected with Servia and Poland having lately led me to correspond with several Slavonian men of letters, I have gathered together the following facts respecting the Transylvanian Unitarians, which it may be desirable to record.

In Transylvania and Hungary their present number (January, 1827) is between 40 and 50,000, or about one forty-fourth of the whole population, which amounted by the last census to 1,972,000. Literature is in rather an inactive state in Transylvania, and for some time no very distinguished author has appeared. The Unitarians enjoy liberty of faith and worship, and possess a College, (Collegium,) not a University, at Klausenburg, which is in a flourishing situation, with about three hundred students, under the care of three Curators, (who do not interfere with instruction,) one Rector, four Professors and seven Teachers. The Unitarians have also two *Gymnasia*, one at Thorenburg, the other at Szekely-Keresztur. The number of head-churches which they occupy is one hundred and ten, and there are fifty-four branch churches or chapels. The principal authority is that of a superintendent. The Unitarians who were formerly scattered over Bohemia and Poland are now extinct, their descendants having conformed to the Calvinistic creed.

J. B.

CANONICAL AUTHORITY OF THE BOOKS OF THE PROPHETS.

THE object of the present communication will be to determine the authenticity and credibility of the prophetical writings contained in the Jewish Scriptures ; and the importance of this object must appear evident to all who feel interested in the fate of Revelation : for, if these books were not the productions of the persons to whom they are attributed, or if they were written after the events of which they are said to contain predictions, not only would the Jew and the Christian lose all advantage which the argument from prophecy furnishes, but the Unbeliever would have just cause to triumph in its failure, and might reasonably enough contend that the system which stood in need of such artifice, to secure it a favourable reception in the world, must rest upon a tottering and precarious foundation.

It must be confessed, indeed, that all the direct evidence of which the subject admits is derived from Jews and Christians, whom the ignorant and the prejudiced may regard as incompetent witnesses : nor can it be for a moment doubted that the evidence would have been more complete, and more likely to have carried conviction to the mind of the unbeliever, if a catalogue of Heathen testimonies could have been added to those which are furnished in such abundance by Jewish and Christian writers. But the absence of these, it may be presumed, is sufficiently accounted for by the peculiar circumstances of the case ; by the character which the Jews maintained as the chosen people of God through a long series of ages ; by their comparative indifference in making proselytes to their religion ; by the language in which their sacred books were written being but little known among heathen nations ; and by the destruction, in ages far remote, of those works which alone could have supplied the desired testimony. In cases of historical inquiry, however, we cannot expect all the exactness of mathematical demonstration. If the evidence adduced be unimpeachable as far as it goes, nothing further can in reason be expected. Nor is it very material, in an investigation like the present, whether the evidence be furnished by Heathen or by Jewish and Christian writers, since the sources from which it is derived, and the indirect manner in which it is supplied, afford the most effectual security against fraud or collusion. Had all the authors to whom reference will be made by and by, written with the intention of proving that which it is the object of the present communication to establish, it would have been but fair to receive their testimony with some degree of caution ; but, so far were some of them from aiming to prove the authenticity and credibility of the prophetical writings, in the references which they made to them, that they uniformly took these points for granted, as matters about which no doubt ever had existed or ever could exist. Our sources of information on the subject are neither so clear nor so copious as theirs were ; but, if we can trace the writings in question backwards through a regular series of periods, and prove that they have always been received as the productions of those to whom they are now ascribed, the utmost demand of curiosity will be satisfied, and their authenticity will be confirmed by the most undeniable evidence.

It will be admitted on all hands that the descendants of Abraham, notwithstanding their dispersion over every part of the globe, both civilized and uncivilized, have always kept themselves a distinct people, and entertained the deepest and most rooted abhorrence of the Christian name. The former of these facts is confirmed by our own daily observation, combined with the testimony of historians and travellers, whose veracity has

never been disputed, and of the truth of the latter we are furnished with abundant proofs in the writings of Christian Fathers and Jewish Rabbins. Hence, then, it follows that for a period of more than eighteen centuries the best possible security against a joint fraud has existed in the irreconcileable enmity which has subsisted between the two parties ; both of whom have nevertheless preserved, with the most religious care, the books of the Old Testament, and appealed with confidence to the writings of the Prophets in particular, as affording the strongest corroboration of their respective notions concerning the character and offices of the Messiah.

The Jews, it is true, have sometimes been charged by Christian writers with having corrupted their prophetical books, and the charge has been maintained with great ingenuity and learning by Whiston and Dr. Henry Owen.* A summary of the arguments used by these and other writers, who have embraced the same view of the question, may be seen in "Gerald's Institutes of Biblical Criticism." † From a review of these arguments, however, allowing them all the weight and importance which their advocates are disposed to claim for them, it appears that the alleged corruptions consist only of slight alterations in the text, and do not by any means affect the credit due to the prophetical books generally. The shape in which these books have been transmitted to us is precisely that in which they were received by Jews and Christians nearly two thousand years ago. Amidst all the differences of opinion which have existed as to the interpretation of them, and their application to particular persons and events, no writer of any celebrity has ever thought of calling their authenticity in question, or of assigning the composition of any one of them to a later period than that in which its reputed author lived, with the solitary exception of the book of Daniel ; and the grounds upon which the authenticity and credibility of this book have been disputed are of too singular a nature to pass entirely without notice.

The prophecies of Daniel extend through a long period of history, and point out in the most clear and distinct manner the fall of successive kingdoms, upon the ruins of which the kingdom of the Messiah was to be erected. They contain, however, such particular allusions respecting place and time, and correspond so exactly with the events to which they refer, that Porphyry, a heathen writer of the third century, and a great enemy of the Jewish and Christian religions, not being able to resist the evidence which they supplied in favour of Divine Revelation, was led to regard them as historical narratives, written after the events of which they contain such a minute and particular outline. This Porphyry was the author of a work, consisting of fifteen books, which had for its object a refutation of the arguments usually urged in defence of Judaism and Christianity ; and the twelfth of these books was expressly directed against the authenticity and credibility of the book of Daniel. The prophecies relating to the Persian and Macedonian kings were so exactly accomplished, that he found it impossible, in any other way, to overcome the difficulties which they presented. He compared them with the writings of the best Greek historians, and attempted to shew, that they corresponded so exactly with the events, as related by these writers, that they could not possibly have been written prior to the events themselves. He denied, therefore, that the book which goes under the name of *Daniel* was written by the Daniel who flourished during the Babylonish captivity, and contended that it was the production of another Daniel, who lived in the

* See Whiston's "Essay towards restoring the true Text of the O. T.," Proposition 12 ; and Owen's "Enquiry into the present State of the Septuagint Version of the O. T.," Sect. 2—9.

† Part II. Chap. I. Sect. II. § 740.

time of Antiochus Epiphanes. He maintained also, that the part relating to the times preceding the reign of Antiochus was true, but that all which had a reference to any period subsequent to this was false. The main reason assigned by Porphyry for this sweeping charge against the book of Daniel, is, that its author could not have known what was to take place in futurity,—*quia futura nescierit* ;* and truly this summary argument might, without fear of contradiction, be pronounced unanswerable, if it could be proved that a revelation of future events is impossible. With the aid of a concession like this, it would not be difficult to subvert the whole fabric of revelation, by undermining the authority and credit due to Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the rest of the prophets, as well as Daniel. Let it be taken for granted that the Deity has laid down a plan, from which it is not in his own power to deviate, and there is no inference, however wide of the truth, to which the admission might not lead. As long as the Unbeliever does no more than complain of the darkness and obscurity of the predictions contained in the Sacred Writings, and the difficulty of tracing out their accomplishment with any degree of exactness, there is some prospect of bringing the general question to a satisfactory issue one way or the other, by mutual concessions and explanations ; but when the possibility of a divine revelation of future events is denounced as an absurdity, argument ceases to be of any avail.

At the beginning of the last century the objections of Porphyry were revived by the celebrated Anthony Collins, in an anonymous work, entitled, “The Scheme of Literal Prophecy considered,” and were ably refuted by Chandler in “A Vindication of the Antiquity and Authority of Daniel’s Prophecies ;” to which “Vindication” the reader who is anxious to obtain further information on the subject may be referred. The objections of the Schematist, which were eleven in number, received separate answers from the pen of the Dissenting divine, who subjoined eight arguments to prove the antiquity of the book of Daniel, and critical remarks upon three of the most interesting passages contained in the prophetical parts of that book ; viz. ii. 44, 45; vii. 13, 14; ix. 24—27.

This long digression concerning the book of Daniel having, in some measure, cleared the way for a more profitable discussion of the general question, let us now proceed to adduce the testimonies by which the authenticity and credibility of the whole of the prophetical writings may be proved. These testimonies may be conveniently arranged under the six following heads, which will carry us back, step by step as it were, to the very period in which some of the books in question were published :

1. The Jewish Talmud.
2. The Works of the Christian Fathers.
3. The Writings of Philo and Josephus.
4. The Books of the New Testament.
5. The Alexandrine or Septuagint Version.
6. The Books of the Old Testament.

1. The Talmud is a collection of ancient Jewish traditions, consisting of two parts, called the Mishna and the Gemara. The Mishna contains the text, and the Gemara the commentary. The former is said to have been compiled in the second century, by Rabbi Jehudah Hakkadosh. It is sometimes called the Talmud of Jerusalem, and sometimes the Talmud of Babylon, according to the commentary which is annexed to it ; one of these commentaries having been supplied by the Jews of Judæa, and the other,

* S. Hieronymi Opera, Colon. 1616, Tom. IV. p. 495, Proæm. in Lib. Comment. Danielis.

after the expulsion of the Jews from that country, by those of Babylon.* These Talmudical writings contain all the books of the prophets, though not in precisely the same order in which they stand in our English Bibles;—a circumstance which it will be necessary to explain by observing, that the Talmudical doctors divided the books of the Old Testament into the three following classes: (1) the *Law*, called חֹדֶת, containing the five books of Moses; (2) the *Prophets*, called נְבִיאִם, which were subdivided into two parts, the former containing the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, and the latter those of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah, and the twelve minor prophets; and (3) the remaining books, called כְּתֻבִּים, containing Ruth, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Lamentations, Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah in one book, and Chronicles, and amounting in all to twenty-four books.† In most of the Talmudical writings an inferior rank is assigned to Daniel,‡ partly in consequence of a fanciful notion which prevailed among the ancient Jewish doctors that prophecies were never committed to writing out of Judæa, and partly on account of the high estimation in which the early Christians held that book and the use which they made of it in their controversies with the Jews. These Talmudists say, that Daniel lived in the Babylonish court in a style of magnificence inconsistent with the simplicity of the prophetical character, and that the medium through which future events were made known to him was inferior to the other modes of revelation specified by God in his address to Aaron and Miriam (Num. xii. 6—8); but they admit that the Daniel who is mentioned by Ezekiel, (xiv. 14, xxviii. 3,) and who flourished during the Babylonish captivity, was favoured with divine communications, and that he was the author of the book which is inserted in the Jewish canon under his name.

2. Among the Christian Fathers none devoted so much attention to the study of the Jewish Scriptures, and none, therefore, are so competent to give evidence on the present question, as Origen and Jerome.—Origen was at the trouble of collating the copies and correcting the text of the Septuagint Version, a work of great labour and inestimable value; and Jerome, in like manner, undertook the revision of the old Latin versions of the Jewish Scriptures, and afterwards executed, with great ability, a complete version of the Old Testament into Latin. Both these fathers published catalogues of the books of the Old Testament. That of Origen is preserved by Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History,§ and that of Jerome forms the substance of the celebrated Prologus Galeatus,|| generally prefixed to our modern copies of the Vulgate. Jerome, who took great pains to make his collection, adopts the threefold division of the Talmudists, but makes the whole number of books twenty-two, to correspond with the number of letters in the Jewish alphabet. The order in which he mentions the later prophets differs likewise in a slight degree from that of the Talmud, and is as follows: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets. The book of Daniel is placed by Jerome among the Chetubim or Hagiographa; but his catalogue embraces all the prophetical books. Origen places Daniel before Ezekiel, and, according to our present copies of Eusebius, omits the book containing the writings of the twelve minor prophets. This, however, must be a mis-

* Marsh's Lectures, Part II. p. 128, and Butler's Horæ Biblicæ, Vol. I. pp. 10—12.

† Bava Bathra, fol. 13, 14, ed. Venet. 1548. See Eichhorn's Einleitung in das A. T. Band I. § 56.

‡ Yet Daniel is reckoned among the Prophets in some Talmudical books. Vide Megilla, cap. ii. Jacchiades in Dan. i. 17. Gray's Key to the O. T., Dublin ed. 1792, p. 332.

§ Lib. vi. cap. xxv.

|| Hieron. Op. Tom. III. p. 287.

take on the part of Eusebius himself or his transcriber, because, at the commencement of the quotation, Origen makes the number of books twenty-two, whereas, in the catalogue itself, he enumerates no more than twenty-one.

To the testimony of Origen and Jerome may be added that of Melito, Bishop of Sardis, of whom little is known among modern readers except the name, but who, nevertheless, stood high in the estimation of those who lived near his own times, and whose evidence in the present question is particularly valuable, his catalogue of the books of the Old Testament being more ancient than that of any other Christian writer upon record. Melito is placed by Cave in the year of our Lord 170, and is mentioned with honourable distinction by Jerome, in his "Catalogue of Illustrious Writers," and by Eusebius, in the fourth book of his Ecclesiastical History.* His information respecting the canon of the Old Testament was collected during a journey into the East, of which he gives the following account in the preface to one of his works consisting of short extracts from the Law and the Prophets: "When I went into the East, and was upon the spot where these things were formerly preached and done, I procured an accurate account of the books of the Old Testament, a catalogue of which I have here subjoined and sent to you. There names are these—." Here he proceeds to specify the names of the books, and, although his catalogue differs in one or two minute particulars from that which is given in our common English Bibles, it contains all the prophetical books included in the present Jewish canon, which it enumerates in the following order: Isaiah, Jeremiah, the twelve minor prophets, Daniel, and Ezekiel.

W.

(To be continued.)

332

LINES ON THE DEATH OF A YOUNG LADY.

SHE is gone to the land which mortal eye
 Hath never yet glanc'd on ;
 To the regions of bliss beyond the sky
 Her pure, pure soul is gone !
 And there shall she live in endless day,
 As the years of eternity glide away.
 She was not made for this world of woe :
 Her angel form and look
 To little of this dull scene below,
 And too much of heav'n partook.
 She seem'd like a saint from a brighter sphere,
 But sent on an errand of mercy here.
 Now back to that land of bliss she hies ;
 Her embassy is o'er ;
 She has join'd the concert of the skies ;
 She has gain'd her native shore ;
 And a crown of glory gems her brow,
 And the spirits of light are her sisters now.
 Then weep not, ye who are left behind ;
 The friend for whom ye sigh
 In the regions of blessedness ye shall find,
 The heavenly world on high !
 And there, as eternal ages glide,
 Ye shall dwell in glory side by side.

J. C. W.

* Cap. xxvi.

ON THE STATE OF RELIGIOUS PARTIES IN ENGLAND.

THE *Dissenters* of England constitute the most important body of *Protestant* dissidents from an *Established Religion* that is now to be found in the world. There is, probably, an equal number of persons holding the like faith, observing similar rites and united in nearly the same discipline, in the United States of North America: these are, indeed, from the old English Dissenting stock: they occupy the same position that is maintained by the Dissenters of England relatively to their fellow-christians; but they stand in a very different relation to their country, which is to them "a nursing mother," while England is to her Dissenting population a hard and jealous stepmother. This feature in the character of the mother-country, unpleasant as it is, makes the English Dissenters of more consequence in the State than the same number of Churchmen, or than a much greater number of persons living under an impartial government. They derive no importance, however, from their ancient families, or from the rank and titles of their members. Nobility is extinct amongst the Protestant Dissenters. One of the sons of nearly the last Dissenting Peer, Lord Barrington, lately died in the princely see of Durham, which he had held for five and thirty years. The last nobleman, we believe, that made an avowal of Nonconformity, was the Lord Willoughby, of Parham. One or two may yet remain who are occasionally seen, preserving their *incognito*, in the meeting-house. In the last generation it was by no means uncommon for both Scottish and Irish peers to join the worship of Dissenters in England; their children are politically wiser, and do not suffer religion to stand in the way of the objects in pursuit of which they visit the Metropolis.* Some few baronets are said to linger on the Dissenting threshold. Two of them in our own day have ascended Nonconformist pulpits. The families of these semi-nobles soon find that they are not at home in the conventicle; and the unsuitable connexion is gradually loosened, and is dropped as soon as the dissolution of early friendships will allow it to expire with decency.† The same description applies to country gentlemen. With a few honourable exceptions, the owners of large estates and manors have sunk away from the Dissenters and settled down into quiet conformity. Nonconformity, then, is not to be estimated by acres.—On the other hand, commerce and manufactures have poured their full proportion of wealth into the Dissenting community, amongst which may be pointed out the merchants that are princes, and the

* This change, or at least dismission, of a religious profession, according to local convenience, is said not to be confined to this class of persons. Gentlemen from the United States of America, who boast of their descent from the *Pilgrims*, and make a figure at home in churches framed upon the liberal Dissenting model, are seldom known on visiting England to shew any preference for Dissenting worship, or even Dissenting society. Some of them have, notwithstanding, thought themselves qualified on their return to describe, for the information, if not the gratification, of their countrymen and brethren, the character of our Dissenters.—Nay, we have heard Unitarian pastors complain that the more opulent members of their churches sometimes put in abeyance, for three months of the year, the religious principles which, at some cost and with no small opprobrium, they act upon during the other nine.

† Electioneering purposes have been heretofore answered by the declared abandonment of the Dissenters on the part of candidates: yet it used to be reported that a certain City Baronet, who was the head and chief of Toryism in the Corporation of London for a great number of years, sometimes caught a vote by avowing that he was bred a Dissenter and still paid an annual subscription to a meeting-house.

traffickers that are the honourable of the earth. The times in which their fortune and influence have been acquired have not demanded the renunciation of their faith and worship; and the still growing liberality of the age holds out a prospect of their continuance in their religious profession, and of their families being a counter-balance to the numerous secessions which in less propitious days weakened the Dissenters in political importance. It may be thought to give some plausibility to this speculation, that there is at present as great a number of Protestant Dissenters in the House of Commons as have appeared there since the Revolution, and as marked a disposition in the House to listen with indulgence and respect to the Dissenting claims, whenever those claims are brought before the Legislature; though it must be admitted, and the admission is not creditable to the Dissenters, that a Dissenting grievance is rarely represented even in the House of Commons, and never directly and always faintly.

Numerically, the Dissenters of England are an important body. No census has been taken of them, nor are there any tables of their congregations to which we can refer; but they were many years ago computed by some of their well-informed leaders to consist of not less than two millions of persons, and of late they have increased far beyond the ratio of the growth of the population of the country. Every Dissenter is a religious worshiper; his character is derived from his place in some congregation. In common parlance, all that do not frequent meeting-houses are Churchmen. This, however, is a very unsatisfactory criterion of strength for the Church of England. The unclassed absentees from her communion consist of unbelievers and scoffers, of immoral men, of those that are indifferent to all religion, and of the lowest orders of the people, whose ignorance and wretchedness incapacitate them for opinions and moral feelings, and banish them from all the assemblies of their decent and serious countrymen. Of those that attend the Established worship, multitudes are led by habit rather than by any preference for which they can assign a reason; a considerable number are disaffected to the political constitution, the discipline and the doctrines of the Church; and not a few are accustomed to join occasionally and with approbation in the worship of some one or other of the numerous sects of Nonconformists. Measured by actual and stated attendance upon religious services, the number of Dissenters is equal to that of Churchmen; and taking man for man we should say that the Dissenters form by far the more active and influential part of society in the middle ranks of life. Amongst them religion is considered as a personal concern, and the terms of their communion, the style of their preaching, their forms and orders, and the spirit of their social intercourse, tend to interest the individual in the business of the party, and to excite him to zeal, and to move him to undertake his proportion of labour for the common object. The circumstance, besides, of his being relatively to his country and to a considerable number of his neighbours a Nonconformist, puts him of necessity into an attitude of defence, and obliges him to arm himself with texts and arguments. A sectary (we use the word of course innocuously) is likely to become a proselytist; in some cases, he can defend himself only by carrying the war into the enemy's territories. In the degree that he is sensible of suffering injury for his opinions or worship, will self-interest prompt him to strengthen his own position by drawing over converts. Higher motives may also sway his mind, and he may feel it to be an imperative duty to promulgate what he believes to be divine truth, and to assert the claims of pure scriptural worship. From whatever cause it originates, the habit of thinking for himself, and of main-

taining an individual character, and of prosecuting seriously some important object, will inevitably raise a man to a state of superiority amongst the thoughtless and indifferent. In point of fact, we apprehend it will not be disputed, that throughout England a great part of the more active members of society, who have most intercourse with the people and most influence over them, are Protestant Dissenters. These are manufacturers, merchants and substantial tradesmen, or persons who are in the enjoyment of a competency realized by trade, commerce and manufactures, gentlemen of the professions of law and physic, and agriculturists, of that class particularly who live upon their own freeholds. The virtues of temperance, frugality, prudence and integrity, that are promoted by religious Nonconformity and sectarian peculiarities, assist the temporal prosperity of these descriptions of persons, as they tend also to lift others to the same rank from the humbler classes of society. If the wealthy soon quit the Dissenters, they are Dissenters whilst they are becoming wealthy, and this is the period during which they are most valuable members of any communion. When their moral energy is exhausted, they may settle into habits of conformity, without subtracting any weight from the church which they quit, or adding any to that which they join. Churchmen are often surprised at the sight of the numerous Dissenting places of worship that rise up in the streets of populous towns and along the road-side of villages; but they would be still more surprised if they could look into the interior of society and see at one view the rank which Dissenters hold, and the part which they act in all those institutions that exercise the strongest influence upon the mind and character of a people. They have innumerable charities of their own, and their names are enrolled in almost all other charitable lists. Amongst them originated those little knots of readers, called Book-clubs, which have done so much for the spread of intelligence during the last half-century, and through their means these circles of knowledge are multiplied daily. They take the lead in more permanent literary and scientific institutions. To them is mainly owing the establishment of Schools for All. In all but the highest branches of education, their teachers are as numerous as those that are in communion with the Establishment. They have in their hands far more than their share of the popular press. Their funds for charitable and religious uses are not inconsiderable, though their carelessness in some cases and their liberality in others have suffered many of these to be alienated from them. Their division into sects, like the division of labour in political economy, is in one sense favourable to their influence and power; for the amount of zeal in those sects is greater than could have been excited in the united body, and in every one of them a principle is at work which tends greatly to the prosperity of each and of the whole, namely, that being in some degree proscribed by the State, the individual Nonconformists ought to support and cherish one another. The action of this principle is different in these sects, according to their numerousness, the relations of their members to general society, and even their theological faith; but in all it is incessant, and the result is of great moment to the civil and political importance of the Dissenters.

Political is, we are aware, a term at which, as applied to Dissenters, some of this body are apt to start. It is, nevertheless, in our usage strictly correct. The State places Nonconformists in a different relation to itself from that of Conformists, and a relation very unfavourable to some of their dearest interests as free-born Englishmen. It would be worse than ridiculous to deny that this relation in which Dissenters stand to the governing power, is

political. Protest as some of them may against the word, it will belong to them whilst the State takes any notice of them and shews any partiality towards another class of believers and worshipers, and whilst there is any civil right withheld or abridged on account of Nonconformity, and privileges are granted to other religionists which are denied to them on the sole ground of religion. They assume, in fact, a political character whenever they petition Parliament or address the Throne.

This dread of being regarded as a political party may have sprung either from an apprehension of being maltreated if they looked to the bettering of their condition, just as the slaves in the West Indies keep the word freedom under their breath, lest its utterance should bring down upon them the whip ; or from a fanatical notion that the spirituality which it behoves true Christians to aim after is inconsistent with an anxious regard to national measures and a serious attention to the duties of patriotism. The sentiment is alike mischievous in either case, and in both cases it is contemptible.

Whatever ground there may have been for the silence of fear in the reigns of the Stuarts, there has been certainly none for the last hundred and forty years, and it is our fixed opinion that the pusillanimity of the Nonconformists at the Restoration, and from that era to the Revolution, so far from disarming a persecuting government, only provoked its hostility : a weak enemy is crushed, a strong one is respected. Since the accession of the House of Brunswick to the British Throne, the state of the Dissenters appears to us to have depended wholly upon their own temper and conduct. Every enlargement of their liberties has been the result of their united and firm but temperate application for their rights. When they have slept, they have been forgotten. It is not to be supposed that government will do any thing for a people who do nothing for themselves, or remove grievances which are not galling, or confer benefits which are not valued. There have been feverish moments within the period which we have described, when it might have been inexpedient for the Dissenters to put themselves before the country ; but with these exceptions, what man amongst them does not see and lament that numberless opportunities of improving their condition and that of their children have been lost ? Instead of rising, they have sunk in political importance ; for time gives to a wrong the colour of a right, and intolerance is riveted by prescription and usage. Many of their best families (in a worldly point of view) have slidden into the Establishment to escape from civil proscription. Their parliamentary friends have been disheartened, and their enemies encouraged, by their supineness. A generation has grown up without hearing a complaint from their lips. A few years' more folding of the hands to sleep and their case will be hopeless ; for a party may brave hate and struggle through oppression, but never yet did it live long under contempt.

It may seem paradoxical that so numerous, wealthy, intelligent and active a people as we have described the Dissenters, should be regardless of their civil condition and acquiesce in the denial of their political rights ; but the second cause that we have assigned of their fear of being accounted a political body will explain the mystery. A large proportion of them have been unnerved by the apprehension that they should lose their spirituality if they stepped out into the world and manifested any zeal but that which has religion for its object. This state of mind has been encouraged by certain ministers that have aspired to the distinction of being peculiarly heavenly-minded, and of enjoying a more than common share of Divine influence. When rights and liberties and parties have been spoken of, these lofty spi-

ritualists have said, “Let the potsherds of the earth strive together.” One of them, a quaint writer not long ago deceased, who had considerable power in the religious world, wrote a treatise on what is called amongst “Evangelical” persons, Backsliding, and along with other symptoms of backsliding described by the author, who well knew what would exalt his own reputation for sanctity, is set down “an eager attention to politics.” This un-english and unmanly sentiment has been kept up mainly of late by the extraordinary passion that has prevailed for foreign missions; which being in some measure dependent upon the government for the time being, have led their supporters to court the favour of ministers of state by assuming the character of government-men. The Bible Society may also have tended the same way. The leaders in this institution have been from the first exceedingly ambitious of the patronage of the great, and have accordingly flattered them by declamation upon the influence of the Bible in promoting loyalty; by which is always meant upon anniversary platforms a devotedness to the will of the reigning party in the State. Many of the active Dissenters have, we know, secretly disapproved of this temper and these practices, but have remained silent lest they should provoke dissension and throw a stumbling-block in the way of “Evangelical” schemes.

A little reflection would, we think, satisfy the most zealously religious Dissenters that nothing is really gained to the cause of religion by the abandonment of patriotism. They do not think it necessary to close their shops or counting-houses, or to throw up their farms, for the sake of spiritual attainments; and is it the proof of a more worldly mind to pursue public than private and selfish ends? The money-getting spirit is tolerated amongst the warmest professors of sanctity, and it is hard that a generous zeal for the good government of a community and the temporal interests of posterity should be alone stigmatized and marked with reprobation. St. Paul did not judge it inconsistent with his apostleship to assert his rights as a Roman citizen, and to demand satisfaction for wrongs inflicted upon him by insolent and tyrannical magistrates: and the best of the Puritans and early Nonconformists, who were sufficiently spiritually-minded, regarded it as no impeachment of their Christian character to watch the proceedings of rulers, to guard their civil rights, and to make conscience of their political duties. They saw clearly enough that all misgovernment has an immoral influence upon a people; that the doctrine of passive obedience holds out a temptation to bad laws, and that the habit of non-resistance is an invitation of oppression; that the reformation of religion is helped by all other reforms; that every man has a deep interest in every other man’s liberty; and that, as John Milton, the purest and noblest of the first race of Nonconformists, has expounded his sense of Christian politics, “Any law against conscience is alike in force against any conscience.”

In spite of casuistry and hypocrisy, the Dissenters must know, for all the world knows, that whilst they maintain consistency of character and cherish the spirit of Nonconformity, they never can be favourites with the High-Church and Tory party in Great Britain. They may be used as tools; but the baser the work in which they suffer themselves to be employed, the sooner will they be thrown away when the work is done. The high Protestant principle asserted by the Dissenters is naturally looked upon with jealousy, if not with hatred, by the enemies of public liberty. This party see with instinctive sagacity that all men of independent opinions and character are their opponents, and that there is an inseparable connexion between civil and religious freedom. They are not deceived because they

are fawned upon ; on the contrary, their hand, even when it is licked by sycophancy, is ever ready to smite those that make the least reserve of obedience and submission. However the Dissenters may regard themselves, these politicians know that they properly belong to that class of public men who contemplate in all their measures the amelioration of our laws and institutions ; and they hate them from dread of this natural, which is also a moral, connexion. The Whig party in return bear the odium amongst High-Churchmen of being Dissenters in their hearts ; and it is really a public scandal that so enlightened and virtuous a body of men as the Dissenters, should seem for a moment not to distinguish between their enemies and friends, and even to requite long services with ingratitude and neglect, and to seek to strengthen the hands of a faction who may use their power in the first instance to put and keep down their political antagonists, but who will never cease, so long as their power lasts, to watch and curb those religionists in whose Nonconformity they discern the elements of political freedom.*

Z.

DISSENTING COLLEGES.

To the Editor.

SIR,

THE paper in your last Number in recommendation of the London University, is one in the general sentiments of which most of your readers will doubtless concur, and which is manifestly the work of a man of talent and reflection ; but it is equally evident to me that, whoever he may be, he is not

* The writer is reminded that he has been partly anticipated in the above reflections by the Edinburgh Review, from a late No. [LXXXVIII.] of which the following excellent passage is extracted :

“ Every measure of government, every act of legislation, every vote of an individual, which, upon the whole, and in the end, tends to lessen the influence of the opinion of those classes who *must* be orderly and provident, over the conduct of the rich and great, is an aggression against public morals, which, as far as its power reaches, impairs their best human security. The neutrality of the zealously religious party among us, in all late contests between authority and liberty, and the partiality shewn by a large body to the side of power, seem to indicate that they no longer perceive that important relation of civil institutions to domestic morality, which contributed to make the ancient Calvinists the most zealous friends of human freedom. From whatever causes this remarkable deviation from the example of their predecessors may have arisen, it will be strange if they should persevere in supporting principles favourable to a state of society the most fruitful in vice, and the most incompatible with every disposition towards religion. Other considerations, perhaps, of a still higher order, present themselves, which, from their importance and their peculiar nature, would require (if presented at all) to be more fully unfolded than they can be at this time and in this place. It will be sufficient, for those who have much considered such matters, to observe, that all ardent and elevated feelings have a strong, though frequently a secret, connexion. They often combine for a time with other principles. They are disturbed by accidental circumstances. They may be made to counteract each other. But their natural affinity is always discoverable, and most generally in the end prevails. They prepare for each other—they succeed each other—they combine together. There are no principles which have so often and so clearly exemplified these observations, as the zeal for religion and the love of liberty. But if the friends of religion should be blind to this affinity, they may be well assured that it never escapes the watchful jealousy of the possessors of power ; who, however they may be pleased with an obedient clergy and a religion which teaches quiet, yet, as politicians, (whatever may be the exceptions of individual character,) regard zeal as an ungovernable quality, tremble at the approach of every species of enthusiasm, and have a natural dread of whatever breaks upon them from that higher region of human feeling where piety and patriotism are kindled.”

much connected with Dissenters, and having ventured to speak of them and their affairs without first taking care to obtain accurate information, he has, unintentionally no doubt, done them great injustice. After asserting (p. 164), that "the Dissenters have no institutions which profess to teach the higher branches of education," he says, (p. 169,) "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." These assertions I must take the liberty to deny. I say nothing of the merit of Dissenting Colleges and Academies in comparison with the proposed London University, but it is notorious that they have existed in great numbers, and have been liberally and zealously supported by the voluntary contributions of various branches of the Dissenting body.

For some account of the institutions at present in action amongst the Dissenters, chiefly for the education of ministers, I may refer to a valuable pamphlet entitled, "Thoughts on the Advancement of Academical Education in England," now known to be the production of the Rev. James Yates, M. A., F. L. S., M. G. S., a gentleman as much distinguished for his eminent learning and varied acquirements, as for his candid and truly catholic spirit, who will, I have no doubt, be proud to acknowledge himself indebted for a considerable part of his advantages of education to a Dissenting college. There are no less than seven institutions for the education of ministers amongst the Independents alone, some of them deriving very considerable incomes from annual subscriptions.

There are four similar institutions among the Baptists, abundantly sufficient to shew that they are not indifferent to the intellectual education of their religious teachers, and have not neglected the means which appeared to them sufficient to secure it. But I naturally feel particularly interested in vindicating the Presbyterian or Unitarian Dissenters from the charge brought against the whole body, and for this purpose nothing more can be necessary than the statement of a few plain facts. Of the older academies for the education of Presbyterian ministers, I shall only say that they fully satisfied the wants of the period, and produced an abundant supply of truly learned, as well as pious and laborious pastors. But I claim for the Presbyterian Dissenters the merit of having taken the lead in this country in improving the *system* of education for young men after they have left a common school. In the plan of the Warrington Academy, established in 1757, we meet with enlightened views on which no other body of men would at that time have acted, and which, except in the institutions since supported by the same body, have hitherto been but little applied. The young men were to be "*free to follow their own judgments in their inquiries after truth, without any undue bias imposed on their understandings;*" and besides the divinity students, others were to be received, designed for commercial life or for the learned professions, it being an important object to "*lead them to an early acquaintance with, and just concern for, the true principles of religion and liberty.*" The subjects of study are described to be, besides theology, "*moral philosophy, including logic and metaphysics, natural philosophy, including the mathematics, the languages, and polite literature;*" and three tutors were appointed to give instructions in these various departments. An institution which "*professed to teach the higher branches of education, the especial object of which was to supply adequate means of intellectual education to the religious teachers*" of one great class of Dissenters, and which had for its tutors such men as Dr. Taylor, Dr. Aikin, Gilbert Wakefield, Dr. Priestley and Dr. Enfield, existed for twenty-six years,

affording the most important advantages to great numbers both of ministers and laymen. I need only mention the names of the similar institutions supported for a time at Manchester and Hackney, as proving the anxiety of many amongst the Presbyterian Dissenters respecting the liberal education both of their ministers and, as far as circumstances would admit, of their laity also. But Manchester College, York, the seminary on which we now chiefly rely for our supply of ministers, though your correspondent seems not aware even of its existence, certainly not of its character, claims a more particular notice. This institution is furnished with an extensive and valuable library, and a collection of philosophical apparatus. Its three tutors are all of them eminent in their several departments. A highly accomplished teacher of modern languages is now added to its establishment, and occasional instructions have been obtained in elocution and in botany. Not a few of its students have already greatly distinguished themselves, or are rising to eminence both as ministers and in various other situations in life, and they none of them can pretend to the merit of having "*educated themselves.*" "The proper discipline and instruction *have been afforded,*" and they have only not entirely neglected the advantages offered to them.

I am, Sir, a sincere well-wisher to the London University, and estimate very highly the benefits it promises to confer. To the inhabitants of the Metropolis and its vicinity it will be inestimable, and indeed to those in every part of the kingdom, who wish their sons to be able to study law and medicine without submission to creeds, or slavery to antiquated forms, or who, belonging to the Established Church, desire the advantage of an improved system of education. But I must maintain that the Dissenters in general should not be represented as indifferent to the education of their youth, or as having done nothing effectual to promote it. Parents connected with our body, who are especially anxious that their sons should acquire the habit of judging for themselves, should be imbued with the principles of civil and religious liberty, should be instructed in the evidences of natural and revealed religion, so as to acquire a steady and rational faith, and should be guarded from dissipation and immorality, will still prefer their own institutions as most suited to their views, and shew that though the *public* requires a London University, they in particular have been in advance on their age, and have provision already made for their wants.

H.

[We have given ready insertion to the preceding letter. We agree with our respected correspondent that the language employed by the friend who favoured us with his thoughts on the London University, on which he animadverts, seems to need some qualification. But we are quite sure that it was far from his intention to depreciate the existing academical institutions among the Dissenters. His main object in this part of his paper, as it appears to us, was simply to declare his opinion that those institutions, on their present limited scale, were of themselves inadequate to supply the means of intellectual education to the Dissenting population at large; and, on this account, to recommend the London University to the support of the Dissenters, as promising to furnish the requisite additional facilities for this purpose. In this view of the case, we do not conceive that H. will widely differ from him. EDIT.]

OBSERVATIONS ON THE GOSPEL OF LUKE, IN REPLY TO DR.
SCHLEIERMACHER AND MR. BELSHAM.

(Continued from p. 176.)

MR. BELSHAM urges that the Ebionite Gospel of Matthew "and the Marcionite Gospel of Luke did not contain these accounts, and that both these sects maintained their own to be the uncorrupted, unmutilated copies of these evangelical histories." Now how ingenuous as well as ingenious all this is ! Who can refuse implicit credence to the pure authenticity of such high and immaculate authorities as the Ebionite and Marcionite copies ? Who can hesitate, for an instant, to spurn from him as spurious and base all which either of those sects refused to admit ? What signifies it, that, in point of fact, they admitted or rejected just what suited their peculiar tenets ; that each of them was stigmatized with the charge of mutilating and adulterating the gospels which they respectively used ? What signifies it that such alterations in and additions to Matthew were made by the Ebionites, that their copy soon lost all authority ? What doth it signify, that the Marcionites, in their edition of Luke, excluded not the two first chapters only, but all the third and part of the fourth ; and in the third, of course, that part relating to the age of Jesus, which formed the pivot of Mr. B.'s above-noticed operations against the miraculous conception ? What does it signify, that the Ebionites excluded all the Gospels, (except Matthew's,) as well as the whole of Paul's Epistles—that the Marcionites rejected the Old Testament in toto ; together with four of Paul's Epistles and all the Gospels but Luke's (Marcionite *edition*) ? What signifies it, that the Deist or the Infidel might with equal consistency and success avail himself of the Christian Divine's high and spotless authorities, to rid himself at "one fell swoop" of all the Old Testament and the greatest part of the New ?—seeing, that if Marcion be an authority, away would vanish all the Old Testament with Matthew, Luke and John ; and then would be brought up the Ebionites to the charge, sweeping off Luke and all Paul's Epistles. What did all or either of these things in the least signify ? The various manuscripts and versions of unexceptionable reputation did not suit the purpose which our "Inquirer" had in hand, and therefore recourse was had to the Ebionite and Marcionite copies ; which, instead of being "uncorrupted and unmutilated," have been for centuries reprobated as being replete with adulteration and impurity ! That the learned writer invoked the ancient Ebionites to his aid, was, perhaps, nothing more than natural, since he labours strenuously in other parts of his work (pp. 8, 257, &c. &c.) to identify them with those moderns who profess the same creed with himself ; but that Marcion should be warped into the service—he who, according to Priestley, first said that there were three Gods—is absolutely ludicrous.

It is true that Mr. Belsham hath not ventured to assert that he himself believed either the Ebionite copy of Matthew, or the Marcionite copy of Luke, to have been uncorrupted and unmutilated ; but it is true also, that he, from his mode of introducing them, plainly anticipates that his reader may draw that conclusion !

In saying this, the writer most positively and sincerely disclaims any intention to impute any unworthy motive whatever ; but assuredly, such sinister reasoning bears a much stronger resemblance to the *pious frauds* of the zealot, than to the honest and philosophic exposition of a "Calm Inquirer," anxious only to arrive at, and to disseminate, TRUTH !

It is further contended in the "Calm Inquiry," that "the Ebionites and Gnostics agreed in disbelieving the miraculous conception, and that there was nothing in the peculiarities of those sects which should render them averse to that opinion." Hence the reader is tacitly invited to infer, that the exclusion of the chapters in question, arose solely from a well-informed conviction of their being spurious, and not in any respect because the doctrine contained in them was irreconcileable with the peculiar dogmas of those sects.

But let us see what the fact is. As to the Ebionites—so called, not from the poverty of their worldly circumstances, but from the meanness of their notions respecting Christ, as denying his pre-existence and divinity; and having received that *relative* appellation, it may reasonably be inferred, from the contrast between such notions and the more exalted sentiments of the great mass of Christians at that period—it is to be observed, that it is not correct to attribute to the whole body of Ebionites a disbelief of the miraculous conception, for some of them were actual believers; and indeed in a subsequent page of the "Calm Inquiry" even, (pp. 260, 261,) Origen and Eusebius are quoted to that effect: but those Ebionites who denied the miraculous conception, (and it is to that class only that the remark of Mr. B. can apply,) maintained that Jesus was the Son of Mary by Joseph in the ordinary course of nature: and, as that was one of their peculiarities, it is most plain that they could not at the same time admit the opinion that Jesus was miraculously conceived by Mary through the influence of the Holy Spirit. No! no! the *ancient* Ebionites were more consistent; some of them, indeed, believing Jesus to have been the Son of Joseph and Mary, and others, of Mary only and the Divine Spirit; but neither of the two sects was so enamoured of absurdity, as at one and the same time to believe him the natural offspring of Joseph and the miraculous production of the Holy Spirit!

Then, as to the Gnostics—of whom the Marcionites amongst a great number of different sects of that name formed one—the doctrine of the latter was, that "Christ first appeared on earth *full grown*, but was a man in outward form only:" and therefore it is not less clear, that their tenets could not be reconciled with the doctrine of the miraculous conception. Nor was the miraculous conception more admissible by that only other sect of Gnostics spoken of in the "Calm Inquiry," who allowed Jesus to be a real man, but who denied that he was the Christ, maintaining that Christ was a celestial *Aeon* who descended into Jesus *at his baptism*, but quitted him at his crucifixion.

We are told too, that "the Ebionites and Gnostics had their origin in the apostolic age, and had probably at that time never heard the report" (p. 9). The short answer to which would be, "Probably they had heard it." If we are to go into probabilities upon such a subject, let us see whether the negative or the affirmative presumption recommends itself the strongest. What caused the negative supposition to float on the writer's fancy we are not apprised: and nothing further need be offered in favour of the affirmative, than to remind the reader that it appears from the earliest authentic accounts of the Ebionites, that one sort of them were actual believers in the miraculous conception: and surely it is more than probable, that those Ebionites at least must have heard of such a report! No other than the apostolic age is mentioned by Mr. B., nor does he tell us when he guesses that the new light first beamed amongst them at a later period: but at all events, it is beyond controversy, that a great number of Christians are proved

by history to have been believers in the miraculous conception long before history even mentions the name of "Ebionite;" and it would have been somewhat miraculous if either Ebionites or Gnostics could have *disbelieved* the report of the miraculous conception, if at the time of such their disbelief they had never heard of it.

In truth, Mr. B., in p. 7, really states as an argument in his favour, that "Trypho the Jew, in his dialogue with Justin Martyr, early in the second century, reproaches the Christians for their belief in the miraculous conception"! Well: the scoffing Israelite will answer Mr. Belsham's purpose, doubtless, although the "Hebrew Christians" and "philosophizing Gentile believers" turned out to be non-effectives! In the name of common sense, however, what conclusion does the statement sanction but this—that at that very early period the Christians did believe in the doctrine of the miraculous conception? And the very prevalence of that belief, at an era so near to the publication of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, doth of itself alone furnish a very strong presumption in favour of the authenticity of the narrative contained in them.

Let it be remarked, that the writer makes use of the expression "scoffing Israelite," for the reason that such was the individual character of Trypho, and not with the view of insinuating any indirect reproach against the Jews as a people; who, in point of moral conduct towards their fellows, and devout veneration for the God they worship, need not, it is believed, fear a comparison with Christians in similar situations and circumstances of life. But how often do Christians in their demeanour towards the Jews forget that generous principle, that most essential part of a Christian's duty, **CHARITY**! The reflecting Christian will always bear in mind that all the evangelists and apostles, and even Jesus himself, were Jews; and that the ancestors of the present race of Jews were righteous, worshiping in the consecrated temple of the true God, at a period when our forefathers were, and for ages upon ages before had been, grovelling in heathenish idolatry! And above all, let it not be forgotten that the time will come (and it may be close at hand) when for the Jew as well as for the Christian, there will be but one Shepherd and one fold.

It is asserted, too, that the miraculous conception of Jesus would not infer his pre-existence; but, whether it would or not, it at least proves that he was not the Son of Joseph, as Mr. Belsham attempts to maintain throughout his work; and it shews also, Luke i. 35, *why* he was called **THE SON OF GOD**: and at the same time that verse establishes the fact, that he was so called in a sense and for a reason totally different from what the "Calm Inquiry" represents.

It remains for the writer of the above observations most earnestly and absolutely to disclaim that they have proceeded from any want of respect towards the author of the *Calm Inquiry*, either on the score of his great talents or of his irreproachable character; much less is there meant to be attributed to him any other than well-meant intentions. If, however, much be conceded, there is not, on the other side, any alternative but to refer his positive but unsanctioned conclusions, and his reference to authorities simultaneously sound, but in reality corrupt, to his having been led away in his *Calm Inquiry*, by the headlong zeal of an indiscreet partisan: and, however pure may have been the motive, the practical result is pernicious, inasmuch as it tends in the minds of but too many to lessen the credibility of the Sacred Volume; for great is the number of those who, not having had leisure, means, or capacity, competently to examine the subject for them-

selves, yet nevertheless prate about *their* disbelief, forsooth, of the authenticity of the preliminary chapters of Matthew and Luke, on no other ground than Mr. Belsham's "Calm Inquiry," published as it now is "in a cheap form to facilitate and extend its circulation"! The consequences of instilling into the minds of Christians an opinion, or even a distrust, that the preliminary chapters in Matthew and Luke are "absolute falsities," must necessarily be most baneful. Perhaps there is nothing so closely associated with the belief of Christians in general, as the very facts which those identical chapters detail respecting our Lord's nativity, forming as they do in every town, in every village, and in every house and cottage, the constant themes of rejoicing at those annual festivals, which are the anniversaries of that momentous epoch which brought "glad tidings of great joy to all people," and on which occasion the heavenly host lauded the all-bountiful and beneficent Giver, saying, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will towards men." The narrative of those most interesting events was engraven on their memories in their earliest childhood, in a way, too, and at a season, calculated to render the impression indelible. It has grown with their growth, and strengthened with their strength: and in minds like those of the multitude, faith in the truth of such facts relating to the blessed Founder of Christianity, and belief in the truth of Christianity itself, must stand or fall together. It is impossible without the worst consequences to attempt to separate the two: destroy the one, and you shake the other to its very centre. The great majority of Christians are, from various causes, unable to sift such matters for themselves; but they have been taught (and truly taught) to believe that the New Testament contains the revealed word of the Almighty. As such they have appreciated it justly as a jewel above all price. They have drawn from it, with religious reverence, the practical inculcation, "to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly before God." As a *whole*, they have venerated it hitherto as above all suspicion, spotless and pure; when they are told, possibly by an authority highly respectable in point of talent and moral conduct, and moreover greatly influential from his station and office, that one hundred and seventy-six verses are "complete falsities," what is in many instances the inevitable, the lamentable consequence? Why, the whole work sinks in their estimation, just as the reputation of any individual, whom they had been accustomed to revere as a model of uprightness and goodness, would sink on his being convicted of a vile falsehood, or an atrocious act of criminality: and all confidence, as well in the integrity of the one as in the authenticity of the other, would alike receive an irrecoverable shock. But the mischief doth not stop there: it prepares a highway for the march of Deism; for many of those individuals who have been so initiated in partial infidelity, are but too well prepared to tolerate the reasoning—"Why, if these four chapters which for so many centuries have been received as true, are now as clearly proved, as they are positively asserted to be, *absolute falsities*, it is very possible that there may be other chapters, which deeper investigation may shew to be equally spurious; nay, it is not impossible that there may be but too good a foundation for the Deistical assertion, that the whole is a 'cunningly devised fable!'"

If YE, the "philosophizing Gentile believers" of the age, must indulge yourselves in wild conjectures and arrogant hypotheses in matters of theological controversy, yet do not—in mercy do not—bereave the sober-minded, single-hearted and pious Christian, of one atom either of his devotional reverence for, or of his unbounded confidence in, the purity of that book

whose divine assurances of a future state of blissful immortality, beaming on his recollection when goaded by the anguish of worldly affliction to the very verge of despair, are at once more gratefully soothing and reanimating, than to the benighted and dismayed traveller, through those murky wilds of the desert where the savage brute roams relentless, are the earliest scintillations of the morning gleaming through the gloom. That the narrative should have been made the subject of attack at all, is deeply to be regretted ; for the poison will be imbibed by many, whom no antidote to counteract its operation will ever reach. Convinced, as the writer of these remarks fully is, that the cause of Christianity, the present and future happiness of individuals, and the well-being of families and society at large, would be all greatly prejudiced if the opinion respecting the falsity of the preliminary chapters in Matthew and Luke were to become more prevalent, it would be to him a source of the highest satisfaction if he could but feel himself justified in entertaining an expectation that this his humble effort will in any degree be conducive towards vindicating the credibility and pure integrity of the holy Gospels of Matthew and Luke.

It remains for him to state, that if the strong feelings under which he is sensible that he has written, have exhibited themselves in any part of his observations, it behoves him, before he concludes, to protest in justice to himself, that they are directed entirely towards the doctrine itself, and in no degree personally against the advocate for such doctrine, much less has he been led away by any spirit of intolerance or party zeal : for, however strong may be his opinion upon particular points of doctrine, he cannot but feel that those who totally differ from him may possibly be in the right. In his judgment, that person must have his mind imbued with more or less than human wisdom, who can venture to pronounce that his own doctrinal sentiments alone are sterling truth, and the tenets of all others who may happen to differ from him but merely base alloy.

Every rational inquirer, however superior may be his faculties of penetration and discrimination, cannot but be conscious, it is presumed, that the immeasurable sublimity of the subject too far transcends the limited powers of his shackled mind, for him ever to indulge the hope of infallibility. Perhaps in proportion as an individual becomes enlightened, does he entertain more firmly the persuasion that it is utterly hopeless to expect that his darkened intellect can ever attain sufficient energy and lucidness of vision to enable him competently to comprehend the subject : and it may be, that he often repossesses himself after a range of thought, but to exclaim, in a mingled tone of humility and awe, "It is high as heaven—what *can we know?*" And whatever creed may be the result of his anxious investigation, and however soundly rooted he may occasionally consider it, yet must a distrust frequently come across his mind, if duly sensible of his own fallibility, and cause him in doubt and fear mentally to prefer, to the great Source of all Wisdom, all Power, and all Goodness, a fervid though silent prayer, in the spirit of the following lines of the poet :

" If I am right, thy grace impart,
Still in the right to stay !
If I am wrong, Oh, teach my heart
To find that better way !"

W. H. ROWE.

Weymouth, Jan. 31, 1827.

QUESTION OF THE COMPETENCY OF HERETICS AND UNBELIEVERS AS
JURORS AND WITNESSES IN AMERICAN COURTS.

SIR,

Hackney, March 5, 1827.

FROM some of the publications sent me by my friends the Universalists of America, which I referred to in my former letter, (p. 176,) and which I have since received, I learn that the competency of unbelievers, and even of some Christian believers, to serve as Jurors and to give evidence in courts of justice, has been called in question in the United States of America.

The first case of this kind is thus related in *The Philadelphia Universalist Magazine*, Vol. II. p. 315, in an extract from *The American Watchman and Delaware Advertiser* of Jan. 7, 1823 :

“ In a trial in the court of Oyer and Terminer, held at Newcastle in November last, of a man indicted for * * * *, one of the Jury impanelled was, on his being called, challenged by the Attorney-General, who proceeded to shew cause for the challenge, by propounding to him, under the direction of the court, the following questions, and requiring his answers thereto :

“ Q. 1. Do you believe in the obligation of an oath ?

“ A. 1. An honest man, to speak the truth, requires not an oath to bind him ; and a dishonest one will not be bound by an oath.

“ Q. 2. Do you believe in the existence of a God ?

“ A. 2. It appears reasonable to believe, that all things are governed by a superior intelligence rather than by a blind fatality.

“ The same question being repeated and a more direct answer required, Juror replied,

“ 2. I do believe in the existence of a God.

“ Q. 3. Do you believe in a future state of rewards and punishments ?

“ A. 3. I am ignorant of them. The subject is beyond my comprehension.

“ The Court, on hearing the answers of the Juror to the questions proposed, decided that he was incompetent to serve as one of the Jury. He was consequently rejected, although it was the prisoner's wish that he should pass between him and his country.”

Another case of judicial bigotry, in which a witness was rejected on account of heresy, is described (in an extract from the *Boston Patriot*) in the *Boston Universalists' Magazine*, Vol. VII. pp. 113, 114.

“ In a case tried before Judge Hallowell and a special Jury, in the District Court of Philadelphia, Nov. 14, a man was offered as a witness for the defendant, who, on being interrogated by the plaintiff's counsel as to his religious belief, declared, that he did not believe in a future state of rewards and punishments *after this life*, but that the only punishment for sin was *in the present state of existence*. The Judge, after argument, refused to admit him to be qualified as a witness. He quoted in support of his opinion the decision of the Supreme Court of New York, as delivered by Chief Justice Spencer, that ‘ no testimony is entitled to credit, unless delivered under the solemnity of an oath or affirmation which comes home to the conscience of the witness, and will create a tie arising from his belief that perjury would expose him to punishment *in the life to come*; on this great principle rest all our institutions, and especially the distribution of justice between man and man.’ ”

Upon this judgment, so unworthy of a functionary in a Free State, the editors of the work from which I have taken the extract, make the following remark,—

“ By the above decision, the honourable Judge informs the public, that had the man whom he would not admit to be sworn, been dishonest enough

to deny his religious belief, he then would have admitted him to swear! And he furthermore informs the public, that if he did not fear a punishment in a future state he should entirely disregard the *institutions* of society, *and especially the distribution of justice between man and man.*"

A precedent had been set in this precise case which Judge Hallowell would have shewn wisdom in taking as his guide. I gather the particulars from "An Extract from a Letter, dated Elkton, 4th April, 1822," in the *Philadelphia Universalist Magazine*, Vol. I. pp. 285, &c. At the County Court of Cecil County, held at Elkton, a suit was brought before the Hon. Richard T. Earle, Chief Judge, and the Hon. Lemuel Purnell and Thomas Worrell, Associates. The case having been stated to the Jury, and the Chief Judge having called upon the counsel for the defence to produce their evidence, a witness was brought forward, William Miller, who had been a Methodist preacher, but had become an Universalist.

"Just as he was going to be sworn and give in his evidence, one of the counsel for the plaintiff (Gale) rose and objected to Mr. Miller's giving evidence in court at all, as he was instructed by his client [John Miller, but no relation to the witness, himself also a Methodist preacher] to say, that Mr. Miller did not believe in a state of future rewards and punishments. 'An Infidel!' exclaimed Carmical, the other counsel for the plaintiff. Upon which the progress of the cause was arrested; a considerable interest was excited in all the spectators; a consultation took place between the three judges, legal authorities were appealed to and read, and a witness named John A. Simpers was produced by the plaintiff's counsel to throw out of court Mr. Miller's testimony, which was important, by invalidating his qualifications to testify upon the grounds of his religious belief. All that this Simpers could swear was, that Mr. Miller had publicly declared his belief that our Saviour died for all mankind; that all mankind would be saved, and that he did not believe in a state of future rewards and punishments. The court having asked the witness if Mr. M. ever to his knowledge had denied his belief in the existence of God, and he replied in the negative; Mr. M. then obtained permission of the court to interrogate the witness. Mr. M. asked him if he, (Mr. M.,) so far from disbelieving the Scriptures, had not always appealed to them as the bulwark of his faith? The witness' knowledge was such, that he was constrained to reply in the affirmative. So that Mr. M.'s principles brightening so upon investigation, because bottomed upon the truth, the Chief Judge immediately ordered the clerk of the court to proceed to swear him without further hesitation. Thus was an attempt overthrown, which, had it succeeded, might have gone to establish a precedent whereby Universalists would have been, at least in this county, and perhaps this state, in a measure disfranchised."

Every sensible man must rejoice in the defeat of this attempt to exclude a man from the relations of civil life on account of his religious belief; but the end here aimed at is the natural consequence of all inquiry into the faith of individuals before judicial tribunals. The inquiries would begin with unbelievers, but they would go on to interrogate and disqualify misbelievers, that is, all who did not believe, or rather repeat after, some arbitrary standard that might chance to be acknowledged by the court. Bigotry is always bad, but it is worst of all on the judicial bench: the Inquisition as carried on by churchmen is odious, but it is supremely detestable when "the holy office" is administered by civil judges. Wishing and hoping that our own courts may resist the evil in its beginning, and that all persons summoned as jurors or witnesses may beware of legal snares for conscience,

I am, Sir, yours, &c.,

ROBERT ASPLAND.

ON THE BAPTISMAL COMMISSION.

" Facts are stubborn things."

To the Editor.

SIR,

I AM inclined to think that the great majority of my Unitarian brethren feel assured of the *authenticity* of the Baptismal Commission as recorded in the existing copies of St. Matthew's Gospel. Now my own fixed and only not unalterable conviction is, that the words "in the name of the Father," &c., are even more unquestionably than those in St. John's Epistle an interpolation. And the ground of that conviction is, that the text is point blank opposed to the uniform testimony of Scripture history as to the FACT of baptism in the apostolic age, and utterly irreconcileable with the Apostle Paul's repeated references to that fact and his arguments upon it. I am unwilling to trespass on your pages by dilating on these grounds of objection, and my purpose will be answered if my opponents will oblige me by replying to the following queries:—In what form do they believe that Baptism was administered at the period immediately subsequent to our Saviour's ascension into heaven? What evidence have they that the apostles were cognizant of a commission to baptize in the *three* names? How do they reconcile St. Paul's mention of Baptism, Gal. iii. 27, Rom. vi. 3, et seq., Ephes. iv. 5, 1 Cor. i. 13, Col. ii. 12, with the fact of baptism having been administered in or into more than *one* name?

Feb. 25, 1827.

J. T. CLARKE.

" REPORTED BURNING OF A JEW."

To the Editor.

SIR,

Feb. 19, 1827.

A FEW months ago the public papers asserted that a man had been lately burnt to death in Spain for heresy. When opinion had expressed itself pretty loudly on this incredible outrage, the Spanish authorities circulated documents denying the fact, and in your last Number, p. 144, your respect for "truth and the character of the age," induces you to consider these documents as entitled to credit.

These documents have only added mendacity to cruelty. The fact is incontestable, that in the month of August, in the year 1826, a Catalonian schoolmaster named Brosquil, who lived in the Barrio de Ruzasa in the city of Valencia in Spain, suffered the penalty of death on the solitary accusation of "Deism." At his trial a strong opposition to this barbarous sentence was made by the minority of the judges, but their resistance was over-ruled by the majority, and the decree for his execution was confirmed by the mandate of the King. Every species of contumely accompanied the unhappy but most courageous man, (for he refused to retract or to disguise his opinions,) both on the way to and at the place of execution. The saints and images were veiled in all the streets through which the procession passed, and the crosses which are always attached to the gallows in Spain were torn away.

The difficulty of communication with Spain has hitherto prevented more minute details from reaching England, but a time will doubtless come when this and other deeds of darkness and ferocity will be exposed to the world.

J. B.

REVIEW.

ART. I.—*The Ecclesiastical History of the Second and Third Centuries, illustrated from the Writings of Tertullian.* By John, Bishop of Bristol, [Lincoln,] Master of Christ's College, and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. Second Edition. 8vo. pp. 588.

IN the introduction to this very able and interesting work we are informed that it contains the substance of a course of Lectures delivered by the author, as Regius Professor of Divinity, in the Lent and Easter terms of 1825. Two previous courses had been devoted to the writings of the earlier Fathers ; “ and the plan which he then pursued was, first to give a short account of the author's life ; next an analysis of each of his works ; and lastly, a selection of passages, made principally with a view to the illustration of the doctrines and discipline of the Church of England.” But in proceeding to the works of Tertullian, “ it occurred to him that a different mode might be adopted with advantage, and that they might be rendered subservient to the illustration of Ecclesiastical History in general.” Not, however, intending to compose an Ecclesiastical History of the second and third centuries, but only to assist in collecting materials for a future historian, it was necessary to fix upon some plan for the arrangement of these materials. The Professor chose that of Mosheim, not because he regarded it as the best which could be devised, but because his History is in most general use among theological students in this country. Mosheim, it will be remembered, divides the history of the Church into two branches, external and internal : comprehending under the former, the prosperous and the adverse events which befel it during each century ; and under the latter, the state of learning and philosophy, the government, the doctrines, the rites and ceremonies of the Church, and the heresies which divided its members during the same period. Under these heads, therefore, all the matter which the writings of Tertullian supply to illustrate the ecclesiastical history of the period during which he flourished, is arranged in the work before us. But while the learned Professor is thus filling up Mosheim's outline, he does not lose sight of the object which in his former researches he had chiefly in view ; but by comparing the information he collects relating to the doctrines, the government and the rites of the Church in the second century, with the Thirty-nine Articles, he endeavours to obtain the sanction of the Presbyter of Carthage to the doctrines and the usages of the Church of England ; and at the same time, whenever he can, he shews that his authority cannot be pleaded by the Church of Rome. It was also necessary for him, as he observes, “ so far to adhere to his original plan as to prefix a brief account of Tertullian himself, in order that the student might be enabled accurately to distinguish the portion of ecclesiastical history which his writings serve to illustrate, as well as justly to appreciate the importance to be attached to his testimony and opinions.” (P.-3.) The whole work, therefore, is divided into seven chapters, thus entitled : I. Tertullian and his Writings. II. The external History of the Church. III. The State of Letters and Philosophy. IV. The Government of the Church. V. The Doctrine of the Church. VI. The Ceremonies of the Church. VII. The Heresies and Divisions which troubled the Church.

The first chapter is introduced by the short article on Tertullian in ‘Je-
VOL. I.

rome's Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers.' This account is not so full and satisfactory as might be wished, and leaves us in uncertainty whether he was born of Gentile or Christian parents, and whether he officiated as Presbyter at Carthage or at Rome. It has, indeed, been doubted whether Jerome was correct in calling him a Presbyter: this doubt, however, would probably never have been felt, but for the fact, which is undeniable, that he was a married man; a fact which all the ingenuity of Catholic writers cannot reconcile with the doctrine of the celibacy of the clergy. The most remarkable incident in the life of Tertullian was his secession from the Church, in consequence of his having adopted the errors of Montanus; the true cause of which, as the learned Professor justly observes, "is to be found, not in the failure of his attempts to obtain the see either of Rome or Carthage, but in the constitution and temper of his mind, to which the austere doctrines and practice of the new Prophet were perfectly congenial." (P. 36.) As he wrote many of his works after his secession, and some of them in direct opposition to the Catholic Church, it is necessary that they who study his writings should form just notions of the tenets and pretensions of Montanus. An inquiry into these, therefore, constitutes an important part of the present chapter; in the course of which some errors into which both Mosheim and Lardner have fallen respecting the nature and extent of the inspiration to which that Heresiarch laid claim are corrected.

Though the pretensions and the tenets of Montanus may have been in some respects less absurd than they have usually been represented, yet they were so manifestly groundless and unreasonable as to render it a matter of astonishment that any one who, like Tertullian, had been well instructed in the learning of the age, and had the writings of evangelists and apostles, the words of truth and soberness, in his hands, should be induced to acknowledge and adopt them. The learned Professor, therefore, could not fail to anticipate the objection which he states, and endeavours, perhaps not without success, to obviate, in the following passage:

" 'What reliance,' it may be asked, 'can we place upon the judgment, or even upon the testimony of Tertullian, who could be deluded into a belief of the extravagant pretensions of Montanus? Or what advantage can the theological student derive from reading the works of so credulous and superstitious an author?' These are questions easily asked, and answered without hesitation by men who take the royal road to theological knowledge: who either through want of the leisure, or impatient of the labour, requisite for the examination of the writings of the Fathers, find it convenient to conceal their ignorance under an air of contempt. Thus a hasty and unfair sentence of condemnation has been passed upon the Fathers, and their works have fallen into unmerited disrepute. The sentence is hasty, because it bespeaks great ignorance of human nature, which often presents the curious phenomenon of an union of the most opposite qualities in the same mind; of vigour, acuteness and discrimination on some subjects, with imbecility, dullness and bigotry on others. The sentence is unfair, because it condemns the Fathers for faults, which were those of the age: of the elder Pliny and Marcus Antoninus, as well as of Tertullian. It is, moreover, unfair, because the persons who argue thus in the case of the Fathers, argue differently in other cases. Without intending to compare the gentle, the amiable, the accomplished Fenelon, with the harsh, the fiery, the unpolished Tertullian, or to class the spiritual reveries of Madame Guyon with the extravagancies of Montanus and his prophetesses, it may be remarked, that the predilection of Fenelon for the notions of the mystics betrayed a mental weakness, differing in degree rather than in kind from that which led Tertullian to the adoption of Montanism. We do not, however, on account of this weakness in Fenelon,

throw aside his works as utterly undeserving of notice, or deem it a sufficient ground for questioning the superiority of his genius and talent: we regard with surprise and regret this additional instance of human infirmity, but continue to read Telemachus with instruction and delight. Let us shew the same candour and sound judgment in the case of the Fathers: let us separate the wheat from the tares, and not involve them in one indiscriminate conflagration. The assertion may appear paradoxical, but is nevertheless true, that the value of Tertullian's writings to the theological student arises in a great measure from his errors. When he became a Montanist, he set himself to expose what he deemed faulty in the practice and discipline of the Church: thus we are told indirectly what that practice and that discipline were, and we obtain information which, but for his secession from the Church, his works would scarcely have supplied. In a word, whether we consider the testimony borne to the genuineness and integrity of the books of the New Testament, or the information relating to the ceremonies, discipline and doctrine of the primitive Church, Tertullian's writings form a most important link in that chain of tradition which connects the apostolic age with our own."—Pp. 37—39.

To the justice of these remarks, excepting only the last, we willingly assent; and we confidently hope that the labours of the learned Professor will produce a general desire in students of theology to become well acquainted with the writings not of Tertullian alone, but of all the Fathers who attained to any eminence in the ancient Christian Church. No man who has not studied them can be entitled to the character of a theologian. A full and accurate knowledge of the Scriptures of the New Testament, and, we will add, of the Old Testament also, is indeed of the first importance, as from these all the articles of our creed and all the rules of our practice must be derived. But the writings of the Fathers of the Church, especially of those who flourished during the first five centuries, are essentially necessary to enable us to trace the progress of error, to discover to us the various causes which operated to corrupt the simplicity of gospel truth, and to introduce and establish the various systems which have so long usurped the place of pure and undefiled religion. No one who aspires to be a theologian should be content to follow either Bull or Whitby, Vossius or Wall, Whiston or Priestley, or any other writers to whose zeal and industry we are indebted for large and valuable extracts from these writers: to judge fairly and satisfactorily, he must himself draw from the same sources. And in so doing he will obtain various collateral important benefits which we need not distinctly point out. But even a slight acquaintance with the ancient Fathers will convince the student, that though they may furnish him with valuable facts, he must be cautious not to rely upon their judgment. He will find them worthy of all credit as witnesses to the genuineness and integrity of the books of the New Testament, but, with few exceptions, miserable interpreters of their meaning. And neither to Tertullian nor to any other of the orthodox Fathers can we concede the praise of connecting the apostolic age with our own, by preserving the knowledge of the doctrine of the apostles, excepting so far as they have recorded the faith of those whom they affected to despise as "*simplices, imprudentes,*" and "*idiota.*"

One only of the numerous treatises composed by Tertullian supplies any positive evidence of its date, and various opinions have been formed respecting the time in which most of the rest were written. It has been usual to divide them all into two classes; those written while he was in communion with the church, and those written after he became a Montanist. But the distinction is not always to be perceived; "and in the absence of all evi-

ternal testimony, it is scarcely possible to draw a well-defined line of separation between the works which were and those which were not composed before his secession from the church." After a careful examination of every remaining treatise, the Right Reverend Author arranges them under the following classes: 1, Works probably written while he was yet a member of the church; 2, Works written after he became a Montanist; 3, Works written probably after he became a Montanist; and, 4, Works respecting which nothing certain can be pronounced. It is observable, that the 2d and 3d classes comprehend the majority of his works. Greater precision, we apprehend, cannot be obtained; and this classification will be found sufficiently accurate for every purpose of the student of ecclesiastical history.

The remainder of the first chapter is occupied by a brief but satisfactory refutation of the fanciful theory of Semler, who maintained that the works of Tertullian (and those also of Justin Martyr and Irenæus) are spurious, the produce of the joint labours of a set of men who entered into a combination to falsify history and corrupt the Scriptures, principally with a view of throwing discredit upon certain persons, Marcion, Valentinus and others, whom they thought fit to brand with the title of Heretics; a theory which, as the Bishop observes, rests upon surmises, and opens a door to universal incredulity.

In the *second* chapter, the author proceeds, in conformity with Mosheim's arrangement, to collect from the works of Tertullian such passages as serve to illustrate the external history of the church during the period in which he flourished. Tertullian bears explicit and ample testimony to the wide diffusion of Christianity. "The triumphs of the gospel, in his day, were not," he asserts, "confined within the limits of the Roman Empire; Christ was then reigning over peoples whom the Roman arms had not subdued." The first diffusion of the gospel was undoubtedly accomplished by the aid of supernatural powers conferred upon the apostles and those employed under their directions, but its continued success is not to be attributed to the same means. Mosheim indeed says, (*Eccl. Hist.* Vol. I. pp. 153 and 245,) that with the exception of the miraculous gift of tongues, the extraordinary powers with which the rising church had been endowed were in several places continued during the second and third centuries. And this assertion may seem to be sanctioned by the testimony of Tertullian; but the Right Reverend Professor, with the judgment and candour which he usually displays, is not disposed to admit the validity of his testimony. "The only specific instance," he observes, (p. 102,) "which Tertullian mentions of the exercise of miraculous powers, relates to the exorcism of dæmons." This, as Dr. Douglas has remarked, is the favourite standing miracle of the Fathers before the fourth century, and the only one which he could find (after having turned over their writings carefully and with a view to this point) that they challenge their adversaries to come and see them perform, admitting at the same time that Jews and even Gentiles successfully practised exorcism. The Professor, therefore, is justified in concluding, that "if miraculous powers still subsisted in the church, the writings of Tertullian would have supplied some less equivocal instances of their exercise."

The controversy concerning the continuance of miraculous powers in the church, which so strongly excited the public attention about the middle of the last century, is now almost forgotten, and the names of Chapman, Berri-man, Jackson, Church, Fell, and others, who either opposed or defended Middleton, are rapidly fading, as connected with this controversy, from the

memory of man ; but the subject itself will ever retain a considerable degree of importance from its connexion with the evidences of Christianity, and with the character of early Christian writers. It could not be passed by unnoticed in the work now before us, and they who may not assent to the theory of the learned author, will, without doubt, applaud the spirit with which it is proposed. Gibbon has asserted that the cessation of miraculous gifts " must have excited universal attention, and caused the time at which it happened to be precisely ascertained and noted." But as pretensions to these gifts had continued in all ages, he would have it inferred that no such gifts were ever bestowed. Our author thinks that the uncertainty respecting their cessation is to be accounted for on the supposition of their being *gradually* withdrawn.

" To adopt the language of undoubting confidence on such a subject, would be a mark no less of folly than presumption ; but I may be allowed to state the conclusion to which I have myself been led, by a comparison of the statements in the book of Acts, with the writings of the Fathers of the second century. My conclusion then is, that the power of working miracles was not extended beyond the disciples, upon whom the apostles conferred it by the imposition of their hands. As the number of those disciples gradually diminished, the instances of the exercise of miraculous powers became continually less frequent, and ceased entirely at the death of the last individual on whom the hands of the apostles had been laid. That event would, in the natural course of things, take place before the middle of the second century : at a time when, Christianity having obtained a footing in all the provinces of the Roman Empire, the miraculous gifts conferred upon its first teachers had performed their appropriate office—that of proving to the world that a new revelation had been given from heaven. What then would be the effect produced upon the minds of the great body of Christians by their gradual cessation ? Many would not observe, none would be willing to observe it ; for all must naturally feel a reluctance to believe that powers, which had contributed so essentially to the rapid diffusion of Christianity, were withdrawn. They who remarked the cessation of miracles, would probably succeed in persuading themselves that it was only temporary, and designed by an all-wise Providence to be the prelude to a more abundant effusion of supernatural gifts upon the Church. Or if doubts and misgivings crossed their minds, they would still be unwilling openly to state a fact which might shake the steadfastness of the friends, and would certainly be urged by the enemies of the gospel as an argument against its divine origin. They would pursue the plan which has been pursued by Justin Martyr, Theophilus, Irenæus, &c. ; they would have recourse to general assertions of the existence of supernatural powers, without attempting to produce a specific instance of their exercise. The silence of ecclesiastical history respecting the cessation of miraculous gifts in the Church, is to be ascribed, not to the insensibility of Christians to that important event, (according to Mr. Gibbon's sarcastic assertion,) but to the combined operation of prejudice and policy—of prejudice which made them reluctant to believe, of policy which made them anxious to conceal the truth.—Let me repeat that I offer these observations with that diffidence in my own conclusions, which ought to be the predominant feeling in the mind of every inquirer into the ways of Providence. I collect from passages already cited from the book of Acts, that the power of working miracles was withdrawn, combined with an anxiety to keep up a belief of its continuance in the Church. They affirm in general terms, that miracles were performed, but rarely venture to produce an instance of a particular miracle. Those who followed them were less scrupulous, and proceeded to invent miracles, very different indeed in circumstances and character from the miracles of the gospel, yet readily believed by men who were not disposed nicely to examine into the evidence of facts which they wished to be true. The success of the first at-

tempts naturally encouraged others to practise similar impositions upon the credulity of mankind. In every succeeding age miracles multiplied in number and increased in extravagance; till at length, by their frequency, they lost all title to the name, since they could be no longer considered as deviations from the ordinary course of nature.”—Pp. 98—102.

With similar diffidence we would beg leave to suggest (after Bishop Pearce) that the promise of our Lord to his apostles, that he would be with them to *the end of the age*, *ἐως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αιώνος*, authorizes us to limit the bestowment and the exercise of miraculous gifts, not merely to the apostolical times, but to the period which was closed by the destruction of Jerusalem and the desolation of Judea. In the discourses of our Lord recorded by John near the conclusion of his Gospel, we find him comforting his disciples with such promises as these; “I will not leave you comfortless, (orphans,) I will come to you. A little while and ye shall see me, because I go to the Father. I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice. If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come to him, and make our abode with him.” All these passages manifestly refer to what in other passages in the same discourse is described as the sending and the coming of the comforter, or the advocate, that is, of the Holy Spirit. If such were the presence of Jesus with his disciples, if he were with them in the miraculous powers with which they were endowed, and if he have limited his continuance with them to the end of the age, are we not warranted in believing that, at the end of the age, those powers, being no longer required, were no longer conferred? “The gospel of the kingdom had then been preached in all the world for a witness to all nations,” as our Lord had predicted; the spirit of prophecy had borne ample testimony to his divine mission; all that he had foretold respecting his coming, as he sat on the Mount of Olives, having been fully accomplished; and the Mosaic dispensation had been concluded by the almighty hand to which it owed its introduction and establishment. The Jewish adversaries were silenced: the Gentiles, in every part of the civilized world, had seen the demonstrations of divine power which every where attended the preaching of the gospel; the history of Christ and of the labours of his apostles was committed to writing, while thousands were living who could attest to others the credibility of all that the history contained. Miracles, therefore, were no longer necessary; the future success of the gospel might be safely left to the operation of natural means, and by such only, we are inclined to believe, it was from that time aided. It is certainly a remarkable fact, that in the writings which are ascribed to the Fathers who are called Apostolic, who were the immediate successors of the apostles, no pretensions on their part to the possession of any supernatural powers are advanced.

In an Appendix to this chapter, some very valuable extracts, in reference to this subject, are given from some manuscript Lectures on Ecclesiastical History, by the late Dr. J. Hey; justly described, as all will acknowledge who are acquainted with the excellent course delivered by him as Norrissian Professor, as “one of the most acute, most impartial, and most judicious divines of modern times.” (P. 163.) We cannot refrain from citing the following passage:

“The authors on both sides of this question concerning the reality of the miraculous powers in the primitive Church, seem to have looked too far *before* them, and to have argued the point with too much regard to the *consequences* which were likely to follow from its being determined in this manner or in that. Those who defend the pretensions of the Fathers, do it through

fear, lest, if they should appear indefensible, the cause of Christianity should suffer by the condemnation of its early propagators. Those who accuse the Fathers of superstition, weakness, or falsehood, consider what indelible disgrace they shall bring upon Popery by shewing the impurity of the sources from which all its distinguishing doctrines have taken their rise. But why, in searching after *truth*, should we give the least attention to any consequences *whatsoever*? We know with certainty before-hand, that error of every kind, if it is not an evil in itself, is always productive of evil in some degree or other; and that to distinguish truth from falsehood, is the likeliest method we can take to make our conduct acceptable to God and beneficial to man. Nothing can be more groundless than the fears which some men indulge; lest the credit of Christianity should suffer along with the reputation of several of its professors; or more weak than considering *that* a sufficient reason for defending the veracity of the Fathers at all events. There are some miracles recorded in ecclesiastical history which are too childish and ridiculous for *any one* to believe; and there are *some indisputable* records of the vices of the Christians, and more particularly of the clergy: so that, if Christianity can suffer by *such* objections, (for which there is no kind of foundation in reason,) it has *already* suffered even in the estimation of those who think the objections of weight. All agree (at least all Protestants) that there have been pious frauds and forged miracles, as well as that the sacred order have been in some ages extremely vicious. The only difference then is in the *degree* of this charge, or rather about the century with regard to which it ought to take place; but what difference can such a circumstance as that make in respect of the divine origin of Christianity? We may, therefore, without fear or scruple, enter upon the discussion which I have been preparing, and probe every apparent wound with resolution and accuracy."—Pp. 163—165.

The pretended miracle of the thundering legion, and the proposal of Tiberius to the Senate, that Christ should be received among the Gods at Rome, both of which rest chiefly on the testimony of Tertullian, next come under the review of the Professor: the latter of these is denied; and the former referred to the class of phenomena in the ordinary course of nature. An interesting sketch of the Apology, esteemed by Lardner as the "master-piece" of Tertullian, and a vindication of the early apologists for Christianity, against Mr. Gibbon, succeed.—With the progress of Christianity in the three first centuries, the sufferings of its professors are closely connected. To the subject of martyrdom, two of Tertullian's treatises, one of them entitled, "Ad Martyres," the other, "Scorpiace," expressly relate; and many passages in his Apology, and in several other works, bear testimony to the number of those who suffered, to their fortitude, and to what, in some cases, must be deemed their unwarrantable prodigality of life. The controversy which arose out of the attempt of the elder Dodwell to diminish the number of primitive martyrs, obtains from our author as much notice, perhaps, as it is entitled to receive, in the following passage; which serves at the same time to repel the insidious remarks of Gibbon, grounded upon Dodwell's statements:

" It can scarcely be necessary to remark, that the original signification of the word *martyr* is ' a witness; ' and though in later times the appellation has been generally confined to those who proved the sincerity of their faith by the sacrifice of their lives, in the time of Tertullian it was used with greater latitude, and comprehended all whom the profession of Christianity had exposed to any severe hardship, such as imprisonment or loss of property—those who are now usually distinguished by the name of confessors. To this lax use of the term *martyr* must be chiefly ascribed the erroneous persuasion which has been so carefully cherished by the Church of Rome respecting the

number of martyrs strictly so called; for though it may have been greater than Dodwell was willing to allow, it is certain that his opinion approaches much nearer to the truth than that of his opponents. We shall, however, form a very inadequate idea of the sufferings endured by the primitive Christians, if we restrict them to the punishments inflicted by the magistrate, or to the outrages committed by a blind and infuriate populace. Many who escaped the sword and the wild beasts, were destined to encounter trials of the severest kind, though their sufferings attracted not the public attention. When we consider the species of authority exercised by heads of families in those days, and the hatred by which many were actuated against Christianity, we may frame to ourselves some notion of the condition of a wife, a child, or a slave, who ventured to profess a belief in its doctrines. This alone was deemed a sufficient cause for repudiating a wife, or disinheriting a son; and Tertullian mentions by name a Governor of Cappadocia, who avenged the conversion of his wife by persecuting all the Christians of the province. So heinous indeed was the offence that it cancelled all obligations. He who committed it became at once an outcast from society, and was considered to have forfeited his claim to the good offices of his nearest kinsman; nor were instances wanting, if Tertullian's expressions are to be literally understood, in which a brother informed against a brother, and even a parent against a child.”—Pp. 137—140.

Again,

“ Those more refined and ingenious torments which Gibbon supposes to have existed only in the inventions of the monks of succeeding ages, were, if we may believe Tertullian, actually resorted to in his day. He states also that attempts were frequently made to overcome the chastity of the female martyrs, and that instead of being exposed to the wild beasts, they were consigned to the keepers of the public stews, to become the victims either of seduction or of brutal violence.”—P. 157.

We cannot wonder, though we may regret, that in such circumstances undue honour was paid to the martyr on the one hand—and on the other, too great severity was manifested towards those who could not endure persecution. The doctrine of the efficacy of martyrdom, to wash away every stain of sin, and to procure for the soul, on its separation from the body, an immediate admission to the perfect happiness of heaven, was adapted to encourage an imprudent, if not a sinful sacrifice of life, and to cherish superstition and fanaticism; and in the discredit attached to shrinking from suffering and danger, was laid the foundation of those internal divisions which during a long period agitated and degraded the church.

The *third* chapter treats of the State of Letters and Philosophy; the subject with which Mosheim begins the Internal History of the church. In this part of his account of the second century, his observations relate principally to the New Platonism in Egypt, introduced by Ammonius Saccas; and in his account of the third century, they almost entirely refer to Plotinus, the most celebrated of the disciples of Ammonius. On these subjects the writings of Tertullian afford no information; from them, therefore, the learned Professor can derive no assistance in filling up Mosheim's outline. He rightly judged, however, that an examination of Tertullian's own philosophical or metaphysical notions would supply some curious and not uninteresting information. These notions appear in various passages of his writings; but particularly in two treatises; the one entitled, “ *De Testimonio Animæ*,” the other, “ *De Animâ*.” The design of the former is to prove that the soul bears a natural testimony, universally and uniformly, to the existence and perfections of God, and to a future life and judgment. This is a favourite

topic with him ; often urged in his reasonings with those who admitted not the authority of Scripture, or who evaded the arguments he drew from profane literature ; bearing, it is evident, a very close resemblance to the Common-sense philosophy of modern days. The latter treatise seems to have been composed in opposition to the Platonists, the Valentinians, and the Pythagoreans. The soul, according to Tertullian, includes both the vital and intellectual principles ; has a beginning, but is in its own nature immortal ; deriving its origin from the breath or substance of God ; it is corporeal, having length, breadth, height and figure, an interior man corresponding in form and feature to the exterior ; it is simple and uncompounded in substance, and endued with free will, which is, however, subject to the influence of divine grace ; it is affected by external circumstances, is rational, possesses an insight into futurity ; at death, is separated from the body ; descends to the parts below the earth, and there remains till the day of judgment, receiving a foretaste of the happiness or misery which is to be its everlasting portion. The souls of the martyrs alone pass not through this middle state, but are transferred immediately to heaven. The separation of the soul from the body, he considers a consequence of the fall of Adam.—Acknowledging that some of his speculations may appear trifling, and many of his arguments weak and inconclusive, the learned Professor rightly observes, “ It would be the extreme of absurdity to compare the writings of Plato and Tertullian, as compositions ; but if they are considered as specimens of philosophical investigation, of reasoning and argument, he who professes to admire Plato will hardly escape the charge of inconsistency, if he thinks meanly or speaks contemptuously of Tertullian.” Brucker hints (*Hist. Crit. Philos.* Tom. III. p. 412), that Tertullian was led to adopt the philosophical notions he maintained, especially that of the corporeality of the soul and of all spirits, not excepting even God himself, by his hatred of Plato’s doctrines, and his opposition to the Gnostic systems of emanation, derived from Platonism. This is by no means improbable. Dr. Priestley calls Tertullian “ the most determined Materialist in Christian antiquity ;” but surely he cannot be deemed a Materialist in the sense which is usually affixed to that term. The chapter concludes with a brief statement of Tertullian’s notions respecting the nature of angels and dæmons : in support of which he in vain appeals to the authority of Scripture.

(To be continued.)

ART. II.—*The History of the Reformation of the Church of England.* By Henry Soames, M. A., Rector of Shelley, in Essex. 2 Vols. 8vo. Reign of King Henry VIII.

The History of the Reign of Henry VIII., comprising the Political History of the Commencement of the English Reformation. By Sharon Turner, F. S. A. and R. A. S. L. Second edition. 2 Vols. 8vo.

A History of England from the First Invasion by the Romans. By John Lingard, D. D. Vol. VI. Second edition.

THE important portion of our history to which the works mentioned at the head of the present article are devoted, has lately received much illustration, not only from the labours and industry of historians and memoir-writers,

but also from the researches recently made in the State-Paper Office, the result of which, in the discovery of many most valuable documents, has, we understand, been highly interesting and successful. Should those documents be given to the public, we shall not fail to make our readers acquainted with their nature and value; at present our intention is to devote a few pages to the examination of the writers whose names are mentioned above; and in so doing, we propose to notice, in the first instance, that portion of their works which relates to the ecclesiastical history of this country during the reign of Henry VIII., and in a subsequent Number to give some account of the illustration which our civil history, during the same period, has received from their labours, and especially so far as it regards the character of the Sovereign.

It is not altogether creditable to our literature, that nearly three centuries should have elapsed since the Reformation, and yet that we should still be without a philosophical history of that great Revolution. The Protestant writers on the one hand, regarding it as the key-stone of their own Church, have been led by their partial feelings to mis-state both the principles upon which its proceeded, and the characters of those who were engaged in its execution; while, on the other hand, the partizans of the Roman hierarchy have spoken of it as men might be expected to speak who have witnessed the subversion of their prejudices and the destruction of their power. No historian, however, has yet ventured to set this signal event in that clear and true light in which all who correctly estimate the nature and value of religious freedom must regard it, as one single step only, though certainly a most important step, towards a real Reformation, and as furnishing not only a precedent, but admitted principles, upon which to argue the great question of perfect liberty in matters of conscience. The reasons which were urged by the first Reformers against the spiritual domination of a Pope, apply with equal force to the supremacy of a Potentate; and when Cranmer proved the absurdity and injustice of allowing Clement to controul the consciences of Englishmen, he in effect disproved the existence of a similar right in Henry, in whose hands it was really more dangerous, as more closely allied to temporal authority. To impugn the authority of the papal Bull, was, in fact, to subvert the Articles of the Protestant Church; and, however misrepresented by those who are interested in staying its progress, the Reformation must be regarded as the commencement merely, and not the completion, of the great scheme of religious independence.

In the application of the principles upon which the Reformation was founded, its early supporters fell into a lamentable but not uncommon error. They clearly saw the iniquity of suffering a foreign potentate to impose upon them a rule of faith, but they were not unwilling themselves to exercise a similar coercion over the consciences of their countrymen. The spirit of Popish supremacy still reigned in their hearts, though they liked a Royal Pope better than an Episcopal one; and the evil dominion over the religious opinions of men, which was found so grievous when lodged in the hands of the Roman Pontiff, was only transferred and not destroyed. The merit, therefore, which the most prominent founders of the Reformation here are entitled to claim, is not of the highest order. They exerted themselves willingly to effect a transfer of power in which they were themselves to become sharers, and to which they might be prompted by a desire to conciliate the affections of their sovereign. How truly devoid of the sincere spirit of religious liberty, or even of toleration, these men were, is evinced by the whole history of their times, in which we find them exercising towards those whom they deemed

schismatics and heretics, the same persecuting cruelties which they themselves afterwards, in many instances, endured at the hands of their Popish adversaries. Had it been imagined at the period of the Reformation that such a measure could be construed into a recognition of the principle, that the religious opinions of every individual are solely under his own dominion and cognizance, there is little doubt that the contemplated change would have been viewed with terror and abhorrence, and that the Churchmen who so zealously promoted its progress, would decidedly have preferred the servitude of Rome to a freedom so dangerous to their dearest prejudices and interests.

But views like these cannot be expected from a member of that Church which was erected by the hands of the English Reformers. To Mr. Soames the Reformation is a work which left nothing to be desired, and which placed upon a sure basis the interests of rational religion. In transferring to the native Sovereign the supremacy in spiritual matters, that important power became re-vested in its original depository, and all that remained to be done was to guard it from resumption by the Roman Pontiff. The persons engaged in effecting this change are of course regarded by Mr. Soames as men who laboured wisely and well in their great calling, and whose characters are to be held up to the love and veneration of posterity. The Catholics and their proceedings are, on the other hand, regarded by him with a jealous and an evil eye ; and though the two parties at this period differed very slightly indeed, either in principle or in practice, a most partial measure of praise and censure is dealt out to them. When Cranmer presides at the trial of a wretched Sacramentary, and condemns him to the flames, an excuse is found for the Reformed Prelate, in the plea that he was merely the instrument of the law ; but when the persecutions of a Popish Bishop are detailed, we find no industrious collection of extenuating circumstances. Even the cruel policy of Henry meets with but a small portion of that reprobation which would have been, without doubt, bestowed upon it, had he committed his atrocities in endeavouring to force Catholicism upon his subjects ; and when Mr. Soames no longer can venture to withhold his censures, the cruelties and persecutions of the king are attributed to the instigation of the Catholics. The ecclesiastical hatred descends also on the children's children ; the fight is still for the goodly birthright won from the Papal Antichrist : and if the crime or folly of the Popish zealot of other days is blazoned forth, it is to point the popular venom against his ill-fated descendant.

In preferring these charges against Mr. Soames, we do not mean to impute to him an intention to misrepresent or to mislead. To expect that a faithful son of the triumphant Church should produce a just and impartial narrative of the Reformation of his own Church, and the fight by which she won what he means to keep, is almost as reasonable as to look for a correct history of the Catholic hierarchy from the college of Cardinals. But, unfortunately, the evil and mischief of this false colouring are not materially diminished by the honesty of the historian whose hand lays it on. That Mr. Soames has, with an unsparing hand, made use of these false colours in the picture which he has drawn of the Reformation, we shall soon proceed to shew, although the full effect of his misrepresentations cannot be properly appreciated without a perusal of the whole texture of his work.

The partial feelings of our Churchmen are in nothing more evident than in their estimation of the character of Henry VIII., whom they regard as the champion of the Reformation. Had that Prince been indeed actuated by the true spirit of religious freedom and reformation, in his opposition to the tyrannical dominion of the Roman See, he might have attracted some portion

of our regard, notwithstanding the abhorrence and disgust with which other parts of his character inspire us. So far, however, was Henry from acknowledging, in the most distant manner, the right of private judgment in matters of religion, that never, under Pope nor under Potentate, were the consciences of men held in more thorough thralldom than under this reforming Sovereign. To make his own opinions, instead of those of Popes and Councils, the standard by which his subjects were to form theirs, is the sole merit to which, as a Reformer, he is entitled. But in the eyes of Mr. Soames, the royal antagonist of Popery necessarily finds favour, and excuses are framed and apologies offered for some of his most reprehensible acts. No one who has fairly studied the character of Henry, can doubt for a moment that, in procuring his first divorce, his pretended religious scruples were merely urged in order to further his personal wishes; and yet we are gravely told by Mr. Soames, (Vol. I. p. 258,) that “he could not rest satisfied until his marriage was dissolved by the same authority that had allowed him to contract it; so that while he gratified his love for Anne Boleyn, his conduct should be solemnly pronounced no other *than such as became a man of religion and integrity.*” So, again, we are informed that “something must in fairness be conceded to the King’s conscientious scruples, by those who are anxious to take a sound view of this memorable affair.” (P. 264.) The conduct of Henry itself furnishes an answer to these remarks. He made Anne Boleyn his wife before his prior marriage had been “dissolved by the same authority that had allowed him to contract it;” and little credit can be given to scruples which never occurred to his mind for the first seventeen years of his marriage, nor until a new passion had rendered the person of his wife distasteful to him.

It is not merely by offering apologies for the conduct of Henry that Mr. Soames endeavours to raise his character in the estimation of his readers, but he has also adopted the indirect system of which Hume has made so skilful a use, that of bestowing upon his champion eulogistic epithets, to which he has not in reality the slightest claim. Thus, in speaking of the King’s conduct to Catherine of Arragon, after their separation, he says, (Vol. I. p. 390,) “He so far departed from *his wonted nobleness of mind*, as to harass the repudiated Princess by a second message in July, of which the Duke of Suffolk was the bearer”—as if nobleness of mind could dwell with the dark and cruel passions which inhabited the bosom of Henry.

But it is chiefly in reviewing the conduct of Henry in Ecclesiastical matters, that the prejudices of Mr. Soames manifest themselves. Aware that every person of common feeling must reprobate the severities practised at the period of the Reformation, Mr. S. endeavours sometimes to justify them as acts of political necessity, and sometimes to throw the blame attaching to them entirely upon the Catholics. Thus, in speaking of the unfortunate Carthusians, who suffered, to the letter, the pains of treason, for refusing to acknowledge the King’s supremacy, Mr. Soames makes the following observation: “Nor are rulers ever placed under more painful circumstances than when, from a due regard to the public peace, and to their own security, they are obliged to visit honest but dangerous men with the penalties of the law”—a plea which might be urged with precisely the same degree of justice by all who choose to impose their dogmas upon others, and to regard a reluctance to receive them as the sign of rebellion. A similar apology is offered for the execution of Fisher and More, a deed of barbarity which even Mr. S. acknowledges “has impressed a stain of cruelty upon the Reformation.” In the same spirit, the execution of the Maid of Kent, and of those who perished with her,

is styled “an act of justice;” as though superstition, or folly, or priestcraft, were a crime which the principles of justice required to be punished with death. But in attributing the atrocities of Henry’s reign to the Papists, Mr. Soames has displayed a more than usual ingenuity:—“Thus it appears that the cruelties of King Henry’s reign, though unquestionably casting a black shade over his memory, are mainly, if not entirely, attributable to either the principles or the practices of Romish partizans.” (Vol. II. p. 646.) Now it is certainly singular that the Catholics should be accused of being accessory to their own destruction. Are we then to believe that More and Fisher were not victims to the reformed doctrine of the King’s supremacy? If Mr. Soames merely means to tell us that the spirit of Popery is a persecuting spirit, we reply, that the same spirit pervades every system of faith which pretends to enforce its doctrines by pains or by penalties; and that in few churches has a larger proportion of that spirit resided than in the Reformed Church of England under Henry VIII., and that if the Roman Church be chargeable with more of its effects than any other, it has probably only its greater antiquity to thank for the pre-eminence. Not satisfied with imputing the religious severities of Henry’s reign to the Catholics, Mr. Soames, like other Protestant writers, charges them with inciting Henry to put Anne Boleyn to death, as though the King’s own headlong cruelty and unbridled passions were not sufficient to account for that deed of atrocity.

While Henry, as the great hero of the Reformation, is the especial object of Mr. Soames’s care, he does not neglect to sound the praises of the other principal persons engaged in that revolution, amongst whom Cranmer, of course, holds the most conspicuous place.

In attempting to vindicate the character of Cranmer from the charge of disingenuousness, in the protest made by him previously to taking the oath on his consecration, Mr. Soames advances principles which he would be the first to condemn in the Romanists. The particulars of this transaction, which has been much canvassed in the literary controversies respecting the life and character of Cranmer, were shortly these. In order to be legally consecrated, it was necessary that the Prelate elect should take an oath, which, according to its terms, might bind him to a line of conduct at variance, as he conceived, with his duty to his sovereign and his country. Unless such was his impression, he would, it is obvious, have considered a protest unnecessary; but the whole tenor of that instrument shews that he regarded it, in its words and ordinary sense, as prescribing duties which he could not conscientiously fulfil. “*Non est nec erit meæ voluntatis aut intentionis per hujusmodi juramentum vel juramenta, qualitercumque verba in ipsis posita sonare videbuntur, me obligare,*” &c. Indeed, the words of the oath were sufficiently pointed and explicit, as for instance, in the following passage—“*Papatum Romanum et regalia S. Petri adjutor eis ero ad defendendum, salvo meo ordine contra omnem hominem.*” The meaning of this passage, according to the interpretation of the party imposing the obligation, can scarcely be mistaken. The “*ordo*” there mentioned, is doubtless, as Bishop Marsh has observed, the *Monastic* order to which the Bishop elect belonged, and the clause was merely a saving of his privileges as a member of that order; but Mr. Soames has ingeniously enlarged the sense of the term to suit the latitude of Cranmer’s conscience. “*It may therefore,*” says he, “*be reasonably concluded, that the clerical or episcopal order is the one intended, and that consequently the prelate bound himself to nothing inconsistent with what he should consider to be his duty as a Christian minister.*” Does Mr. Soames then contend that this is the sense in which the clause was understood by the Court of Rome?

The interpretation is most improbable; but, continues he, “the oath is conceived in terms of ambiguous import, and is therefore such, possibly, as a conscientious clergyman may safely take; especially if he be careful to have it understood, at the time of this compliance, that he never will consent to interpret this evasive formulary in any manner inconsistent with his duty as a Christian and a citizen.” But by whom understood? Surely by the party imposing the oath; and had Clement been present at this protest, can it be conceived that he would have suffered the Archbishop elect to assume his new dignity? The conduct of Cranmer, however, on this occasion, is regarded by Mr. Soames as “a proof of his candour and integrity”! “With that sincerity by which he was so distinguished, he came forwards publicly before he took an ambiguous oath, to declare that he would consent to interpret it, and to act upon it, in that sense only which was perfectly unexceptionable!” That an exceptionable oath can be rendered unexceptionable by the uncommunicated protest of the party taking it, is one of those refinements in casuistry which we might expect to meet amongst the disciples of Loyola, but which we could scarcely have anticipated from a Protestant clergyman. Had Cranmer been as sincere in his desire of avoiding his new dignity, as some writers have supposed, the imposition of this oath would, it may be thought, have afforded a very plausible ground for refusing the mitre.

The portion of his work devoted by Mr. Sharon Turner to the History of the Reformation, is inconsiderable, and scarcely evinces the research and industry which are observable through the rest of his pages. He has, indeed, in his preface, given some explanation of this omission.

“The author has left the theological subjects which arose little noticed at present, that he may more distinctly consider them by themselves at a future period, when the great subject can be more justly and more intellectually contemplated on its moral and philosophical bearings, and as a completed whole. In the meantime, the works of Burnet and Strype, the late publications of Mr. Butler and Mr. Southey, and the recent history of Mr. Soames, will fully supply all the religious details which are here deferred.”

In attributing the Reformation to political rather than to religious causes, Mr. Turner has taken a more correct view of that event than Mr. Soames: but his unfortunate resolution to vindicate the character of Henry (of which we shall say more hereafter) forbids us to look for either a candid or a philosophical narrative of that event from his hands. The spirit in which we may expect this subject to be treated may be gathered from the brief specimen which Mr. Turner has presented to us in the present volumes, and especially from the severity with which he has commented upon the character of Sir Thomas More.

The limits which we have prescribed to ourselves will not permit us at present to enter into a detailed examination of Dr. Lingard’s History, so far as it is connected with the Reformation, but we shall probably revert to it on another opportunity. We shall only observe, that it lies open to much remark, more especially in the confidence with which Dr. L. cites the authority of Sanders and Pole, upon whose statements it is difficult to place reliance. We shall, however, conclude by quoting his succinct history of religious intolerance:

“The king, like all other Reformers, made his own judgment the standard of orthodoxy, but he enjoyed an advantage which few besides himself could claim—the power of enforcing obedience to his decisions. That the teachers of erroneous doctrine ought to be repressed by the authority of the civil magistrate, was a maxim which at that period had been consecrated by the assent

and practice of ages. No sooner had Constantine the Great embraced Christianity, than he enacted against Dissenters from the established creed the same punishments which his pagan predecessors had inflicted on those who apostatized from the religion of their fathers. His example was frequently followed by succeeding emperors; it was adopted without hesitation by the princes of the Northern tribes, who after their conversion were accustomed to supply from the imperial constitutions the deficiencies of their own scanty legislation. Hence religious intolerance became part of the public law of Christendom: the principle was maintained, the practice enforced by the Reformers themselves, and whatever might be the predominant doctrine, the Dissenter from it invariably found himself liable to civil restrictions, perhaps to imprisonment and death. By Henry the laws against heresy were executed with equal rigour both before and after his quarrel with the Pontiff."

ART. III.—*Mémoire en faveur de la Liberté des Cultes; couronné par la Société de la Morale Chrétienne; par M. Alexandre Vinet, du Canton de Vaud. Paris. 8vo. 1826.*

THE Canton de Vaud is a fit spot from whence a defence of the principles of religious liberty on the broadest scale should issue; and as the work before us has been crowned by the sanction and applause of a most respectable religious society in France, and may therefore be reasonably supposed to speak to a considerable extent the sentiments of the friends of freedom of opinion there, we shall give an analysis of its contents; and that we may still further illustrate the tone adopted in France on these subjects, and the freedom in which even public journals discuss them, we designedly confine ourselves to almost literally translating this analysis from the review of the book in the "Globe," an able and highly-interesting newspaper published in Paris three times a week.

The question of religious liberty, according to M. Vinet's view of it, resolves itself into the three following propositions:

No temporal power, no government has a right to decide upon the merits of different systems of religious opinion, nor consequently to exercise authority over them, or to protect one or more at the expense of the rest. Supposing, however, that a government had this right, it could not, from the very nature of religious opinions, fairly and justly exercise it; and finally, even if it were possible so to do, to attempt to exercise the power would be contrary to the interests both of the government and of religion.

The two first of M. Vinet's propositions are of course designed to make out the title to religious liberty as a right, while the tendency of the third is to recommend toleration as a matter of policy; that is to say, to enjoin the expediency of adopting in practice what the two others established as just in theory.

The arguments in support of the two first propositions are numerous. But they all resolve themselves into and are founded on this—that the free and honest exercise of religious conviction of every kind is and ought to be sacred and inviolable; and that we should no longer be men or accountable beings if any one had the right of compelling us to believe what seems to us to be false, or not to believe what seems to us to be true. Religious worship being merely the public profession of religious conviction, is entitled to the same liberty. That cannot be refused to the consequence, which is granted to the principle: acts of conscience are, therefore, as inviolable as conscience

itself, and hence, as no one has a right to force conviction upon us, no one has a right to dictate to us or controul our religious worship.

If, however, it should be argued that although this right cannot belong to individuals because of their equality one with another, it may yet be delegated to the state, as the common functionary or protector commissioned to maintain the public peace,—M. Vinet answers this objection by thus defining the legitimate functions of the state or civil power.

It is authorized to take care of and to support the *morale* of the social body, that is to say, to maintain public order and decency. This charge, however, implies no right to intermeddle with individual or domestic morality, and consequently no right over those religious or philosophical opinions which constitute its basis. When any one, therefore, makes a public profession of a particular religious worship or creed without any act which offends against public peace or order, he is out of the reach of the civil magistrate and in no wise accountable to him. If, on the contrary, a particular religion or worship violates the public order of society in any particular overt act, the state is authorized to check such an infringement, and to restrain that worship, or at least that part or act of it which offends against the peace of society ; but even then it has no right to proscribe the exercise of that religious worship altogether, under pretence that it contains something contrary to the laws of society. It has cognizance only of acts, not of opinions.

Still less has the state a right to require every one to adopt some sort of external profession of religion, if it should find some who on conscientious conviction decline to profess any. If, however, by acts or a public expression of indifference or disbelief in the opinions of others, an annoyance or social disorder is committed, the civil power resumes its right, and it may impose silence, only, however, in those respects in which an act of offence against the peace of society has been committed. The state, in short, stands on the same footing with conscience as every individual does, having no right over conscience itself or its acts, whether positive or negative, provided that these acts are not opposed to the execution of the laws or to the respect due to public morality.

M. Vinet then proceeds to the supposition of the state being invested with this *right*, which he denies to be implied in its institution. Granting that it is empowered to preside over the conscience, to bend it according to its own discipline, that is to say, to impose any sort of what it calls truths, how is it to set to work ? The task is possible as far as regards *some* sorts of truths : such, for example, as are self-evident, and which common sense cannot refuse to admit. It would undoubtedly be tyrannical and absurd to proclaim a state arithmetic or a state geometry ; still, without setting up for an infallible arithmetician, the state could find some points in these sciences fixed and agreed on by all, which it might as well as not promulgate officially. In the case of religious truth, or axioms on the contrary, where shall we find the fixed point on which all agree ? The very essence of this truth is its being matter of revelation or deduction, and not being evident to the senses. The state is neither a philosopher nor a theologian ; but if it were, how many philosophers and theologians could be found who would exactly agree with it in defining a single point ? Does it ever happen that two men hold precisely the same opinions on these subjects ? To avoid this perplexity, the state must resolve on deliberating by itself, and abiding by its own opinion. Be it so : but then which of the thousand solutions, adopted by mankind from time to time, will it in the result make choice of, with regard to these impor-

tant and momentous questions? Suppose it to adopt Christianity as its standard of religious truth; still there are degrees and differences in Christianity. Will the state or will it not admit any one to be a Christian who does not believe the doctrine of the Divinity of Jesus Christ without any qualification? If it does not, the Socinian, the Pelagian, and many more professing Christians, are declared to be out of the pale of this law of the state. If, on the other hand, they are admitted, two sorts of truth are recognized as legal; the door is open to all kinds of dissent; and the end sought to be attained, is altogether missed. Take another supposition. Let there be a line drawn thus: say that only the Atheist and the Materialist shall be proscribed, because it may be assumed that there is not a particle of truth contained in *their* doctrines. Still this would be saying in other words, that the state not being able to decide what is the true religion, authorizes and establishes all, on consideration that every body shall profess *some* religion; but that those who refuse to profess *any* shall be punished. But are Materialists and Atheists the only persons who neglect the outward conformities of religion? There may be, for instance, a Deist who professes what is in accordance with all the great moral truths of Christianity; must he, unless he conforms to some ceremonial of worship, be persecuted or proscribed? Would you protect the Jew or the Armenian, or even the Indian who worships a God under nobody knows what absurd incarnation, while the man who thinks with Plato or Marcus Aurelius should be put out of the protection of the laws? Nothing could be more absurd.

There is then no medium. The state, if it would not outrage common sense, must make no difference between differing opinions on matters of religion or philosophy, whatever they may be. It must grant equal liberty, equal protection, to all sorts of belief or disbelief, as matters of opinion. What, it may be said, is the Atheist then to be protected? M. Vinet says, Yes! and here the honesty of his conviction is put to the test. An Atheist is in his eyes a monster, and he calls him so involuntarily, yet he claims for him toleration and protection; and it is only in the event of his seeing such a person practising, by overt acts, what we may consider the consequence of his principles, and committing actions destructive of the peace and order of society, that he would consider himself justified in departing from his neutrality, and then only to restrain the acts, not the opinions.

In short, M. Vinet contends, that the nature of religious opinion precludes the possibility of the state's determining, with certainty and justice, which is the best, and can, therefore, adopt no one form of worship in preference to another; and secondly, that, if it had the power, liberty of conscience would forbid the right to exercise it.

This is the theory from which M. Vinet proceeds to the policy of its application. He supposes that it may be asked, admitting that social morality and forms of religion are distinct, Is there not a necessary connexion between civil order and religion? The state is not an abstract existence without passions or prejudices; it is an assembly of men who, as men, have their opinions. How then, it may be said, can it be expected that when possessed of power they should not and ought not to employ it to protect the faith which they adopt? Besides, in so doing, they may be actuated by the best motives; among governments there *may*, perhaps, be some who consult the good of the governed. May not, therefore, one who is convinced of the efficacy of religion on the morals of men, and who is convinced that the religion he professes is pure, mild, and full of good fruits, give it his encouragement, protect it, and seek to make it prevail over all others?

Be it so!—The state and every good man would wish such a religion to triumph. Its influence is the best remedy for the evils which disturb society. But the question then arises, What is the best means of attaining the end desired? Is it best to declare this religion, the religion of the state? Beware, says M. Vinet; if you do, you wither it at the root. You may see its ranks swell in numbers, but what signify numbers? A thousand hypocrites are not worth one honest believer. Power may propagate opinions, but propagate only to destroy. The conscience is not reached, the surface only is touched. This is not the conquest which is desired; it is faith that is wanted, not conformity; piety and sincerity, not the parade of ceremonials.

Power too, however justly administered, has and makes itself opponents, and these opponents insensibly range themselves against the religion which power establishes. The friends of the state adopt its faith in sycophancy, its enemies reject it from a spirit of opposition. Even for those who resist prejudice of either sort, religion loses some of its charms when allied to power; truth itself is suspected when imposed upon us authoritatively, and one almost feels a pleasure in resistance.—Woe to truth when it comes with such allies. When resistance becomes a point of honour, hesitation swells into decision; and incredulity is magnified into heroism.—The ministers, too, of religion become puffed up with pride and the feeling of power. Little by little they forget their station; they cease to care about convincing, and begin to persecute; peace and charity are far from their lips.—But this is not all; the state's quarrel becomes theirs; the state meddles with religion, and they in return meddle with the state; it gives them the support of soldiers, and they repay the obligation with sermons; thus the pulpit becomes a political tribune, and where then is religion?

Thus, then, M. Vinet argues, the interest of religion and the interest of society (which has need of religion) concur in recommending that the state, as a state, should have none. It would not be Atheistic on that account, as some pretend. Atheism implies certain opinions, and the state should have none; it neither denies nor maintains any thing. Confining itself to its legitimate province, it should regulate only the purely civil transactions of the community, granting to all its members equal rights whatever be their opinions; and as to modes of worship, it should give free liberty to all, without salaried any, without favour, prerogative, or preeminence to any. By the force of emulation, and the free collision of opinion and reason, truth will ultimately prevail, and then, at least, its triumph will be pure, honourable, and useful, for it will be the triumph of truth, and of truth alone.

A dream it is, it will be said, of days to come: and so M. Vinet admits; but, as he contends, no idle Utopia. There are still many countries where it might not be prudent thus to emancipate all religions, but it is not the less on that account the end towards which the honest and faithful believer, as well as the sound politician, should aim; since it is the only sure road of keeping alive active and honest zeal in the cause of religion, at the same time that it preserves the peace and harmony of society.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

ART. IV.—*A Discourse preached at the Dedication of the Second Congregational Unitarian Church, New York, Dec. 7, 1826.* By W. E. Channing. New York, 1826. 8vo. pp. 57.—Reprinted in England under the following title: *The superior Tendency of Unitarianism to form an elevated Religious Character. A Discourse, &c.* Reprinted from the New York Edition. Liverpool, F. B. Wright: London, Teulon and Fox, R. Hunter, and D. Eaton. 1827. 12mo. pp. 41.

THIS is a very remarkable Sermon, and has caused, as we are informed, a considerable sensation in America. Its object is to shew the superiority of Unitarianism to all other forms of Christianity as a means of promoting “*true, deep and living piety.*” Not content with repelling an accusation constantly brought against the opinions which we receive as scriptural and true, Dr. Channing boldly carries the war into the territories of our opponents, exposes the evil tendency of their most favourite doctrines, and establishes by comparison the superior interest and value of our sentiments. The subject is well chosen in reference to the occasion on which the discourse was delivered, and, in his mode of treating it, the author has displayed the intellectual power, the depth of feeling, the energy of expression, and at the same time the gentleness of spirit, which have secured for his former writings such deserved popularity. Taking as his text Mark xii. 29, 30, Dr. Channing first observes, that the building is dedicated “to the worship of the only living and true God, and to the teaching of the religion of his Son Jesus Christ.” His remarks on the dedication service, to which some have made objections, are excellent and of very extensive application. They are worth the attention of those who object to services at the settlement of Christian ministers. “We are not among those who consider the written word as a statute book, by the letter of which every step in life must be governed. We believe, on the other hand, that one of the great excel-

lencies of Christianity is, that it does not deal in minute regulation; but that, having given broad views of duty and enjoined a pure and disinterested spirit, it leaves us to apply these rules and express this spirit according to the promptings of the divine monitor within us, and according to the claims and exigencies of the ever-varying conditions in which we are placed. We believe, too, that revelation is not intended to supersede God’s other modes of instruction; that it is not intended to drown, but to render more audible the voice of nature. Now nature dictates the propriety of such an act as we are this day assembled to perform.” Having observed that the building is dedicated to the Unitarian doctrine, “and to Christianity interpreted in consistency with it,” he gives the conviction, that this system “is peculiarly the friend of *inward, living, practical religion,*” as the great motive for zeal in its propagation, and thus introduces the proper subject of his discourse. We cannot withhold from our readers his explanation of what he claims for Unitarianism: “In speaking of Unitarian Christianity as promoting *piety*, I ought to observe, that I use this word in its proper and highest sense. I mean not every thing which bears the name of piety, for under this title superstition, fanaticism and formality, are walking abroad and claiming respect. I mean not an anxious frame of mind, not abject and slavish fear, not a dread of hell, not a repetition of forms, not church going, not loud profession, not severe censures of others’ irreligion; but filial love and reverence towards God, habitual gratitude, cheerful trust, ready obedience, and, though last not least, an imitation of the ever active and unbounded benevolence of the Creator.” The remarks on the various influences which modify the evil effects of erroneous creeds, are in their principle truly philosophical, in their spirit delightful, and in their expression beautiful. We hardly know how to abridge, yet we must not give the whole passage. “I mean not,” he says, “in commanding or condemning systems, to pass sentence on their professors. I know the power of the mind to select from a mul-

tifarious system, for its habitual use, those features or principles which are generous, pure and ennobling, and by these to sustain its spiritual life, amidst the nominal profession of many errors. I know that a creed is one thing as written in a book, and another as it exists in the minds of its advocates. In the book, all the doctrines appear in equally strong and legible lines. In the mind many are faintly traced and seldom recurred to, whilst others are inscribed as with sunbeams, and are the chosen, constant lights of the soul. Hence, in good men of opposing denominations, a real agreement may subsist as to their vital principles of faith; and amidst the division of tongues, there may be unity of soul, and the same internal worship of God. By these remarks I do not mean, that error is not evil, or that it bears no pernicious fruit. Its tendencies are always bad. But I mean, that these tendencies exert themselves amidst so many counteracting influences; and that injurious opinions so often lie dead through the want of mixture with the common thoughts, through the mind's not absorbing them and changing them into its own substance; that the highest respect may, and ought to be cherished for men in whose creed we find much to disapprove."

We shall first enumerate the particulars in which the superiority of Unitarianism for the promotion of piety is maintained, and in which its tendency is contrasted with that of the opposite system.

1. It presents to the mind *one*, and *only one*, *Infinite Person*, to whom supreme homage is to be paid.
2. It holds forth and preserves inviolate the *spirituality* of God: here are some admirable remarks on the effect of Trinitarianism in materializing and embodying the Supreme Being.
3. Unitarianism presents a *distinct and intelligible* object of worship, a Being whose nature, whilst inexpressibly sublime, is yet simple and suited to human apprehension.
4. It asserts the *absolute and unbounded perfection of God's character*.
5. It *accords with nature*.
6. It opens the mind to new and ever-enlarging views of God.
7. It promotes piety *by the high place which it assigns to piety in the character and work of Jesus Christ*. After ably illustrating this point, and shewing the inconsistency of piety and devotion with supreme Godhead, the author indulges in a short digression to observe, "that we deem our views of Jesus Christ more interesting than those of Trinitarianism. We feel that we should lose much, by exchanging the distinct character and

mild radiance with which he offers himself to our minds, for the confused and irreconcileable glories with which that system labours to invest him. According to Unitarianism, he is a Being who may be understood, for he is one mind, one conscious nature. According to the opposite faith, he is an inconceivable compound of two most dissimilar minds, joining in one person a finite and infinite nature, a soul weak and ignorant, and a soul almighty and omniscient; and is such a Being a proper object for human thought and affection?" 8. Unitarianism promotes piety by *meeting the wants of man as a sinner*. This is one of the most interesting and striking portions of the Discourse. The author attempts to shew what a sinner needs; how Unitarianism fully supplies his wants, and how completely the doctrines of the Trinity and Atonement, notwithstanding their high pretensions, fail in this respect. The following passage will doubtless very much shock believers in the commonly-received doctrine of Atonement, and that it was likely to have this effect, the author has shewn that he was himself sensible; but, anxiously as we should avoid any wanton or useless attack on the religious feelings, or even prejudices, of others, we cannot but think in this instance that the effect will be useful, for we are persuaded that it is the doctrine which shocks, not any thing unjust in the representation of it; and we hope that many who were misled by mysterious language, and a reference to circumstances different to any thing which falls under their own observation, may be brought to perceive the real character of an error most injurious to the Divine perfections and pernicious in its influences on human minds: "This doctrine of an infinite substitute, suffering the penalty of sin, to manifest God's wrath against sin, and thus to support his government, is, I fear, so familiar to us all, that its monstrous character is overlooked. Let me then set it before you in new terms, and by a new illustration; and if in so doing I may wound the feelings of some who hear me, I beg them to believe, that I do it with pain, and from no impulse but a desire to serve the cause of truth. Suppose, then, that a teacher should come among you, and should tell you, that the Creator, in order to pardon his own children, had erected a gallows in the centre of the universe, and had publicly executed upon it, in room of the offenders, an Infinite Being, the partaker of his own Supreme Divinity; suppose

him to declare, that this execution was appointed as a most conspicuous and terrible manifestation of God's justice and wrath, and of the infinite woe denounced by his law; and suppose him to add, that all beings in heaven and earth are required to fix their eyes on this fearful sight, as the most powerful enforcement of obedience and virtue. Would you not tell him that he calumniated his Maker? Would you not say to him, that this central gallows threw gloom over the universe; that the spirit of a government whose very acts of pardon were written in such blood, was terror, not paternal love; and that the obedience which needed to be upheld by this horrid spectacle, was nothing worth? Would you not say to him, that even you, in this infancy and imperfection of your being, were capable of being wrought upon by nobler motives, and of hating sin through more generous views; and that much more the angels, those pure flames of love, need not the gallows, and an executed God, to confirm their loyalty?

" You would all so feel at such teaching as I have supposed; and yet how does this differ from the popular doctrine of Atonement? According to this doctrine, we have an Infinite Being sentenced to suffer as a substitute the death of the cross, a punishment more ignominious and agonizing than the gallows, a punishment reserved for slaves and the vilest malefactors; and he suffers this punishment, that he may shew forth the terrors of God's law, and strike a dread of sin through the universe."—In justice to the author we must add the following paragraph, though it must close our quotations: " I am indeed aware that multitudes, who profess this doctrine, are not accustomed to bring it to their minds distinctly in this light; that they do not ordinarily regard the death of Christ as a criminal execution, as an infinitely dreadful infliction of justice, as intended to shew, that without an infinite satisfaction, they must hope nothing from God. Their minds turn, by a generous instinct, from these appalling views, to the love, the disinterestedness, the moral grandeur and beauty of the sufferer; and through such thoughts they make the cross a source of peace, gratitude, love and hope; thus affording a delightful exemplification of the power of the human mind to attach itself to what is good and purifying in the most irrational system. But let none on this account say that we misrepresent the doctrine of atonement, the primary and essential idea of which is,

the *public execution of a God*, for the purpose of satisfying justice and awakening a shuddering dread of sin."—The ninth and last consideration in favour of the superior tendency of Unitarianism to promote piety is, that it is a *rational religion*, which, like all the others, is powerfully and successfully treated. The conclusion expresses a lively feeling of the value of the Unitarian doctrine, and the duty of diffusing it, and solemnly offers up the building to the service of God in the promotion of the great principles of true and practical religion. This Sermon eminently preserves the merit of uniting the defence of what is esteemed truth with practical utility. If it does much to convince the judgment and enlighten the understanding, it certainly does not do less to improve the heart. The piety which it claims as most naturally and most purely arising out of our sentiments, it causes to glow in our breasts with peculiar warmth, and excites us to love and cherish with increased ardour. Though employed in exposing error, it has no tendency to produce either angry or contemptuous feelings, and if it be apt to destroy a reliance on false grounds of hope, it does not do so without substituting those which can never be shaken. It is a Discourse which exhibits, as much as any with which we are acquainted, the true spirit of Unitarian Christianity, as well as the high intellectual powers of the gifted mind from which it emanates, and we recommend it to our readers with the fullest confidence of obtaining their gratitude for introducing it to their notice.

ART. V.—*The Blessedness of the Faithful and Wise Steward: a Funeral Sermon, preached in St. John's Church, Trichinopoly, on the Decease of the Right Rev. Reginald, Lord Bishop of Calcutta.* By the Rev. Thomas Robinson, M. A., Domestic Chaplain to his Lordship. 8vo. London, 1826.

FOR the immense field of duty before a Bishop whose diocese is India, no one seems to have been better adapted than Dr. Heber, so far as any one is capable in such situation of being much more than a moving pageant. The labour of any man will be pretty severe who traverses once or twice only during the probable duration of his career the vast world of territory placed under his guidance. From the many and affectionate

tributes to his memory, Dr. Heber cannot have been otherwise than an excellent and virtuous man, a conscientious performer of his ministerial duties, and a zealous advocate of the cause of Christianity. There is a document, however, printed in an appendix to this Sermon, which, however creditable to the Bishop's ingenuity, and however curious in itself, we cannot consider either very judicious or very charitable in its spirit. A Bishop bringing the glad tidings of the gospel into a heathen land from a remote corner of the earth, does not act, perhaps, with very good policy in charging two-thirds of the professors of the faith he wishes to recommend, with crimes of the deepest dye. "Beautiful are the feet of those which bring glad tidings of good that publish peace;" but they must bring kind and charitable feelings, or their professions are an empty sound; and so thinking, we feel that the worthy Bishop would have acted better if he had kept his tongue from slandering his neighbours, still more from imputing to them the sins of their forefathers.

This singular document is a letter addressed by him in a mixture of scriptural and Eastern style, to the Archbishop of the Christians of St. Thomas, whose history Dr. Buchanan has illustrated. Mar Athanasius was in Bombay on his road from Antioch to take possession of his See, and was hospitably received by Dr. Heber.

"To the excellent and learned Father Mar Athanasius, Bishop and Metropolitan of all the Churches of Christ in India, which walk after the rule of the Syrians—Mar Reginald, by the grace of God, Bishop of Calcutta,—Grace, Mercy, and Peace, from God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ.

"I have earnestly desired, honoured brother in the Lord, to hear of thy safe passage from Bombay, and of thy health and welfare in the land of Malabar. I hope that they have rejoiced at thy coming, even as they rejoiced at the coming of Mar Basilius, Mar Gregorius, and Mar Johannes.* And it is my prayer to God, that He who led our Father Abra-

ham the beloved from the land of his nativity, through faith, to a strange and distant country, may in like manner guide, protect, and prosper thee, in health and grace, and every good gift, in the love of thy people, and the spiritual fruit which thou shalt receive of them; as it is written, 'Commit thy way unto the Lord, and trust in Him: and He shall bring it to pass.'

"Especially, I have been desirous to hear from thee of the good estate of our brethren, the faithful in Malabar, the bishops, presbyters, and deacons; and also of my own children in Christ, the English presbyters who sojourn among you at Cottayam; may God reward you for your love towards them, and may the good-will which is between you be daily established and strengthened!

"Furthermore, I will you to know, my brother, that the desire of my heart and my prayer to the Lord is, that the holy name of Jesus may be yet further known among all nations; and also, that all who love Him may love one another; to the intent that they which are without, beholding the unity and peace that is among you, may glorify God also in the day of their visitation. Like as was the desire and prayer of the holy Bishop Thomas Middleton, my honoured predecessor in this ministry; whose memory is blessed among the saints of Christ, whether they be of the English or the Syrian family; not that there are two families, but one, which both in heaven and earth is named after His name who sitteth at the right hand of God, in whom all nations, tribes and languages, are united and shall be glorified together.

"I also pray thee to write me word how thyself and they that are with thee fare, and how my own children the English presbyters fare, and in what manner of conversation they walk with you. Furthermore, it is my hope, that by God's blessing, I may be strengthened shortly to pass to Madras, Tanjore, and Trichinopoly, visiting the churches there which belong to my nation; whence my mind is, if God will, to pass on to salute thee, my brother, and the churches under thee, that I may have joy beholding your order, and partaking in your prayers. And if there be any thing more, it may be explained when we meet; for a letter is half an interview, but it is a good time when a man speaketh face to face with his friend.

"This letter is sent by the hand of a learned and godly man, John Doran, one of the presbyters before me: who

* "The last Syrian Bishops (before Mar Athanasius in 1825) who went to rule the Church in Malabar in 1751; all the Metropolitans after them (called Mar Dionysius; or Cyrus, or Philoxenus, severally) being Indian Bishops of their ordaining."

purposeth, with thy permission, to sojourn in Cottayam, even as the presbyters, Benjamin Bayley, Joseph Fenn, and Henry Baker, have sojourned until now with license of the godly bishops of the Church of Malabar, to teach learning and piety to all who thirst after instruction, doing good, and offending no man. And I beseech thee, brother, for my sake, and the sake of the gospel, to receive him as a son, and as a faithful servant of our Lord, who is alone, with the Holy Ghost, most high in the glory of God the Father: to whom be all honour and dominion for ever. Amen.

“ Moreover, I beseech thee, brother, to beware of the emissaries of the Bishop of Rome, whose hands have been dipped in the blood of the saints, from whose tyranny our Church in England hath been long freed by the blessing of God, and we hope to continue in that freedom for ever: of whom are they of Goa, Cranganor, and Verapoli, who have in time past done the Indian Church much evil. I pray that those of thy Churches in Malabar,* who are yet subject to these men, may arouse themselves and be delivered from their hands. Howbeit, the Lord desireth not the death of a sinner, but his mercies are over all his works, and He is found of them that sought him not.

“ Our brother Abraham, Legate of the Armenian nation, who is sent from his Patriarch at Jerusalem,—may God rescue his holy city from the hands of the Ishmaelites!—who is with us in Calcutta, salutes thee. He also brings a letter which was sent by his hand to thee from the Syrian Patriarch at Jerusalem, and has not found means hitherto of forwarding it to thee at Malabar: and has therefore requested me to send it now to thee. All the Church of Christ that is here salutes thee. Salute in my name thy brethren Mar Dionysius, and Mar Philoxenus,† with the presbyters and deacons.—We, William Mill and Thomas Robinson, presbyters, that write this epistle in the Lord, salute you.

* “ *i. e.* all Churches of the Syro-chaldaic ritual, one half of which still are under the Romish yoke imposed by the Synod of Diamper. See Geddes and La Croze.”

† “ The former governor of the Church, who resigned the chair to the last Mar Dionysius, and now lives in voluntary retirement at Codangalangary, or Aihur, in the North.”

“ The blessing of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, be with you evermore. Amen.

“ (Signed in Syriac)

“ REGINALD, BISHOP.

“ *By the help of God, let this letter go to the region of Travancore, to the City of Cottayam, and let it be delivered into the hands of the grave and venerable Bishop, Mar Athanasius, Metropolitan of the Church of Malabar.*”

ART. VI. — *The Historical Evidences of Christianity Unassailable, proved in Four Letters, addressed to the Rev. Robert Taylor and Mr. Richard Carlile.* By J. R. Beard. 8vo. pp. 146. Robinson and Bent, Manchester; R. Hunter, London. 1826.

THE ignorance, hardihood and ribaldry of the two persons named in this title-page, have excited so much contempt and disgust in the minds of well-informed Christians, that they have been left in a great measure to their own extravagancies and follies. This is not perhaps wise; for disagreeable as is the task of exposing the practices of falsifiers of history and defamers of holy characters, lying statements and calumnious charges may impose upon the half-witted and “ willingly ignorant,” so long as they are not brought into open day-light. Mr. Beard has therefore deserved well of the moral and Christian public by this complete development of the arts of modern infidels. Upon his opponents it was not to have been expected that he should make much impression; but could any of their deluded followers be persuaded to read his pamphlet, it is impossible that with all their credulity they could any longer place confidence in these “ blind leaders of the blind.”

The last of Mr. Beard’s Four Letters exhibits an excellent view of the internal, and, what may be called, the *literary* evidence of the genuineness of the Christian Scriptures: stripped of all that belongs to the controversy with the famous London champions of infidelity, and somewhat enlarged, it would form a very useful pamphlet, and would procure for the author the reward of a wider perusal than can, we apprehend, be expected for the present publication, valuable as it is, on account of the wretched names of the antagonists whom he is obliged to bring forward, in order to encounter, on every page.

OBITUARY.

ANTHONY ROBINSON, Esq.

"Were the Supreme Being to appear before me and say—Mortal! lo, in my right hand is all truth, and in my left hand the love of truth: choose between them: I should make answer—Lord! give me the contents of thy left hand, those of thy right hand can be held by none but thee."—LESSING.

ANTHONY ROBINSON was born in July, 1762, at *Kirkland*, near *Wigton*, in *Cumberland*. His father, John Robinson, and his direct ancestors during several centuries, had resided on their paternal inheritance, and were, in the language of the Northern counties, *Statesmen*. In the happy mediocrity of his birth Mr. R. took pleasure, but rather in accordance with the prophet's prayer than as a modification of family pride. He received his education at the endowed grammar school of Wigton, where mathematics and the higher classics were taught. Being the youngest of three sons, he was designed by his father for trade, and his education was therefore probably limited by that object. Of his attainments in school learning little is known. It was a peculiar feature of his mind to hold in too little estimation every thing purely ornamental. Neither the fine arts nor polite literature had any value in his eyes, except in subserviency to serious truths and important duties. His avowed indifference to classical learning must have manifested itself both as cause and effect in the direction of his studies. He served an apprenticeship at Cockermouth, in *Cumberland*, but his father's death having left him in the possession of a small property and master of his own actions, on attaining his majority he availed himself of his liberty by becoming a pupil of Dr. Caleb Evans at Bristol, the head of an academy belonging to the Calvinistic Baptists. We are unable to account for Mr. R.'s abandonment of the Church of England, in which he was brought up, or his preference of a community so widely different from the Establishment. But we find, that having submitted to the rite of baptism, he pursued his studies for the usual period of three years; and at the end of that period accepted, under the auspices of his respected tutor, an invitation to supply

for six months an orthodox Baptist Church at Fairford, in *Gloucestershire*; he had, however, scarcely assumed the ministerial office before his sensitive and scrupulous mind was disturbed by the discovery that he was not universally acceptable to the congregation. On this he wrote to the church, inviting his own dismissal. In answer, he was informed, in respectful and kind language, that some members found his ministry "not adapted to their edification." And he was released from his engagement.

He now returned to the North, and even then contemplated resuming his first pursuits as a man of business. From this he was diverted by an invitation through his friend Mr. Job David, then a General Baptist Minister at Frome, who had recommended him to the church of that community, assembled at *Worship Street*, *London*. And it is worthy of remark, as shewing how early Mr. R. had made known to his friends that peculiar mode of thinking, which afterwards gave occasion to such notable productions from his pen, that Mr. David urged as a reason for his friend's remaining in the ministry the *intolerance* of their churches. As if a correction of this vice was a fitter object for the labours of an ardent and vigorous mind than the support of any system of abstract metaphysical opinions. In no other way, probably, could Mr. R. have been brought to adopt the ministry as a profession. A rapid and striking change had taken place in his opinions and feelings, when he first assumed the ministerial office at Fairford. No sooner was the duty imposed on him of accurately defining the articles of the creed he was to promulgate, than, his faculties being sharpened by that sense of duty, he felt his inability to fathom the mysteries of orthodoxy, and he trembled before the responsibility of being an assertor dogmatically of any doctrines. He was informed that the learned Mr. Bulkeley, who preached in *Worship-Street Meeting*, was "in some sort a Unitarian." In fact, neither Mr. B. nor Mr. Noble, the last pastor of the church, had deviated further from popular opinions than *Arianism*. The un-fixed state of the church on the dogma concerning the person of Christ, was a recommendation to the young divine,

and he consented to become their preacher, but the more solemn charge of the pastoral office he did not accept.

His personal connexion with his old friend and tutor remained unbroken. We have now before us an affectionate letter from the Doctor to his former pupil, kindly lamenting the change in his opinions, rejoicing that he had "not sunk into Socinianism," which he thought "less consistent than sober Deism;" and gently hinting, that his young friend would do well to "fix in Arianism—though far from the truth," rather than be "thus ever learning," and "kept fluctuating in the boundless ocean of speculation." No advice was ever more unfortunately addressed, for it became the fixed opinion of Mr. R., that to be ever learning is both the duty and end of human existence.

Mr. Robinson's services in Worship Street were interrupted by an event which altogether changed his prospects in life. By the death of an elder brother he inherited the paternal estate, which afforded a competent subsistence to a man of his humble wishes and simple habits. After a connexion of little more than a year with the Worship-Street congregation, he returned into Cumberland, where he remained, occupying his own estate, about seven years. During those few years he became husband, father, childless and a widower. The domestic losses which he sustained, deeply affected his spirits, for he had received from nature the perilous gifts of acute sensibility and very strong personal affections.

During this period the interests of religion had not been disregarded by him. He took an active part in the erection of a Meeting-House at Wigton, in 1788, and was one of the largest pecuniary contributors. Here he preached, but as a locum tenens only, until a regular minister was appointed. That minister was the late Mr. Davis, of whom Mr. Robinson published an interesting account in a late Number of the *Repository*.* Mr. Davis was a decided Unitarian—a circumstance which may assist us in conjecturing that Mr. Robinson had profited little by the well-meant counsels of his old preceptor. Mr. R., during this period, was an occasional preacher in the absence of his friend.

The direction which Mr. Robinson's mind had taken on matters connected with religion, was fixed during his retirement in Cumberland. The result was

given in his first work, "A Short History of the Persecution of Christians by Jews, Heathens, and Christians." A second edition is now before us, published by Johnson in 1794. It is a brief manual, written with the "humble aim to instruct the common ranks of society into a practical use of the history of the church." It opposes the precepts of Christianity to the practices of all churches, which are developed and reprobated with perfect impartiality, and advocates the utmost extension of the rights of conscience.

We have been informed by an old friend of Mr. R.'s, a professional gentleman, very competent to form an opinion on such a subject, that during his residence in Cumberland he printed and distributed in Wigton and the neighbourhood, a small pamphlet on "The Advantages of settling Disputes by Arbitration." Dr. — writes, "The pamphlet was so excellent that it ought if possible to be preserved, for I never read so much sound sense and such strong reasoning, compressed into so small a compass, and so perfectly intelligible to any human being." This pamphlet was reprinted by Johnson. But of this, as well as of another little book, "Hints to Juries in Trials for Libels," no copy has been found either at the publisher's or among Mr. R.'s papers.*

During his residence in the North, Mr. R. cultivated an acquaintance with Archdeacon Paley, of whom he used to say, that he was out of his place, and that he would have been as great a judge as his distinguished countryman, Lord Ellenborough.

The quiet pursuits in which Mr. R. indulged, were interrupted by the domestic calamities we have already mentioned. These led to an entire change in his views and plans of life. In the year 1796, he came again to London to settle permanently in business. About the same period he united himself for a second time in marriage, with a young lady of a respectable Cumberland family, a Miss Lucock. He entered into business as a sugar-refiner, in which he continued till his death, and in which, after the usual fluctuations of disappointment and success, he accumulated a handsome fortune.

* The gift or loan of a copy, communicated to the Editor of the *Monthly Repository*, or Mr. Hunter, St. Paul's Churchyard, would be gratefully accepted.

Though he professed to be merely a tradesman, yet he retained a strong interest in those momentous truths in which the happiness of mankind is involved, and became a steady and active assertor of civil and religious liberty. It was his good fortune to contract a close, personal intimacy with that excellent man, the late Mr. Joseph Johnson, of St. Paul's Churchyard. The unostentatious benevolence and integrity of his character, and the simplicity of his manners, were congenial virtues which Mr. R., after his friend's death, in 1809, was untired in eulogizing.

Mr. R. became a regular contributor to Johnson's Analytical Review, a short-lived publication, which deserved a longer duration. He took the department of politics and political economy, and adopted the signature of S. A. This lasted during the years 1797, 1798 and 1799. His articles are distinguished by clearness and spirit. He was by no means an unimpassioned contemplator of the great events of that momentous period, nor free from the illusions which it generated in every mind.

Mr. Robinson availed himself of his friend Johnson, in the publication of several small tracts.

In 1796 he published "The Catholic Church," a short but masterly argument, in which is opposed to the *pseudo* Catholic Church of Rome, as assuming infallibility, the genuine Catholicism of an institution in which "should be taught not the assertion but the examination of religious opinions; not the belief of, but an inquiry into, sacred positions—which should connect salvation, not with credulity but with sober thought and sincere benevolence."

In 1797, Mr. R. published, on occasion of the stoppage of the Bank, "New Circulating Medium; being an Examination of the Solidity of Paper Currency, and its Effects on the Country at this Crisis." The author partook of the general panic, and anticipated the national ruin which has not yet taken place, but which is still predicted.

In 1798, he published in 8vo., "A View of the Causes and Consequences of English Wars," which he dedicated to his friend Mr. William Morgan. An anxious solicitude for the happiness of mankind, and a just sense of their rights, will not be denied to the author, even by those who see in the work ordinary views, and an *uncritical* spirit.

In 1800, Mr. R. appeared as a controversial writer in "An Examination of a Sermon preached at Cambridge, by Ro-

bert Hall, A. M., entitled *Modern Infidelity considered with respect to its Influence on Society.*" Mr. Hall's eloquent discourse has attained just celebrity as a most splendid specimen of pulpit eloquence; Mr. R.'s Examination has been forgotten: yet a discriminating mind will allow to the Examiner as great a pre-eminence over the Orator in powers of thought, as inferiority to him in the graces of composition.

Persecution, in all its forms, had been the subject of Mr. R.'s painful study. That of infidels or sceptics by Christians was as offensive to him as any other, indeed more so, as in more decided opposition to the *pretended* principle of the persecutor. He who misrepresents and vilifies furnishes ready weapons to the persecutor; and with this impression Mr. R. penned his indignant and powerful Examination. He analyses with masterly skill the well-sounding common-places of his antagonist. We must in candour add our regret, when we observe, that there is a tone of acrimony, and almost of scorn, towards Mr. H., which is *single* in the history of Mr. R.'s works and mind. They had lived together as students at Bristol, and they parted *not* friends. Perhaps the possession of certain qualities in common, induced this alienation as much as the opposition of their opinions and tastes. It is but justice to add, that this is the only instance in Mr. R.'s life, where diversity of taste and opinion occasioned a want of friendship with those with whom he was connected. With the family of his old master at Cockermouth, with the son and descendants of Dr. E., he remained intimately connected during life; and he chose the Worship-Street cemetery for his family vault: proofs of affectionate attachment to those whom he had in some respect deserted.

In the same year, 1800, he printed, in quarto, but did not publish, "A Sermon preached to a Country Congregation in the Year 1795." In a caustic advertisement he remarks, that "out of many it alone survives, to report the labours of an individual who asks no longer the indulgence of a hearing, and who never thought the praise of the populace any honour." Its object is to prove, that on the several hypotheses—"There is no God"—"There is a God, and he is a malevolent being"—"There is a God, and he is benevolence,"—the conduct of a wise man will be the same. He takes care to assert his faith in the last doctrine; and his practical object seems to be, as in his answer to Hall, to shew

that even the Atheist is not without a principle of virtue. Indeed, Lord Bacon had long before observed, that Atheism "leaves a man to natural piety." In his bitter strictures on the supposed doctrine of the malevolence of Deity he apparently aims a blow equally at Hobbes, who asserts, "that in God power constitutes right," and at the doctrine of the "sovereignty of divine grace," as maintained by high Calvinists. "What conduct will such a religion produce? To invent protracted means of torment—and after torturing the body, to agonize the mind by drawing the picture of an eternal hell, would be the legitimate practice which such a religion would introduce."

It appears from this account of Mr. R.'s writings, that, though attached to religion, he contemplated with an eye of hostility its ordinary ministers, the priests of the established religions. He therefore readily concurred in trying the experiment of "a school of mutual instruction for adults." We borrow a term since invented. In 1796, he assisted in founding a small society which met on Sunday evenings for conversation, first in Crispin Street and then in Colman Street; no one of the ordinary attendants came near him in ability. At that period of alarm it excited the attention of the magistracy who interfered, and the society dispersed. They came within no law or regulation of police, but the period was critical. With similar professions other societies have sprung up in later days, with which Mr. R. could have no concern, for he was alike repugnant to the insincerity which has marked some, and the violation of decency and good manners which has distinguished others of these societies. The writer of this memoir does not feel himself called upon to deliver any opinion of such experiments, the expediency of which must depend on circumstances of time, place and person; nor could he with impartiality on this occasion; for it was at one of those humble meetings that he formed an acquaintance with Mr. R., which in due time ripened into a friendship to be terminated after a duration of thirty years by that event which puts a period to all our enjoyments. After so long and intimate an acquaintance it becomes him to say of his departed friend, that as he scarcely ever knew his equal in colloquial eloquence, in acuteness and skill, and promptitude in debate, so he never knew his superior in candour and sincerity; he loved truth sincerely and without wavering.

No imagined interest even of morality could induce him to affect an opinion he did not entertain. On many points of important speculation he would say nothing, and the friends who most honoured him respected his silence. It is possible that what Lord Clarendon said of John Hales was true of Mr. R., that he was silent from principle, conscious that he entertained opinions which he thought might injure others, though they had not injured him.

We are not aware of any other production of Mr. Robinson's pen, with the exception of articles which have at intervals appeared in the Monthly Magazine and in the former series of the Monthly Repository. It is a recollection of these latter articles which has encouraged the present writer to expatiate more at length on his friend's character and writings, than he should have ventured to do in any other publication; aware as he is, that the actual exertion of the rare powers of Mr. R.'s mind had fallen far below their capacity, and that he will live chiefly in the recollections of his personal friends and associates.

Mr. Robinson's connexion with the Monthly Repository began by an article of singular acuteness and ability, which excited great attention at the time, and generated no slight ill-will among some leading men of the Unitarians. In Vol. III. p. 184, appeared "Arguments to prove that Unitarians are not Rational Christians." This article drew down upon its author the severe comments of Mr. Belsham, Castigator, A Rational Christian, A Unitarian Christian, and Mr. Allchin. The controversy was continued till the late respected Editor of the Repository deemed it necessary, like the judge at an ancient tournament, to declare the combat at an end.

A brief enumeration of articles subsequently written by him may be acceptable to those who possess the miscellany. Vol. IV. p. 601, "Reasons for being a Churchman," in which the opposition between practical and speculative religion is strongly marked. Vol. VI. p. 149, signed D. D. has been ascribed to him. The article expresses his opinions, but not in his peculiar style. Vol. VII. p. 425, "On Creeds." Except in Lord Bacon's Essays it would be difficult to find so much wisdom in a single page. But the article is spoiled by a clumsy attempt at humour (in which Mr. R. was generally unhappy) in the invention of the term *creedite*. But the appellation should be forgiven for the sake of the portrait. One feature is, "They may

be said to fall down and worship their creed instead of their Creator." Vol. XI. p. 276, On "Calvinism" denying its pretensions to be more evangelical than Unitarianism; and an article headed "Misery of Life an Objection to the Divine Government." This would have been fitly written with mingled tears and blood, so pitiable wretched must the writer have been. It is due to his memory to relate that at this period (April, 1816) he was bowed down by a heavy domestic calamity. He lost a child to whom he was excessively attached. From the shock he never completely recovered. His views of human life were henceforth neither correct nor healthy. It may be here added, that believing man born to trouble as the sparks fly upwards, he estimated the virtues rather by their fitness to mitigate the evils of life than their capacity to confer felicity. In the same volume, p. 323, he deduces moral evil from natural evil. And in a subsequent article, Vol. XII. p. 393, urges, that criminals are to be contemplated rather with compassion than detestation, because pain produces crimes.* So he affirms, Vol. XIII. p. 254, that original sin is nothing but original misery. Mr. R., however, declares his assent to the Unitarian doctrine concerning evil and its origin.

In Vol. XII. are several painful articles on the doctrine of Malthus on population, signed *Homo*, a signature he afterwards adopted. Malthus's book seems to have materially contributed to the depression of spirits under which Mr. R. was at this period suffering. Vol. XII. p. 274, on Southey's Letter to W. Smith. Vol. XIII. p. 362, on a sentiment ascribed to Dean Tucker. The religious tone of this article is remarkable. One striking observation deserves repetition: "I have never yet met with a writer on eternal torments who did not write as if himself were without either part or lot in the matter." Vol. XIV. p. 226, fine remarks on Dr. Johnson. The warm eulogy passed on the writings and character of Mr. Belsham ought to be noticed, as proving the generous placability of his disposition. Vol. XIV. p. 617, on Lady Russell. Vol. XV. p. 93, on "Li-

berty and Necessity." "Doubt and suspense of judgment I conclude to be all that we can reach on this difficult and important question." This he wrote in 1820. The same conclusion he eloquently contended for in debate in 1796. In Vol. XVII. p. 11, he advances an argument in favour of liberty, which he anxiously wished to believe in, as he did in every doctrine promoting the well-being of man here and strengthening his hopes of a happy hereafter. Vol. XV. p. 593, "Importance of Revealed Religion." An earnest argument in favour of Christianity arising from the purity of its morality. This argument shews clearly what his life made manifest to his friends, that his affections were decidedly Christian. Vol. XVII. p. 163, in honour of Dr. Priestley for his moral as well as intellectual qualities.

The last, and certainly not the least excellent contribution of Mr. R. to the Repository was, Vol. XX. p. 53, an account of his old friend Mr. Davis, of Culmpton, formerly of Wigton. In drawing a beautiful picture of this good man, his biographer has undesignedly portrayed his own feelings and affections towards religion and religious men. That these were his last words deliberately penned for general perusal, adds to their interest.

The concluding years of Mr. R.'s life were not years of happiness. Old age was still at a distance, but the serenity of health was gone, as well as the vivacity of youth. For several years before his death, languor and debility had been slowly undermining his constitution. While he still continued to attend to business, his strength was gradually failing. The powers of body seemed exhausted. He kept his bed three weeks before he died. His sufferings were not acute; and he never lost his equanimity. He died on the 21st of January, 1827, in the 65th year of his age. He was interred in the cemetery attached to the Worship-Street Meeting, where, on the succeeding Sunday, an appropriate discourse was delivered by Mr. Aspland, which the deceased would have appreciated as it deserved, for the union of strong powers of reasoning and benevolent zeal for the truths of revelation.

Mr. Robinson was somewhat above the ordinary size; latterly corpulent; and his limbs were small, and seemed hardly able to sustain his frame. He had a florid complexion, a dark eye, prominent nose, and handsome mouth, his voice thin and piercing, his speech strongly marked with the Cumberland

* It is at least equally plausible to affirm that pain is also the cause of error, and certainly those speculative opinions which the friends of Mr. R. suspected him to entertain, seemed rather to have their origin in the excitations of wounded sensibility than to be the result of calm contemplation of human life and nature.

dialect ; his appearance altogether that of a remarkable man, a person of superior powers of mind.

Of the character of his understanding, and of his powers as a writer, the specimens given, and the books referred to, will enable every one to judge.

But those powers were more highly appreciated by those who associated with him daily, than by those who knew him only as a writer. The reproach that at an early period of his life he drew upon himself for too free indulgence in vehement censure and unsparing sarcasm, is to be met by this remark—that to imagine in one character a combination of a passionate love of every thing that is just and generous and lovely, an intense scorn of arrogance and imposture and vanity, with the most cool and impartial discrimination between all the shades of good and evil, would be foolish in a work of fiction, for it has never been met with in one in real life.

It may, indeed, startle those who have a lively recollection of Mr. Robinson's tone of conversation, to be told that he was a very humble man, for it is a common mistake to suppose that they who will not fall down before the idols of other men, are worshipers of themselves ; yet, in truth, this praise belongs to him. No man could be less egotic and more free from selfishness in every form than he was. No man could value his own opinions less than he did ; he never spoke of his writings in his family or to his friends. He never swerved from the political principles with which he first set out in life ; but the vehemence of party feeling had long subsided. He attached himself to the cause of reform, and concurred gladly in every specific project of improvement. He took a strong interest in the recently-projected London University, but he had very faint hopes of any material improvement in society, for he was of opinion that the evils of social life had a source deeper than the corruptions of government.

Of his character and conduct in active life it cannot be necessary to say much. His judgment was highly valued, and his counsel freely given on all matters connected with business, which he thoroughly understood theoretically and in practice. He took an active interest in the unsuccessful attempt to introduce East-India sugar on equal terms with the produce of the West Indies. In his parish, St. Andrew's, Holborn, he took the lead in resisting the attempts of the clergy to procure the erection of another church against the will of the inhabitants. It

has occurred to his friends occasionally, that the bar would have been the proper field for the exercise of talents such as his. For the study of the law, and the due application of it, indeed, he was eminently qualified. For the practice of the bar he would have been utterly disqualified by the acuteness of his moral feelings, which ever blended themselves with the operations of his understanding ; and he utterly wanted those *strong animal spirits* which are, after all, the main qualification for acting on the public mind.

To conclude, with an attempt to answer a question which may be put with peculiar propriety in the Repository, Could Mr. R. be justly deemed a religious man ?

If religion be a system of confident conclusions on all the great points of metaphysical speculation, as they respect the universe and its Author ; man and his position in the one, and relation to the other—it must be owned Mr. R. laid no claim to the character. But if the religious principle be that which lays the foundations of all truth deeper than the external and visible world ; if religious *feeling* lie in humble submission to the unknown Infinite Being, which produced all things, and in a deep sense of the duty of striving to act and live in conformity with the will of that Being ; if, further, Christianity consist in acknowledging the Christian Scriptures as the sole exposition of the Divine Will, and the sole guide of conduct in life—then, surely, he may boldly claim to be a member of that true Christian Catholic church, according to his own definition of it, “an association of men for the cultivation of knowledge, the practice of piety and promotion of virtue.”

H. C. R.

DR. JOHN JONES.

THIS accomplished scholar and voluminous writer, whose death was announced in our last number, (p. 224,) was born in the parish of Landingate, near Londover, in the county of Carmarthen. His father was a respectable farmer ; and the son had been destined for agricultural pursuits, till it was discovered that he had neither taste nor inclination for such occupations. From his earliest childhood he had evinced an unusual predilection for books. It was his frequent practice, immediately after breakfast, to disappear from the family circle, and retire to the banks of a secluded rivulet, about a mile from the house, and there pursue his stu-

dies till hunger compelled him to return. His memory was at this time remarkable for its strength and tenacity.

His father finding that it would be vain to attempt to consign him to the drudgery of the farm, resolved to educate him for the Christian ministry. With this view he procured for him the best instruction in the elements of the Latin and Greek languages which he could obtain in the country schools of the neighbourhood. He made the most of these slender advantages; and he imbibed, with the knowledge he acquired, an ardent desire to become a proficient in classical learning. About the age of fourteen or fifteen, he was sent to the College Grammar School at Brecon, one of the first classical seminaries in the Principality, always under the superintendence of a clergyma[n] of the Established Church, and then under the care of the Rev. William Griffiths. Here he remained three years, when the death of his father, in 1783, obliged him to return home.

About this period, his neighbour and relation Mr. David Jones, afterwards the colleague of Dr. Priestley, and known in the controversy with Dr. Horsley as the "Welsh Freeholder," was a student at the New College, Hackney. Through his recommendation, the managers of that institution admitted him a student on the foundation. Here he soon acquired the friendship and patronage of the late Dr. Abraham Rees, who then held the office of resident tutor. He remained at Hackney six years, enjoying, among other advantages, the enviable privilege of the classical instruction of the late Gilbert Wakefield, with whom he was a favourite pupil.

In the year 1792, the death of the learned and excellent Mr. Thomas Lloyd having created a vacancy in the office of classical and mathematical tutor in the Welsh academy, then stationed at Swansea, Mr. Jones was appointed by the Presbyterian Board to be his successor. After he had held this office about three years, some unhappy differences arose between him and his colleague, the late Rev. W. Howell, in which the students rashly embarked as partizans. The Board, finding that there remained no prospect of an amicable adjustment of the disputes, and not wishing to side with either party in a matter which was entirely personal, adopted the resolution of dismissing both tutors, and removing the institution to Carmarthen. On quitting Swansea, Mr. Jones settled at Plymouth Dock, as the pastor of the Unitarian congregation in that place. He remained here two years,

when he accepted an invitation to become the minister of the Unitarian congregation at Halifax, in Yorkshire. Here he resided for three years, joining to his ministerial labours the instruction of youth, an employment for which he was singularly well qualified by his high classical attainments, and the peculiar bent of his mind. From Halifax he removed his residence to London, where he continued till the end of his life.

Not long after his settlement in London, he married the only daughter of his friend and former tutor Dr. Rees. This lady died, without issue, in the year 1815. In 1817 he married Anna, the only daughter of the late George Dyer, Esq., of Sawbridgeworth, in the county of Herts, who, with two children, survives him.

After his removal to the Metropolis, Mr. Jones occasionally preached for his brethren, but never had the charge of a congregation. Under some momentary feeling of disgust, never explained to his brethren, he destroyed all his manuscript sermons, and, from this time, never could be prevailed upon to appear in the pulpit. He still, however, adhered to his profession; was a member of the Presbyterian body of London Dissenting Ministers; and, for some years, one of the clerical trustees of the estates and endowments of Dr. Daniel Williams.

A few years ago, the University of Aberdeen conferred upon him the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws, and within a year or two of his death, he was elected a member of the Royal Society of Literature.

Dr. Jones maintained a high reputation as a teacher of the classical languages. His instructions were for many years in great request among persons of rank and eminence, and he had to reckon, in the number of his pupils, some individuals of noble birth. He superintended for a considerable time the education of the sons of the late distinguished lawyer and philanthropist, Sir Samuel Romilly, and to the last he had under his care some young persons of opulent families. It must be observed here, to the honour of Dr. Jones, that while he was thus courted by the rich and the noble, he was ever ready to afford encouragement and gratuitous personal assistance and instruction to young men in humble circumstances, whom he found struggling with difficulties in the pursuit of learning.

Dr. Jones has acquired no small degree of celebrity as an author, if not by the uniform success, at least by the number, the originality, and the ability of his writings. In the year 1800, while he

resided at Halifax, he published his first work, in two volumes 8vo., under the title of "A Developement of Remarkable Events, calculated to restore the Christian Religion to its original Purity, and to repel the Objections of Unbelievers." His original design was to embody in these volumes all the facts which he meant to adduce to elucidate the meaning, and establish the credibility of the historical and epistolary writings of the New Testament. But his materials having unexpectedly accumulated as he advanced, he was able to carry on his plan no farther than the end of the Acts of the Apostles. These volumes contain a vindication of the authenticity of the disputed passage in Josephus; and the work is remarkable as conveying the first intimation of the hypothesis, for which he was afterwards so greatly distinguished, of Josephus and Philo being converts to the Christian faith. In the year 1801 followed a second part of this work, which the author entitled "The Epistle of Paul to the Romans analysed, from a Developement of those Circumstances in the Roman Church by which it was occasioned." In the former volumes he had intimated his doubts as to the success of his undertaking. He now became convinced that he had failed to interest the religious public in his speculations. He therefore discontinued the prosecution of his original plan, meaning, however, to resume the subject at a more advanced period of life,—“When,” he writes, “the fashionable levity and scepticism of the times should, in some degree, subside, and the spirit of party give way to a rational inquiry and a zeal for the truth.” In the year 1808, Dr. Jones published “Illustrations of the four Gospels, founded on Circumstances peculiar to our Lord and his Evangelists.” This work is distinguished by a mode of thinking peculiar to the author, and evinces an intimate acquaintance with the sacred writings and with Christian antiquity. It is, unquestionably, one of his ablest theological publications. Many of his “illustrations” are strikingly original, and as felicitous as they are original. They discover an acute mind, always feelingly alive to the unrivalled excellence of our Lord’s manner of instruction, and to the unstudied but exquisite beauties of his historians. Dr. Jones’s next work of this class appeared in 1812. It was entitled, “Ecclesiastical Researches, or Philo and Josephus proved to be Historians and Apologists of Christ, of his Followers, and of his Gospel.” The title of this work sufficiently explains its object. The author here maintains at length, the hy-

pothesis at which he had only glanced in preceding publications, that Philo and Josephus were Christians; and that under the name of Jewish believers, they were, in fact, recording the history and delineating the character of professors of the Gospel. A sequel to this work was published in 1813, in which the author proposed to trace the origin of the introductory chapters in Matthew and Luke’s Gospels from Josephus, and to deduce the peculiar articles of the orthodox faith from the Gnostics, who opposed the Gospel in the days of Christ and his Apostles.

Under the name of Essenus, Dr. Jones published, in 1819, a New Version of the first three Chapters of Genesis. The work was occasioned by Mr. Bellamy’s translation that had then just appeared.

In the following year, the appearance of numerous Deistical works induced Dr. Jones to print, in one volume, 8vo. “A Series of important Facts, demonstrating the Truth of the Christian Religion, drawn from the Writings of its Friends and Enemies in the first and second Centuries.”

Dr. Jones’s next publication was “A Reply to two Deistical works entitled, A New Trial of the Witnesses, &c., and Gamaliel Smith’s Not Paul but Jesus.” In the title of this work he assumed the name of Ben David.

His last publication of a theological character, which appeared in 1825, was entitled “Three Letters addressed to the Editor of the Quarterly Review, in which is demonstrated the Genuineness of the three Heavenly Witnesses, 1 John v. 7, by Ben David.” The aim of Dr. Jones in this tract is to prove that this much-disputed verse, which nearly all the most eminent scholars and writers of modern times have pronounced to be a forgery, was the genuine composition of the author of the epistle; and that instead of being foisted into the text, as is commonly maintained, for the purpose of supporting the doctrine of the Trinity, it was actually expunged by the earlier fathers, as furnishing a strong argument in favour of the proper humanity of Jesus Christ. This pamphlet exhibits, in the liveliest colours, the sanguine temper of the author’s mind, and displays great ingenuity, as well as enthusiasm in the maintenance of a favourite hypothesis.

Before we quit this class of Dr. Jones’s writings, we may remark here, that he was, for many years, a frequent contributor to the former Series of the Monthly Repository: we shall not attempt an enumeration of his articles. A large portion of our readers are already aware

that the chief object of most of his papers, was to vindicate and establish his favourite notion that Philo and Josephus were Christians, and the historians and apologists of Christianity; and to support the argument of his last piece on the authenticity of the text of the heavenly witnesses. His last contributions related to the Baptismal Controversy, in which he advanced an opinion that, to say the least of it, was altogether novel.

Dr. Jones ranked deservedly high as a scholar and philologist, and his writings on the classical languages are numerous. In 1813 he published a short Latin Grammar for the use of schools, which was reprinted in 1816. In 1804 he published a Greek Grammar, on an improved plan. This work was repeatedly reprinted; but in the last year he re-modelled and nearly re-wrote the work, and published it under the title of "*Etymologia Græca*, or a Grammar of the Greek Language," &c. The intention of the alterations in this edition, was to render the Grammar more generally useful to young learners.

In the year 1812 Dr. Jones published "*A Latin and English Vocabulary, on a simple, yet philosophical principle, for the Use of Schools.*" This work he afterwards greatly improved, and re-published, in 1825, under the title of "*Analogiæ Latinæ, or a Developement of those Analogies by which the Parts of Speech in Latin are derived from each other,*" &c.

But Dr. Jones's great work on language, to which he had devoted a very large portion of his active life, and the best energies of his mind, was his Greek and English Lexicon, which appeared in 1823, in one volume octavo. The success of this work equalled his most sanguine wishes. A large impression was rapidly sold. It was not to be expected that a work of this nature and extent could be sent forth wholly free from defects, or that the author, whatever might be his learning and critical skill, should be able in every instance to secure the concurrence of scholars in his derivations and explanations. But though the work may possibly be liable to some objection, the author has executed his task in a manner highly creditable to his industry, his erudition, his taste, and critical acumen. He has been rewarded by the approving verdict of some of the first scholars and critics of the age, and, among others, by the late Dr. Parr.

When the impression of this work was nearly sold, Dr. Jones printed another of a similar kind, but designed for a different class of persons. This he entitled the "*Tyro's Greek and English Lexi-*

con," which is a very excellent and useful publication. Dr. Jones had intended to revise the first Lexicon, and to republish it at some future period, with all the improvement which further researches and a more mature consideration could impart to it. He had, however, at the time of his death made very little progress, and the author's copy remains nearly in the same state in which it was printed.

Not long after the publication of the first Greek Lexicon, some severe animadversions in a critical journal, drew from Dr. Jones an indignant and triumphant reply, in a pamphlet which he entitled, "*An Answer to a Pseudo Criticism of the Greek-English Lexicon*, which appeared in the Second Number of the Westminster Review;" a criticism which he ascribes to a "*Mr. John Walker, late Fellow of Dublin College,*" and characterizes as a malignant personal attack.

In the course of the last year Dr. Jones published "*An Exposure of the Hamiltonian System of Teaching Languages, in a Letter addressed to the Author of an Article recommending that System, in No. 87 of the Edinburgh Review.*" We have taken some notice of this able pamphlet in our Review department, p. 109.

Dr. Jones's last work was entitled, "*An Explanation of the Greek Article, in Three Parts. 1. Analysis and Refutation of Dr. Middleton's Theory. 2. An Analysis of Matthiæ's Dissertation. 3. An Application of the Article to obscure Passages of the New Testament.*" This work was printed during the author's life-time, but he died before it was published.

The characteristics of Dr. Jones's mind were an irrepressible ardour and enthusiasm in the prosecution of whatever he undertook; great confidence in the correctness of his own views, arising from a consciousness of superior intellectual powers; an utter disdain of the authority of great names when he failed to be convinced by their arguments; a devoted attachment to truth, and a faithful adherence to what he deemed such, united with a fearless disregard of personal consequences. By posterity he will probably be better known as a scholar and philologist, than as a theologian and ecclesiastical historian; though he seemed himself confidently to expect that the progress of knowledge would tend to support his speculations, and to demonstrate to general conviction the correctness and truth of his theories. He has

left his literary property in the charge of trustees, providing that his classical works should be reprinted under the editorial care of his nephew, Mr. James Chervet, of Croydon, who had been educated by him, and of whose classical attainments and judgment he entertained a high opinion.

Dr. Jones was interred in the burying-ground of St. George's, Bloomsbury, the parish in which he had resided. Over the grave is placed a plain monumental stone with the following inscription :

Depositum
JOHANNIS JONES
L.L. D.
Societ. Regal. Liter. Soc.
Viri sacris profanisque literis
Apprime periti,
Qui die decimo Januarii
Anno Domini
MDCCCXXVII.
Obiit. T. R.

MISS E. HUTCHINSON.

Jan. 5, at Hemsworth, Yorkshire, Miss ELIZABETH HUTCHINSON, of Chesterfield, Derbyshire, aged 19. In the midst of apparent health, in the bloom of youth, the sterling excellence of her character just beginning to display itself, her friends indulging the most sanguine hopes with respect to the future, and witnessing with pleasure the gradual development of those virtues which are calculated to lend an ornament to private life, and shed a lustre on society—she was snatched away by the unsparing hand of death and hurried to the tomb. Her sufferings during her short illness were extremely great, but gentle and serene were her last moments, as had been the current of her life; for the unwearyed assiduity of an affectionate mother had deeply imbued her mind with the principles of pure Christianity; and she displayed in death a cheerful resignation to the decrees of Providence.

“ So fades a summer cloud away ;
So sinks the gale when storms are
o'er ;
So gently shuts the eye of day ;
So dies a wave along the shore.”

Her modest, unaffected manners, the purity of her mind, the goodness of her disposition, and the simplicity of her character, rendered her an object of general esteem, and peculiarly endeared her to the members of her own family, by whom her unexpected death will be long and deeply deplored. May all who knew and loved her, imitate her virtues! And

may her mourning relatives be consoled under their affliction with the joyful hope of meeting her again in another and a happier state of existence! W.

MRS. ELIZABETH HOWARD.

Jan. 9, Mrs. ELIZABETH HOWARD, as much lamented in death as she had been respected in life.

This lady, though unknown to public fame by her writings, was duly estimated in a circle of literary friends for her learning. She possessed superior abilities, which she had improved through life up to a good old age. Her literary attainments, therefore, were very considerable. To much general knowledge she added a considerable acquaintance with ancient and modern languages. But with very superior talents Mrs. H. made no display, and with much learning she possessed not the least pedantry or affectation. She was not reserved, but, in the highest degree, modest and retiring; amiable, affable, urbane among her friends; benevolent and generous to all in proportion to her means.

This excellent woman possessed religion, but without the least bigotry; she was a sincere and consistent friend to civil and religious liberty. In her own religious principles she was an Unitarian Christian, and died in the 79th year of her age.

MRS. COPPOCK.

WHEN a friend who has been the loved companion of our earliest years is no more, it is natural that the mind of the survivor should resort to that period when their joys were enhanced by a reciprocity of feeling, when, as it seems to the young and inexperienced, the future promised a long succession of health, prosperity and happiness, when there are no forebodings of adversity, or dread of disappointment in the schemes suggested for permanent felicity. The death of Mrs. Coppock, of Bridport, who departed this life on the 4th of February, at the age of 65 years, has awakened these reflections. Our attachment to each other commenced in childhood, and as we advanced in years, it was cemented by a congeniality of sentiments on religious subjects. Our opinions were freely communicated and affectionately discussed. We had both received serious impressions from our mothers, who were solicitous to enforce upon our minds the great truth that religion was, above all other things, the “ one thing needful ! ”

Sweet were the hours we spent together in perusing such books as were calculated to strengthen those injunctions. The result was, that my friend's character, under the Divine blessing, became remarkable for piety and virtue. Her devotion was fervent without enthusiasm, and her seriousness was decided without affectation. *Sincerity*, which is the life and soul of religion and friendship, was her characteristic.

In the course of a long life, she experienced many vicissitudes and trials, but she bore them all with exemplary fortitude and Christian meekness; and I am convinced that the choice she made in her youth of devotedness to God, and an entire reliance on his infinite wisdom and goodness, proved in her severest afflictions a cordial support. The same principles which produced in her calm resignation under her own sufferings, powerfully operated in calling forth a tender sympathy with the sufferings of others, and prompted her, to the utmost of her abilities, to relieve the necessities of the indigent, and to afford consolation to the wretched. She continued through life to cultivate a taste for reading; her memory was remarkably retentive; her natural cheerfulness of temper never forsook her, and thus her society was rendered truly delightful. When she was surrounded with a small circle of attached friends, her heart dilated with pleasure, and shone out in her illumined countenance while she entertained them with remarks on the subjects of her reading, or recited some interesting anecdote.

As her health declined, her faith gained new accessions of strength. Not long before her death she frequently said to her affectionate daughters, whose kind attentions had been her solace during the gradual decay of her health, that the principles on which she grounded her hopes of happiness, when she should be called from this sublunary state, were her constant support. These were the strict unity and paternal character of God, and the mediation of Jesus Christ, according to the declarations of the gospel. She did not rely on her own merits for salvation, but believed that eternal life is the *GIFT* of God, proceeding from *his love* to the creatures whom he has made capable of enjoying his favour. She did not regard *Him* as a

Being who arbitrarily selects a chosen few from all eternity, but as one who confers this gift upon *all* who conform to the terms proposed by his beloved Son. As she approached the confines of the eternal world, she evinced a strong wish to indulge in such meditations. Her last words were, "Do not disturb me, but pray for me;" and soon after, with a composure and a tranquillity which few persons have enjoyed in that solemn hour, she entered into that rest which remaineth for the people of God. Thus lived and thus died, a Christian! Her memory will ever be dear to her friends, and to none more so than to the author of this sincere but imperfect testimonial of departed worth.

ANNE HOUNSELL.

Bridport, Feb. 15, 1827.

MR. WILLIAM CLARKE.

Feb. 16, in his 57th year, Mr. WILLIAM CLARKE, of Much-Park Street, Coventry. The loss of this truly excellent man will long be felt by the surviving members of his family, from whose minds the recollection of his many endearing qualities can never be effaced. As a husband and a father, his conduct was such as secured to him through life the most ardent attachment of his wife and children; and he had the satisfaction of witnessing in the latter the maturing of those seeds of virtue and piety which he had early laboured to implant in their minds, and to which his own example was so well calculated to give the desired effect. As a tradesman his dealings were uniformly characterized by the most inflexible integrity, and he had the happiness of seeing his indefatigable exertions in business so far crowned with success, as to be enabled to spend his latter days in ease and affluence. His virtues were of a truly Christian stamp; and though, from the natural bent of his disposition, he shunned to meet the public eye, his purse was ever open to the calls of charity, whether of a public or a private nature. On the 17th of February in the preceding year, he sustained a very severe shock in the loss of his youngest son, (a youth of the most promising talents and amiable disposition,) and it is believed that the grief occasioned by that event, which incessantly preyed upon his mind, materially contributed to hasten his own death.

INTELLIGENCE.

British and Foreign Unitarian Association.

THE Anniversary of this Society will be held this year, conformably to the rules, on the Wednesday and Thursday in Whit-sun Week, at the Unitarian Chapel, South Place, Finsbury. The Meeting for business will be held on Wednesday forenoon, and on the evening of the same day, a Sermon will be preached by the Rev. J. Small, one of the Ministers of York Chapel, St James's Square; and on Thursday Morning a Sermon will be preached by the Rev. John Kenrick, of York.

Marriage Bill.

THE Committee of the Unitarian Association having been deprived of the opportunity of conferring with the Earl of Liverpool, by the affliction which has visited him, have determined on requesting Mr. Smith to bring in the bill originally submitted to the Legislature. The plan of this bill, our readers will recollect, was that of continuing the celebration of Marriage at the Church, the service used being confined to the mere contract which forms part of the present form. It is well known that many Members of the House of Lords prefer this plan, and at all events it will serve to revive the discussion in a form different from that which has been twice rejected.

Dissenters' Marriages.

Mary-La-Bonne New Church.—Feb. 4, were married by Dr. Sprey, Rector of Mary-la-Bonne, Mr. G. Humphries, of Oxford Street, and Miss Sarah Leggatt Temple, of Bayswater. The parties being Members of the sect of Dissenters called Free-Thinking Christians, were attended by the Elder, Deacons, and others of the body, and presented a Protest against the established ceremony. The Minister having received the written protest, proceeded with the ceremony. Upon the bridegroom being required to repeat the words, "In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," he paused, and then solemnly protested against the recognition of the Trinity; upon which the Minister closed the book, and proceeded to the Vestry, refusing to complete the marriage. After considerable discussion there, relative to the views and motives of the parties in protesting verbally, as well as in writing,

the Minister returned to the altar and completed the ceremony. This case was thus considered remarkable by the performance of the ceremony in two distinct parts. The parties expressed their deep sense of the forbearance and kind consideration of the officiating Minister. The Protest delivered on the occasion varies from former ones, inasmuch as it is designed to be a vindication of the conduct of this body in protesting, and also a declaration of their religious opinions.

COPY OF THE PROTEST.

" Protest against the Marriage Ceremony, and Exposition of the Reasons for presenting the same.

" The undersigned being Protestant Dissenters and Members of the Church of God, commonly known as Freethinking Christians, hereby avow and set forth; that they are at this time desirous of entering together into the state of marriage.

" That they regard the right to enter into such state both as a natural and civil right, and the duty so to enter therein as one of religious obligation.

" That, in the present circumstances of society, they should hold it sinful in themselves, and pregnant with mischief to the community, to enter into such state without a legal sanction thereto, which sanction it hath ever been regarded as a first duty of Legislation to afford, and that with facility to all concerned.

" That, in order to obtain such sanction, it has, since the passing of the Marriage Act in the 26th of George II. become obligatory upon Dissenters to appear in a Church of the Established Religion, and then and there to submit to a certain religious rite or ceremony administered by a Priest of the Establishment.

" That, as disciples of Jesus, they have conscientious scruples against all outward rites and ceremonies in religion, and more especially against that which is by law established for the solemnization of Marriage.

" That, to guard against any implied approval on their part of such rite and ceremony—to purge their consciences from all supposed assent to whatever therein contained is contrary to God's holy word—to avoid the sinfulness of dissimulation in religion—to stand ac-

quitted in that day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ—we hereby offer our solemn protest and appeal against the same.

“That, regarding the Clergyman as, in this instance, the Minister of an oppressive and wicked law, to which, by his Ordination oath, he hath rendered himself a party, such Protest and Appeal is delivered into his hands, and through him to all whom it may concern.

“That, considering the *time* and *place* in which the law would compel hypocrisy and falsehood to be the only time and place in which the delivery of a Protest could ease the consciences of the party protesting; such Protest is, for such reason, delivered in the Church, and at the time when the ceremony is to be performed.

“Against the present established mode of legalizing Marriage, by compelling submission to a religious ceremony by law appointed, they hereby offer the following especial grounds of protest:—

“Because it introduces a religious rite into a merely civil compact.

“Because it is an interference of human authority in matters of faith.

“Because it operates as a *test* of religious opinions.

“Because it becomes an act of compulsive conformity with the Church of England.

“Because it establishes a rite or ceremony in religion, all such being contrary to the commands of Jesus, and to the spirit of that religion of which he was the divinely appointed teacher.

“Because, although marriage be sanctioned, and its duties, like all the several duties enforced in the Scriptures, it is nowhere appointed to be entered upon by a religious rite. In no single instance in any age, either in the antediluvian, in the patriarchal, or the Jewish, does it appear that such rite was performed. Neither by Moses, nor by the Prophets, nor by Jesus, nor by his Apostles, was such rite instituted.

“Because the marriage ceremony, as contained ‘in the Book of Common Prayer,’ is a *Papish rite* rendered compulsory in the Church by a corrupt *Papist* (in the thirteenth century), and by him raised to a *Sacrament*, together with transubstantiation and *auricular confession*, as a means of increasing the revenue of the *Clergy*.

“Because, by reason of its origin from the *Papish Mass Book*, together with the absurdity of certain of its terms, its forms are superstitious, its meaning in many places has frequently become ob-

scure, its assertions false, and its allusions indelicate, offensive, and revolting.

“Because it is performed in a ‘place of worship,’ and is part and parcel of the ritual of a Church whose claims are unscriptural, whose foundation is not of God, whose authority is human, whose existence is dependent on the State, whose days are numbered according to the ‘sure word’ of prophecy, and from whose communion we have separated ourselves in obedience to that heavenly mandate, ‘Come out of her, ye my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.’

“Because being performed by a person ‘in Priests’ orders,’ it implies a recognition of the claims of the Priesthood—an order which, upon the extinction of the Jewish Priesthood, hath never been re-established by Divine authority, which possesses no one claim that is sanctioned by Scripture, and can exist only by an usurpation of the rights and liberties of the Church of God, the equality of whose members is by Jesus and his Apostles so expressly asserted.

“Because, as being an act of *public* and *social* prayer, it is without authority from the Scriptures, contrary to the example, and opposed to the positive commands of Jesus, who, when teaching his disciples to pray, directed them to pray in secret, and forbade them all *Synagogue worship*; and who, upon anticipating the approaching termination of all *Temple worship*, declared that man should worship neither in this nor in that temple, but that ‘the true worshipers should worship the *Father* in spirit and in truth.’

“Because the worship connected with this ceremony is *Heathen*, being addressed to a plurality of Gods, each of whom is separately invoked, as *God the Father*, *God the Son*, and *God the Holy Ghost*—whilst to *us*, there is but one true God, *even the Father*, of whom are all things.

“Because it is *idolatrous*, the language of prayer being therein addressed to ‘*Christ*,’ or, as the word implies, the *anointed*, the *Messias*, who, in his office as the *Messias*, is in Scripture expressly called the *Man Jesus*, ‘the *Son of Man*,’ and who has himself proclaimed—‘Thou shalt worship the *Lord thy God*, and him only shalt thou serve.’

“Because the doctrine of a *Trinity of Gods* is a palpable corruption of divine truth; an image of *Pagan idolatry*, which not all the riches or honours it may dispense, or the terrors it may assume, can induce them to do homage to. And should this their testimony against the same expose them to ‘the fiery furnace’

of persecution, they will exclaim with some of old, 'Our God whom we serve is able to deliver us; but if not, be it known unto thee, oh King, that we will not serve *thy Gods*, nor worship the *golden image* which thou hast set up.'

"In concluding this protest, and in order to remove all doubts touching the nature and certainty of their faith, as well as to shew the obligation which is imposed upon them by their principles, to make such protest in the face of the Established Church, as their brethren have hitherto done, the undersigned, both on their own part and that of the Church under whose instruction they now act, hereby declare their belief—

"That the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament contain the revealed will of God.

"That, as such, and in consequence, the Scriptures, and the Scriptures only, should be the rule of their faith and practice.

"That 'the God and Father of our Lord Jesus' is 'the only true God,' and 'that there is none other God but one.'

"That Jesus of Nazareth was 'a man approved of God by miracles and wonders and signs which God did by him.'

"That he died, and by the power of God rose again according to the Scriptures.

"That 'God hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained.'

"That God hath separated to himself a people on earth, 'which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.'

"That the Members of this Church are required to look to Jesus as 'the guide and complete pattern of their faith, who, for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame,' and that it is their duty to follow his example, who hath declared before the rulers of the world, 'To this end was I born, and for this purpose came I into the world, that I might bear witness unto the truth.'

"That with these sentiments and hopes, and with these views of God and Religion, they are compelled, at all times and at whatever risk, to raise their voice against false worship, to protest against all subscription to false doctrines in season and out of season, whether men will hear or whether they will forbear—acting on such occasions not as men pleasers, but as in the sight of God—neither desiring the applause nor deprecating the censure of this world—anxious only for 'the testimony of a good conscience,' and appeal-

ing from the judgment of the timid or the time-serving, to the example of the Prophets and Apostles of old, to the conduct of the early Reformers from Popish darkness, to that cloud of heavenly witnesses, who, in every age and nation, have chosen to obey God rather than man.

(Signed) "G. HUMPHRIES.
"S. L. TEMPLE."

Catholic Question.

We are sorry to have to record the loss of Sir Francis Burdett's motion for the removal of the Catholic Disabilities by a majority of 4, after two nights' debate, the number being 276 to 272, besides about 15 on each side who paired off. The debate did not present any new views of the case, notwithstanding the leading debaters of the House took part in it. It was, however, singular to see that the discussion was mainly kept up by speakers who, though of the most opposite opinions on this point, form part of the present most singularly united administration. There was certainly no increase of candour or liberality in the tone of the supporters of the present wretched system of discord. It does not appear to be clearly ascertained by this division that any decisive alteration, in point of numbers, has been effected by the late elections. The minority on this occasion is larger than the former majorities; the numbers on the great divisions of 1821 and 1825 being 252 to 243, and 268 to 241. More members have now voted; and, perhaps, this may be owing to the temporary excitation occasioned by the recent elections, which has brought out many to vote who would in ordinary cases have kept in the back ground.

The unfavourable position which the Catholic cause undoubtedly occupies in popular estimation is, perhaps, mainly attributable to the turn which the controversy has of late taken, towards a discussion of the theological and ecclesiastical merits of the Catholic religion, rather than of the political question regarding the rights of its professors as citizens. It is clear that it has for some time been the game of the opponents of the Catholics so to confound the argument, and the latter have, unfortunately, too readily fallen into the trap. They of course are not to be blamed for avowing and maintaining, at proper seasons, the opinions which they conscientiously adopt; but every one must see that English Protestants (and particularly those very Protestants from whom they have

always received the warmest support) are neither very likely to be converted, nor the less inclined to assist for not being so; and, that attempts at this time to recommend the peculiar opinions of the Catholics to popular favour, tend only to excite jealousy and distrust with those who, from any motives, are their political opponents. It is their interest (and the interest of all who wish to unite in asserting the principles of religious liberty) to throw on one side all discussion, and right of discussion, with the civil power on the merits or demerits of opinions, as irrelevant and only tending to embarrass the question, which is not whether it be desirable that people should be Catholics, but whether it be just and politic to refuse those who are so, and will be so, the equal rights of citizens for their opinions' sake.

We meant to have stopped here, but we cannot forbear quoting in conclusion some observations from the Examiner, on two positions of Sir John Copley, Master of the Rolls, lately something very like a Radical, but now, like his predecessor Lord Gifford, in training for the Chancellorship.

“Sir John says, ‘It is a question entirely of expediency. If we can grant the Catholics that which they require, with perfect security to our civil liberties and to the religious establishments of the empire, they are entitled to receive it. Prove to me that what the advocates of the Catholics propose to be done may be done with perfect security to ourselves.’

“Such is the language of the Master of the Rolls, who, filling the office of a Judge, does not hesitate to stand forth the avowed advocate of injustice, on the score of its imagined expediency. Formerly, ‘*Fiat justitia ruat cælum*’ was the maxim of the Magistrate; it is now exchanged for—Refuse justice; not, indeed, lest heaven, but lest churches, far more solid than heaven, should fall.

“With all deference to the Lord Eldon, Sir John Copley, and Mr. Peel, we do hold that a Country is even more precious than a Church. Here, however, if they spoke the truth, they would retort upon us, and say, You are playing upon words; a Church is not a mere quarry, or a heap of brick and mortar, it is a mill-stone which grinds our meal. And this brings us to the grand uses of a wealthy Church Establishment, and the real nature of the fears for its welfare; in the proper manner of meeting which we might be instructed by savages. When the American Baptist Missionaries commenced operation in the Burman Empire, and promised

in the name of their Master a number of things which were understood in a literal sense by their hearers, such as food to the hungry and drink to the dry, &c., the native Priests took the alarm, and represented to the Government that the Missionaries were turning the Priests' rice-pot bottom upwards; which being translated into the European language, more apt for mystification, signified that the Missionaries were subverting the Established Church of Burman. In answer to this statement, the Mr. Peel of the Golden Empire, whoever he may be, had the good sense to reply, that if the Missionaries turned the Priests' rice-pot bottom upwards, the Priests' might turn it bottom down again. A response which contains the whole principle of religious toleration, and the policy of free trade to boot. Now as, in the resistance of the Catholic Claims, this same rice-pot of the East, or tithe-pot called the Church of our hemisphere, is the sole object in view, we certainly think it would be most wise in our Ministers to answer politicians in the words of the Burmese Mr. Peel,—‘If the Catholics turn the Church bottom upwards, let the Parsons set it on its end again.’ The Master of the Rolls has shadowed forth the extreme danger to be apprehended, and see what it is—even the breath of eloquence! which is as likely to prevail against corruption as truth is against the gates of hell—

“Let me suppose that there are returned to this House some of those persons who exhibit in themselves specimens of some of those talents which seem to be indigenous to Ireland—let me suppose some of the individuals of that body to be desirous of overturning the Protestant Establishment, and of rearing in its stead the Roman Catholic religion in Ireland—let me suppose these persons swaying the body they represent by their masterly eloquence, and directing that eloquence to the object to which I have referred. I ask, is this a light danger? Or, are we not, on the other hand, to reserve in our own hands the most effectual means of defending ourselves from such a danger?

“Reserve it in your hands! it is sufficiently reserved in your heads. Is there a skull in your Honourable House which is not eloquence-proof? Beat down St. Paul's with pea-shooters, and then plant seventy Plunketts in battery against an ancient and profitable abuse. One Plunkett, one Canning, one Brougham, cannot, with all the united forces of wit, wisdom, and eloquence, prevail upon you to inquire whether the laws for the pro-

tection of your bread and butter are necessary or just; would seventy such as they, or seventy thousand, wheedle it from your grasping hands? Look round the House, Sir John Copley, and observe how impregnably the heads of your creatures are fortified against the assaults of reason. The artillery of truth would in vain thunder at those impenetrable barriers. What then is to be apprehended from the efforts of rhetoric? Indeed, Sir John, you underrate the wooden heads of Old England. Bring all the talent of Ireland to bear, backed by a most righteous cause, and we will produce a material that shall meet their shots with the dull but impenetrable resistance of a wool-pack—a cushion on which the Chancellor sits in State, as typical of the main reliance and muniment of Government, and representative of the stuff of legislative brains.'

Test and Corporation Acts.

House of Commons, March 23, 1827.

A SHORT debate took place on the moving of that annual blind and delusion, the Indemnity Bill, by which the Dissenters have been cajoled for so many years out of prosecuting their claims.—Mr. HARVEY asked when the case of the Protestant Dissenters was to be considered? He saw no reason why the Catholic question, because it was thus made a party and political one, should be fought year after year, and no attention shewn to the case of the Protestant Dissenters, who were open to none of the objections raised against the Catholics. Why were they kept in the back ground, lest they should injure a question about which, too, they were not agreed? His constituents happened, many of them, to be Dissenters who were *opposed* to the Catholics; and why were they to wait till persons succeeded to whom they wished no success?—Lord J. RUSSELL repelled with warmth the charge of his party's postponing the claims of the Dissenters because eclat could not be got by bringing them forward. He had been requested to bring on the case, and would have done so at any time, if they had been desirous it should be done.

It seems to us that Mr. Harvey's observation has much truth in it. We cannot see why his constituents, for instance, with their views, are to wait till certain persons succeed in getting political power, who, as many think, would use it to keep those very constituents out of all chance of liberty. We do not know

from whom Lord J. Russell takes his instructions, or who authorizes him to say that the Dissenters wish their claims not to be brought forward, or to be postponed to those of the Catholics. From all our experience on the subject, *Members of Parliament* have always been the dissuaders of the attempts of Dissenters; among whom an almost irrepressible impatience and disgust at their and their leaders' apathy have long existed. We are happy to find that the Dissenters are moving in this business, and we hope to have to report in our next, proceedings actually taken to bring the question distinctly before Parliament.

Prosecution of Unbelievers.

WE had hoped that the folly of giving consequence to the impugners of our religion by prosecutions was now fully admitted, and that policy, if not principle, would have put an end to the practice. The Lord Mayor has, however, deemed it right to signalize his petty reign by directing a prosecution against the person who calls himself the Reverend Robert Taylor, for publicly maintaining Deistical opinions. His Lordship took care to have the warrant for the offender's apprehension executed on Saturday, so as necessarily to detain him forty-eight hours in custody, and make him pass his Sunday in a prison. The worthy citizens who are called to enjoy, for a season, the honours of a gilt coach and the sovereignty of the city, generally appear anxious to find some novel enterprise or field of energy, which may stamp a degree of permanence on their otherwise ephemeral reigns. Each has his own peculiar line on which to open his career of glory. His present Lordship acts in character. He is a Calvinist Dissenter and an attorney. As a zealot he seeks to gratify his spleen and intolerance by persecuting the impugner of his creed, although himself a tolerated Dissenter: at the same time that the habits of his profession have supplied him with the contrivance of the dirty trick, which peculiarly ennobles the transaction. The sinner is punished, and the saint's sabbath devotions derive an additional zest from the reflection, that the scoffer has been safely lodged to meditate on Christian charity within four walls. Seriously we must say the petty insolence of upstart authority and pharisaic intolerance, were never more aptly exemplified than in the paltry cunning which devised this scheme of Saturday night's indulgence.

Rev. J. Wolff's Challenge.

WHILE on the subject of Mr. Taylor and his disciples and opponents, we must subjoin the following curious epistle from the celebrated Missionary Wolff, who labours, or says he labours, so hard in the conversion of Catholics, Mahometans, and Jews, and has lately received a part of his reward in the hand of a lady of rank. We really do not see why, if Mr. Missionary Wolff is correct in the epithets which he gives his opponents, he should thus refuse consort with his equals. A man is to be tried by his peers, and we cannot but think the whole party here would be very fairly grouped.

Additional Challenge.

To the Editor of the Morning Chronicle.

SIR,

My advertisement of a challenge sent to the Catholics, induced Edwd. B. Singley, a member of the Blasphemous Society called "Christian Evidence Society," to send me a challenge to come forward and defend the tenets of the Christian Religion in their meetings. I *herewith* reply, that I like to discuss the subject with men of reason, but as I consider all the Members of the "Christian Evidence Society" as a *parcel of fools*, I refuse to accept the challenge of one of those fools! and declare *herewith* that I do not mind them at all, and they shall never see me in their dirty assemblies. Whilst I *herewith* again challenge the Rev. Dr. Poynder, and add a challenge to the sensible Dr. Solomon Herschel, Great Rabbi of London.

JOSEPH WOLFF, *Missionary.*
4, Portugal Street, March 9, 1827.

Church Missionary Society.

It would appear from the Report of the Society's Proceedings for 1825-6, that the Church Missionary Society has now nine distinct Missions in different parts of the world, each Mission divided into *stations*, 51 in number. That it employs 36 English ordained clergymen, and 14 Lutheran clergymen, 89 European teachers, male and female, and 342 native teachers or assistants—making in all 483 labourers. That it has established, and now superintends and partly supports 307 schools, containing 10,092 boys, 2795 girls, and 733 youths and adults, making a total of 13,637 scholars under its instruction. Its receipts have increased upwards of £1000 during the last year, its net income has exceeded £42,500. Its expenditure has amounted to £41,000. Out of 68 individuals who have proposed

themselves to the Committee for Missionary employment, 23 have been accepted; some of whom are already gone to the places of their destination; but the majority are yet under probationary studies. Forty-two individuals have, in the course of the last year, studied at the Society's Institution at Islington, and it is proposed to enlarge the buildings for the accommodation of 50 students.

The above is chiefly extracted from a "Table of Missions, Stations, Labourers, Schools, and Scholars," prefixed to the Report. Our attention has been attracted by it to the increase of its schools in India; according to this report, it has now 207 schools and no less than 8,404 scholars under its care in India. It were much to be wished that we had some more particulars respecting the actual state of these schools, particularly of those at Burdwan, than we have yet been able to obtain. Neither Mr. Adam nor Rammohun Roy is sufficiently minute to meet the inquiries of persons who have been long familiarized to the names of Chunar, Burdwan, Cotym, &c., and who want to know *their* report of the instruction going on at the different schools established in these places. One Missionary at Burdwan gives us an account of an examination of the female scholars, 292 in number, many of whom were reading the Gospel of Matthew, in Bengalee, Watts's Catechism, and other books printed for them by the Society. Boys at the *English* schools are also said to be making advances in the knowledge of our own language.—"Are these things so?"

*University of Cambridge.**Summary of the Members for 1827.*

	Members of the Senate.	Members on the Boards.
Trinity	597	1375
St. John's	444	1082
Queen's	61	290
Emmanuel	99	215
Christ's	59	224
Jesus	74	191
Caius	78	228
St. Peter's	59	192
Corpus.	37	153
King's	85	109
Sidney	36	94
Magdalen	37	98
Downing	14	65
Clare Hall	62	156
Trinity Hall	27	138
Catherine Hall	30	133
Pembroke Hall	43	111
Commorantes in Villa	12	12

*University of Oxford.**Summary of the Members for 1827.*

	Members of Convocation.	Members on the Books.
1 University	105	205
2 Balliol	83	220
3 Merton	63	119
4 Exeter	81	249
5 Oriel	144	275
6 Queen's	135	314
7 New	62	143
8 Lincoln	54	127
9 All Souls	68	94
10 Magdalen	114	163
11 Brazenose	228	425
12 Corpus	67	114
13 Christ Church	404	800
14 Trinity	87	222
15 St. John's	127	217
16 Jesus	56	173
17 Wadham	65	185
18 Pembroke	66	170
19 Worcester	86	204
20 St. Mary Hall	29	76
21 Magdalen Hall	38	150
22 New Inn Hall	1	1
23 St. Alban Hall	11	45
24 St. Edmund Hall	41	103
	2220	4794
Determining Bachelors in Lent	281	
Matriculations	401	
Regents	194	

St. David's College, Cardiganshire.

ST. DAVID'S College, which was founded in 1822, by the present Bishop of Salisbury, at Lampeter, in Cardiganshire, (the original intention of building it at Llandewi Brevi, in the same neighbourhood, having been wisely abandoned,) for the benefit of the clergy in South Wales, the poverty of whose preferments excludes a large proportion of them from the advantages of a University education, has been, we understand, incorporated by Royal Charter. The style of the building is gothic. It is calculated to accommodate about 70 students; and the Bishop of St. David's intends to admit persons from any part of the kingdom, *provided they be members of the Church of England.* The annual expense, it is expected, will be within £55. A valuable collection of books has been presented to it by the Bishop of Salisbury, to which many of the colleges and members of the University have liberally contributed. A grace has also passed the Senate of the University of Cambridge to give to it a copy of all books that have been printed at its expense, or are now in the press. The Rev. Llewellyn Lle-

wellyn, M. A., of Jesus College, Oxford, has been appointed Principal; and the Rev. Alfred Ollivant, M. A., of Trinity College, Cambridge, Vice Principal, and Senior Tutor.

Somerset and Dorset Unitarian Association.

THE Half-yearly Meeting of this Association will be held at Bridgwater, on Good Friday, April 13. The Rev. J. G. Teggin, of Bridport, has undertaken to preach on the occasion; and it is expected that there will be an evening service.

Somerset, Gloucester and Wilts Unitarian Missionary Association.

THE Fifth Half-yearly General Meeting of this Association will be held at Marshfield, on Friday, April 13th, (the day commonly called Good Friday,) when the Rev. Robert Cree, of Preston, is expected to preach.

THE Rev. T. C. HOLLAND has accepted an unanimous invitation to be the minister of the united Congregations of Loughborough and Mount Sorrel.

Distressed Unitarians in Lancashire.

THE great suffering and distress prevalent in the manufacturing districts of this country are unhappily too well known to need description, but the Unitarian body are probably not aware that among the thousands who are at this time without bread and clothing in Lancashire, are the major part of the members of the congregations at Newchurch and Padiham, the account of whose proceedings, given a few years back by Mr. John Ashworth, who resides there, so much gratified and interested the Unitarian public.

Information from other sources too truly confirms this painful statement, and it has been thought right to call the attention of Unitarians to it, and to solicit on behalf of their suffering brethren at Newchurch and Padiham, *help in this time of need*, either in the shape of money or clothing.

With the permission of the Committee of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, Mr. Horwood, their Collector, will receive at the Office, No. 3, Walbrook Buildings, near the Mansion House, whatever humanity may entrust to his care.

Donations will also be received by the Rev. Robert Aspland, Hackney; by Mr. Hornby, 31, St. Swithin's Lane, Lom-

bard Street; and any further information desired may be obtained from Mr. John Ashworth, Clough House, Boothfold, near Rochdale, Lancashire.

FRANCE.

Bible Society.

WE learn from the Seventh Report of "the Protestant Bible Society of Paris," that in one department of France, thirty-nine new Bible Societies have been established, from April 1, 1825, to March 31, 1826. The Paris Society has sent into the departments more than 4000 Bibles and 5000 New Testaments. "The Committee hopes," it is said, "to see the moment arrive when it may put a Bible into the hands of every catechumen at his first communion, into the pocket of every artizan leaving his native place for employment, and into the havre-sac of every soldier and sailor."

We shall rejoice to see any rational spirit of religious zeal arising in France. Some system, at once suited to the civilization of the age, and to the moral and religious wants of the people, is highly desirable; and its absence gives the only chance of success to the efforts of the fanatical party, which can only rule by subjugating the vast majority, Catholic as well as Protestant. At present there appears to be little medium between the abandonment of all religion or the adoption of some of its worst forms; the bitter fruits of a revolution founded on the renunciation of all religious principle, are and must long be felt and lamented by the best friends of constitutional liberty. We trust the cure is not hopeless, though it is difficult to point to the quarter from which the evil is to be remedied. The present race of French Protestants have, we fear, too little zeal or influence to be likely to do much in the work of regeneration; in truth, it is a difficult and anomalous course to retrace the steps from the extreme of scepticism back to a firm and rational system of practical and influential belief. On the other hand, revolutions which have owed their energy to mistaken and over-excited religious zeal, have, in the end, produced highly beneficial results upon society; austere and ascetic sects, after their first effervescence has produced its effect, have often subsided into the best elements of society. Has France yet to pass through this ordeal? Is some zealous sect to stamp with vigorous hand the impress of religion, and, in the end, to settle down into that sort of calmer subsidence by which the factious Puritan or

Covenanter of Britain became a good citizen, an exemplary Christian, and a conscientious guardian of civil liberty? We cannot but think the field is open in France for the founder of some new system, who should possess the requisite talents and energy; and we doubt whether any thing but the zeal of some religious reformer can remedy the evils of the existing state of things.

Archbishop of Bordeaux.

WE feel gratified in placing by the side of some of the truly Catholic letters of the venerable Protestant Bishop of Norwich, the following reply of the Catholic Archbishop of Bordeaux to the President of the Protestant Consistory, who had offered him the compliments of that body on his arrival there:

"M. President of the Consistory, I accept with pleasure this expression of your sentiments towards me.—I will endeavour, as far as my weakness will allow, to walk in the footsteps of my venerable predecessor, by maintaining that Christian toleration which is nothing but evangelical charity. As to unity of faith, you will permit me to say, without being surprised or offended, that I desire and hope to see it established among us. I am persuaded, that you too, on your side, wish me to follow the truth. In regard to courtesy and social relations, you shall always find me anxious to fulfil all the duties belonging to them. I number many good friends among Protestants. There are some in a country very distant from us who have loaded me with kindnesses; and I shall consider myself fortunate, if I shall be enabled to discharge, in my conduct to you, the debt of gratitude which I owe to them; and you may depend on me whenever I can be useful to you. I trust you will forgive what I have said on the unity of faith. It is a wish deeply engraven on my heart. I solicit your friendship, as I offer you mine."

Judicial Oaths.

THE French journals claim for their legal tribunals a superior liberality and discernment on the form of judicial oaths as connected with religious opinions. The oath, by the French practice, it appears, is very rational and simple; the witness merely solemnly repeating, (as he does, we believe, in Scotland,) "I swear," &c., without any other form which may place him in collision with peculiar opinions. In England we have attached ourselves to a form which we

wonder has not been exploded as superstitious and unpleasant—that of kissing the Gospels; the consequence of which is, that when a witness appears who is not a believer in the Gospels, either some other book must be found for him, as if some book were part of the magic, or some rite (never mind how ridiculous) must be substituted; and if the man has no rite at all to practise, our law knows no other course than to refuse his testimony altogether.

The French law having provided a simple, solemn form, which suits every one who has any religious opinion at all, no difficulty whatever arises on the subject. Some over-zealous people, however, lately before the Cour Royale of Nismes, wished to bring in all the objectionable points of our practice by objecting to a Jew's being sworn in the simple, comprehensive form of the law, and requiring that his religious opinions should be inquired into and recognized by the Court, and that he should not be allowed the oath in the usual form, but should take the oath "more judaico."

On the other hand, the counsel on his behalf (himself a Jew) contended, that any inquiries of the sort by the court, into the opinions of a man who attended them as a citizen, ready to take the oath required by law, was an attack on the religious liberty secured by the charter; that the court had no right to put a mark of singularity upon any one; that if a man was obliged to declare his opinions for any purpose, his liberty was incomplete; that he owed an account of them to no one, not even to the law; that the law could not have either the desire or the power to inquire into the matter; that it knew men neither as Catholics, Protestants, nor Jews, but as citizens; that though the Catholic religion was, by the charter, the religion of the *state*, it was not and could not be the religion of the *law*, without destroying those other provisions of the charter which secured to all the free exercise of their religion.

The court decided in favour of these arguments, holding that all Frenchmen were equal in the eye of the law, and that the principles of equality towards all religious opinions guaranteed by the charter, would be violated if a French Jew were compelled against his will to take the oath in a different form from that prescribed to his fellow-citizens. The distinction appears to us as a sensible one, of holding, that though the *state* may have made a particular form of religion part and parcel of itself, it by no

means follows that the *law* has: and that, on the contrary, if the law makes any pretensions to justice, all persons should be equal in its eyes, especially where the free exercise and profession of religious opinions has been formally granted and guaranteed.

INDIA.

Liberty of the Press.

WE have more than once (says the *Globe*) had occasion to notice the resistance of the judicial authorities in France to the attacks of the Government on the Liberty of the Press. We are happy to be able to record an instance of similar conduct on the part of a body of English Judges—the Supreme Court of Bombay, who have disallowed a Regulation for the suppression of the freedom of printing, which was passed by the Governor in Council of that Presidency. The regulation was similar to that registered in Calcutta by Sir F. Macnaghten, (at the time the only Judge of the Supreme Court there,) and confirmed on appeal before the Privy Council.—We have been favoured by the *Editor of the Oriental Herald*, to whom the judgment delivered in the case has been transmitted, with a copy of this valuable document. Of the three Judges of the Supreme Court, Sir E. West (the Chief) and Mr. Justice Chambers concurred in disallowing the regulation. Mr. Justice Rice would have allowed it. The language of this Judge, however, it will be seen, is not less remarkable than that of his colleagues, for he does not hesitate to say, that, as far as his own opinion went, the regulation, even at Calcutta, was inexpedient, as well as repugnant to the laws of England, though, on the question of expediency he thought fit to defer to the Government; and on that of the repugnancy, to the appellate authority. He says, "I have read the case of the press of India before the King in Council; but still I think the clause as to the change in the proposed rule is repugnant to the law of England, and that policy *did not*, and does not, require it. It is argued, I think, too much as if the Natives had been at all affected by the licentiousness of the press; the mischief in Calcutta was wholly, I think, *confined to the English, and would, I am persuaded, have remedied itself*. Considering, as I do, that the liberties of England are part of the law of the land, and that they depend on *the freedom of the press, I cannot conceive how a licence, which is to stop its mouth and stifle its voice, can be consistent with, and not repugnant to, the law of England.*"

AMERICA.

Religion in America.

PHILADELPHIA had, we believe, the honour to be the first spot where religious liberty was fully and solemnly established. All men have here full permission to "search the Scriptures," and draw their principles from the fountain head, and no wealthy establishment stands by with bribes in the one hand to ensnare the conscience, and penalties in the other to terrify human weakness. The Jesuits there may ply their intrigues and Antichrist raise his horns in full day; truth and reason smile at such bugbears; no alarms are felt or affected; and no man glides into Congress on the shoulders of shouting multitudes, by raising the cry of "The Church in Danger," or "No Popery." It is delightful to see that this perfect freedom promotes both piety and peace—that there is less wrangling and more religion than in the British Isles, where Christianity is "part and parcel of the law of the land." This is one of the invaluable truths which America, in her bright career, has shed upon the world. There are 77 congregations in Philadelphia, (a city containing less than 130,000 inhabitants,) viz. Presbyterians 15; Methodists 12; Episcopalians 10; Baptists 6; Quakers 6; German Lutherans 4; Catholic 4; Dutch Reformed 3; of other sects 17. For the sake of comparison, we may mention that Edinburgh and Glasgow, the one with 150,000, and the other with 160,000 inhabitants, have each 63 congregations, including Sectaries, great and small.

American Unitarian Association.

WE have been favoured with a copy of the "First Annual Report of the Executive Committee of the American Unitarian Association," the first anniversary of which was celebrated on the 30th of June, 1826, in the Pantheon Hall, in Boston. The meeting was opened with prayer by the Rev. Dr. Bancroft, the President of the Association. The Report was then read, from which we shall give a few extracts, which we doubt not will be interesting to our readers.

"The Executive Committee, in offering their first annual report, cannot but express their gratification at the circumstances under which it is presented. They behold in the numbers and character of those who compose this meeting, not only a proof of interest in the Association, but evidence of its stability, and the pro-

mise of its future usefulness."—"The Committee have been gratified by the sympathy expressed for them in the prosecution of their duties by Unitarians near and at a distance. They have been favoured with letters from Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut, Rhode Island, from all sections of this state, from the city of New York, and from the western part of the state of New York, from Philadelphia, Harrisburg, Northumberland, Pittsburg, and Meadville in Pennsylvania, from Maryland, from the District of Columbia, from South Carolina, from Kentucky, and from Indiana. In all these letters the same interest is exhibited in the efforts which the Association promises to make for the diffusion of pure Christianity. Many of them have contained interesting accounts of the state of religion in different places, and especially correspondents have furnished the Committee with ample details respecting the history and condition of Unitarians in Pennsylvania. If similar accounts could be obtained from all the states of the Union, they would embody an amount of knowledge that is now much wanted. And the Committee avail themselves of this opportunity to remind Unitarians, that they will render a service to the cause of truth by communicating facts connected with the progress and present state of Unitarian Christianity. The existence of a body of Christians in the Western States, who have for years been Unitarians, have encountered persecution on account of their faith, and have lived in ignorance of others east of the mountains, who maintained many similar views of Christian doctrine, has attracted the attention of the Committee. Measures have been taken to ascertain more correctly the situation and character of this fraternity, who have adopted various names significant of their attachment to freedom of inquiry, and to a purer gospel than that embraced by other sects, and who, though they have refused to assume the title, openly avow themselves Unitarians. With two ministers of this body a correspondence has been continued for some time. The Committee have watched with peculiar interest the growth of the Christian connexion, which is daily becoming more numerous and respectable. From members of that body, they have received expressions of fraternal regard; and although there should not be a more intimate union between these disciples and ourselves, than now exists, yet we rejoice that they have the same great work at heart, and we doubt not will prosecute it perseveringly and successfully. The need of a more exact know-

ledge than can be obtained from books, or even from correspondence, induced the Committee to employ an agent, whose sole business it should be, by actual observation, to make himself familiar with the religious condition of the Middle and Western States. This gentleman is now on a tour through Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois. He will probably spend some months in the journey, and has been directed to collect and transmit to the Committee whatever facts in the ecclesiastical history of those States he may obtain, as well as the result of his inquiries and observation concerning the present feelings and condition of the people. The Committee do not possess such information as would enable them to give an estimate of the number of Unitarian congregations in our country. Of New England it would be difficult to speak with certainty. There are in almost every town Unitarians; in many towns of Massachusetts they constitute the majority, in many more they have respectable, though not large churches, but in far the greater number of parishes in New England they are still blended with other sects, and either from a distrust of their own strength, or from a reluctance to disturb the quiet of religious society, or from local reasons, they make small exertions to secure such an administration of the gospel, as may accord with their convictions of truth. The number of these silent Unitarians is increasing, and, at the same time, more are manifesting a determination to assert their rights as citizens and as Christians. The Committee conceive that they have sufficient evidence of the increase of Unitarians in New England, especially in Maine, in some parts of New Hampshire, and in the valley of the Connecticut in Massachusetts. They say this gladly, but not boastingly. The progress of correct opinions has been more rapid than their supporters could have expected for them. They are introducing themselves into every village, and have given peace and joy to many who are yet unknown to the company of their brethren. Before another anniversary, the Committee trust that they from whom the annual report shall proceed, will be able to present an exact statement of the number of Unitarian churches and ministers in the Northern section of our Union. They do not attempt it now, because they have not the means of making it complete. In the Middle States also, Unitarianism is constantly acquiring new adherents. The erection of a second church

in New York, the increased prosperity of the society in Philadelphia, and the commencement of a building for Unitarian worship in Harrisburg, the seat of government of Pennsylvania, are auspicious circumstances. From the Southern and Western divisions of our land, it is presumed that future correspondence and the communications of agents will furnish intelligence equally gratifying. We are assured that the society in Charleston, S. C., continues to prosper, that there are several churches in North Carolina, and that Unitarians are numerous in the states which lie west of the Alleghany mountains."

The Report proceeds to detail the measures taken to bring the Association before the Unitarians in different sections of the country, as well as those in foreign parts. "The thoughts of the Committee have been turned to their brethren in other lands. A correspondence has been opened with Unitarians in England, and the coincidence is worthy of notice, that the British and Foreign Unitarian Association and the American Unitarian Association, were organized on the same day, for the same objects, and without the least previous concert. Our good wishes have been reciprocated by the directors of the British Society. Letters received from gentlemen, who have recently visited England, speak of the interest which our brethren in that country feel for us, and of their desire to strengthen the bonds of union. A constant communication will be preserved between the two Associations, and your Committee believe it will have a beneficial effect, by making us better acquainted with one another, by introducing the publications of each country into the other, by the influence which we shall mutually exert, and by the strength which will be given to our separate, or, it may be, to our united efforts for the spread of the glorious gospel of our Lord and Saviour. Letters have also been forwarded to Unitarians in India, although your Committee did not consider this Association instituted for the diffusion of Christianity in foreign lands, and have only requested that a friendly correspondence might ensue, which would enable them to communicate intelligence interesting to Unitarian Christians in this country. With the same views they are taking measures to open a correspondence with Unitarians on the continent of Europe, and are especially desirous to establish friendly relations with their brethren in France, Switzerland and Transylvania, of whom

they hope to obtain more accurate information than they now possess, from a gentleman, whose return to his people may be expected in a few weeks.

“ Having thus spoken of the means employed to extend the knowledge and influence of the Association, and to secure for it friends and resources, your Committee will state what has been done towards accomplishing the particular objects of this Society. The publication of tracts received their earliest attention, and arrangements were made for furnishing a succession of such as should contain an exposition and defence of Unitarian Christianity. Some difficulty has been experienced in obtaining tracts, which should at once be unexceptionable in doctrine and in spirit, and be suited to the peculiar wants of the community. Four tracts have been published by the Committee.”

“ In connexion with the publication of tracts, the Committee considered the subject of a Unitarian weekly paper. Being satisfied that it might be an instrument of great good, they were anxious that the ‘Christian Register’ should be conducted in such a manner as would entitle it to a liberal patronage. The multiplied engagements of the editor prevented his giving it a due share of his attention, and after several attempts at an arrangement, which should be favourable both to the proprietor and the Association, the Executive Committee undertook the conduct of the paper at the commencement of the present year.”*

“ The next duty which the Executive Committee considered incumbent on them, was the support of missionaries. They have been prevented from making such appropriations as they desired for this object, by the difficulty of finding persons who could be employed in such service. They have made an appropriation of 100 dol. to the Rev. James Kay, a valuable minister, who resides in Northumberland, Penn.; † and who preaches at stated times in several neighbouring towns, and has spent a few sabbaths in Harrisburg.”

The Committee then enter into farther detail as to appropriations of funds, &c., and conclude their Report by recommending the formation of an Auxiliary Association in every congregation, and to unite the existing Unitarian societies

* We have received several numbers of the “Christian Register,” from which possibly we may at some future time be enabled to give some extracts.

† Formerly of Hindley in Lancashire.

in one general Association. These recommendations were afterwards embodied in resolutions and passed unanimously.

LITERARY NOTICES.

Mr. Charles A. Elton, a convert of a few years’ standing from the Church of England to Unitarianism, and of late one of its ablest and most successful champions, has, it seems, retraced his steps, and re-entered the fold which he had quitted. He has announced, as in the press, “ Second Thoughts on the Person of Christ, &c. containing Reasons for withdrawing from the Unitarian Body, and of Adhesion to the Church of England.” We are curious to see the “ Reasons” by which he is able to controvert to his own satisfaction, his masterly expositions and defences of the Unitarian doctrine.

Mr. Gilchrist, of Newington Green, we perceive from a printed circular notice, “ is preparing for the press a work to be entitled Unitarianism Abandoned; or Reasons assigned for ceasing to be connected with that description of Religious Professors who designate themselves Unitarians.” From the terms of this notice, we presume that Mr. Gilchrist has “ ceased to be connected” with the two congregations, “ designating themselves” Unitarian, of which he was the minister.

We are glad to learn that Mr. Belsham is about to publish a second volume of Doctrinal and Practical Discourses.

Godfrey Higgins, Esq., of Skellow Grange, near Doncaster, author of a treatise entitled *Horæ Sabbaticæ*, has nearly ready for publication a work called the *Celtic Druids*. It will consist of one volume quarto, and be elucidated by upwards of Fifty highly-finished Lithographic Prints of the most curious Druidical Monuments of Europe and Asia, executed by one of the first French Artists in that branch of the graphic art.

The Rev. T. Morell will shortly publish the Elements of the History of Philosophy and Science, in one volume octavo.

The Rev. T. F. Dibdin, D. D. F. R. S., is editing a splendid edition of Fox’s Book of Martyrs, which will form about twelve volumes in octavo.

The Rev. J. N. Coleman, M. A., late of Queen’s College, Oxford, has in the press Sixteen Sermons, Doctrinal, Practical, and Occasional.

The Rev. Julius Hare, and C. Thirlwall, Esq., of Cambridge, are preparing for publication a translation of a new and revised edition of Neibuhr’s Roman History.

Mr. Britton will shortly publish the Union of Architecture, Sculpture, and Painting, exemplified in a series of illustrations of, and descriptive dissertations on, the House and Museum of Mr. Soane, of Lincoln's-Inn Fields.

Professor Lee's Lectures on the Hebrew Language, are announced as nearly ready for publication.

It is said that Sir Hudson Lowe has sent for publication to this country, a Memoir of *all the transactions* at St. Helena, while he was Governor of that island, and *Custodian* [Anglice, GAOLER] of Bonaparte.

Memoirs of the Rival Houses of York and Lancaster, Historical and Biographical, by Emma Roberts, have been announced as in the press, and to form two volumes in octavo.

Colonel Trench is about to publish a Collection of Papers, illustrated by explanatory Plates, relating to his famed project of the Thames Quay; with Hints for some further improvements of the Metropolis.

Mr. J. C. Loudon, the popular author of the Encyclopædias of Gardening and Agriculture, has announced as shortly to be published, a *Hortus Britannicus*, or a Catalogue of all the plants, indigenous, cultivated, or introduced into Britain.

Mr. Archdeacon Cox is again pursuing

his editorial avocations, and will shortly publish a History of the Administration of the Right Honourable Henry Pelham, drawn from authentic sources, with private and original correspondence, from 1743 to 1754.

The seventh and concluding volume of Humboldt's Personal Narrative, translated by Helen Maria Williams, is now in the press. This portion contains his account of the very important and interesting Island of Cuba.

Mr. Merivale, one of the Chancery Commissioners, has announced as shortly to be published, a Letter to William Courtenay, Esq., on the subject of that Commission.

The copious Greek Grammar of Dr. Philip Buttman, so justly celebrated on the Continent, is nearly ready for publication; translated from the German, by a distinguished Scholar.

Mr. Smith, of the British Museum, is preparing for the press a Life of Nollekens.

A Life of Fuseli, by his Executor, comprising an interesting correspondence with Cowper, relating to his translation of Homer, is among the promised publications of the present season.

A Treatise on the Natural History, Physiology, and Management of the Honey Bee, by Dr. Bevan, will be shortly published.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

The History of the Rise and Progress of the United States of North America, till the British Revolution in 1688. By James Grahame, Esq. 2 Vols. 8vo. 1l. 8s. boards.

The Architectural Antiquities of Great Britain, represented and illustrated in a Series of Views, Elevations, Plans, Sections, and Details of various Ancient English Edifices. By John Britton, F.S.A. Part I. 2l 2s. in boards, containing Twenty-eight Plates, with ample Letter-Press Descriptions, and to be completed in Ten Parts, forming four handsome volumes in 4to.

The Antiquarian Trio; consisting of Views and Descriptions of the Duke of Buckingham's House, Kirby; Rudston Church and Obelisk; Effigy at Scarborough; to which will be added, The Poet's Favourite Tree. By the Rev. Archdeacon Wraugham. 18mo. 2s. boards.

Memoirs of Scipio de Recci, Bishop of Pistoia and Prato, and Reformer of Catholicism in Tuscany, under the Reign of Leopold. By M. De Potter. 8vo.

A Second Volume of Reminiscences, with a Correspondence between the late Dr. Parr and the Author. By Charles Butler, Esq. 8vo. 9s. 6d.

Sir Herbert Taylor's Memoir of His Royal Highness the Duke of York. 8vo. 2s.

The Modern Jesuits; a Biographical Work. Translated from the French of L'Abbé Martial Marçet de la Roche Arnould. By Emile Lepage, Professor of the French Language, Fulham. 12mo. 6s. 6d. boards.

Travels and Adventures in South Africa. By G. Thomson, Esq. 4to.

Sketches of Persia, from the Journals of a Traveller in the East. 2 Vols. 8vo. 18s.

Voyage of His Majesty's Ship Blonde to the Sandwich Islands. By Capt. the Right Hon. Lord Byron. 4*vo.* 2*l. 2s.*

Personal Narrative of Adventures in the Peninsula, during the War in 1812 and 1813. By an Officer. 8*vo.* 9*s. 6d.*

A Tour round Scarborough: Historically and Bibliographically unfolded. By John Cole. 12*mo.* 5*s. boards.*

Select Pieces for Reading and Recitation. By George Harris. 2*s. 6d.*

An Explanation of the Greek Article. By John Jones, LL.D. M. R. L. S. 12*mo.* 4*s. boards.*

The Objects, Advantages and Pleasures of Science; being a Discourse introductory to a Series of Treatises to be published under the Superintendence and Management of a Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. 8*vo.* 6*d.*

The Distribution of National Wealth, considered in its Bearings upon the several Questions now before the Public, more especially those of the Corn Laws, and Restriction in general. By Cedric. 8*vo.* 2*s. 6d.*

Observations on the Corn Laws, addressed to W. W. Whitmore, Esq., M. P., in consequence of his Letters to the Electors of Bridgenorth. 8*vo.* 2*s. sewed.*

An Apology for the Corn Laws, or High Wages and Cheap Bread incompatible. By a Country Curate. 8*vo.* 6*s.*

Theological and Ecclesiastical.

Systematic Morality; or a Treatise on the Theory and Practice of Human Duty on the Grounds of Natural Religion. 2 Vols. 8*vo.* 21*s.*

Divinity, or Discourses on the Being

of God, the Divinity of Christ, and the Personality and Divinity of the Holy Ghost, and on the Sacred Trinity. By the Rev. W. Davy. 2 Vols. 8*vo.* 1*l. 8s.*

Character and Offices of Christ, illustrated by a comparison with the Typical Characters of the Old and New Testament, in a Series of Discourses. By the Rev. John Crombie, A. M. 8*vo.* 10*s. 6d.*

The Nature and Extent of the Christian Dispensation, with reference to the Salvability of the Heathen. By E. W. Greisfield. 8*vo.* 12*s.*

An Earnest but Temperate Appeal to the Bishops and Clergy of the Church of England, in behalf of Apostolical Christianity. 8*vo.* 1*s. sewed.*

Lux Renata, a Protestant Epistle, with Notes. By the Author of *Religio Clerici.* 8*vo.* 4*s. 6d.*

The Claims of the Established Church: a Sermon. By the Rev. W. H. Cole, A. M. 8*vo.* 1*s. sewed.*

Memorial of the Established Church of Ireland to the King, Lords and Commons of Great Britain. 12*mo.* 4*s.*

Single Sermons.

Sermon on the Death of John Mason Good, M. D., &c. By Charles Jerram, M. A. 8*vo.*

Sorrowing not without Hope, a Sermon. By Thomas Raffles, LL.D. 8*vo.* 1*s. sewed.*

A Sermon on the Duty of redeeming the Time, preached at Newport, in the Isle of Wight, January 7, 1827, and at Bridport, January 28, 1827. By the Rev. E. Kell, A. M.

CORRESPONDENCE.

The Conductors are making arrangements to give occasional Biographical and Critical Accounts of the more eminent German Theologians and their Works. They would be glad to receive information as to the state of religious opinion among the higher and lower classes of Jews in England and in Foreign Countries, embracing a wider range than mere ceremonial conformity.

The Resolutions from Manchester on the subject of the Test and Corporation Acts, came too late for insertion.

The Conductors decline the insertion of the paper from Tavistock, on the ground of their determination not to continue in the New Series controversies commenced in the Old.

The pressure of interesting matter has obliged the Conductors to add half a sheet to the present Number. Several valuable Communications have notwithstanding been unavoidably postponed.

ERRATA.

At the bottom of page 188, and at the top of page 189, of the last Number, for *Janus* read *Jason, passim.* The name, as previously printed, was *Jason Maynus.*

Have Mr. Clarke's initials, page 264, been correctly deciphered?