

THE MONTHLY REPOSITORY

AND

REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, No. V.

MAY, 1827.

BIBLICAL GLEANINGS FROM RECENT WORKS ON EGYPTIAN ANTIQUITIES.

No event in the history of literature has ever promised more curious and interesting results than the remarkable discoveries made in Egyptian antiquities by Dr. Young and M. Champollion. The light of historical truth and certainty has been thrown on ages, which had hitherto been abandoned to ancient fable and modern hypothesis: the long-lost key to the stores of Egyptian wisdom has been found, and though there is no probability that any hidden treasures of moral, political or scientific truth will be found in them, it is a discovery of some importance, even in this view, to know what they do *not* contain, while we may reasonably hope that our knowledge of the history both of this country and others connected with it will receive very important accessions.

The nature of Dr. Young's and M. Champollion's discoveries is now become familiar to the public by means of various articles of periodical literature, and especially the last number of the Edinburgh Review, in which they are very fully and clearly detailed.* It is not the purpose of the

* The Reviewer is not equally successful in his interpretation of the celebrated passage of the *Stromata* of Clemens Alexandrinus, Vol. II. p. 657, Potter, in which that father explains the different kinds of Egyptian writing. He translates *διὰ τῶν πρώτων στοιχείων* "by the initial letters," which he thinks corresponds exactly with M. Champollion's discovery. But "alphabetical letters" would have been a more correct translation. It is true that *στοιχεῖα* by itself means alphabetical letters, but such pleonasm as *primary elements*, (Hor. Serm. I. i. 26,) where *elements* alone would have expressed the meaning, are too common in all languages to allow of any stress being laid on *πρῶτα*. "Probe scio literas interdum alphabeticas (apud Platonem scilicet Aristotelemque) *πρῶτα στοιχεῖα* nuncuperi." Bailey, Hierog. Or. et Us. p. 33. It is, besides, by no means certain, that the phonetic system is derived from the initial letters. That M. Champollion's alphabet represents correctly the sounds of the letters, there can be no reasonable doubt; that the figures represent objects whose Coptic names began with these letters, is a probable conjecture, and strongly supported by analogy; but hitherto only a small proportion of his phonetic characters have been found capable of such an explanation. *Précis*, p. 312. Again, the words *ἢ δ' ὡς περ τροπικῶς γράφεται ἢ δε ἄντικρυς ἀλληγορεῖται κατὰ τινὰς ἀνιγμούς*, the Reviewer renders, (following, indeed, Warburton and others, including

present paper, therefore, to enter into any examination of their evidence, or the respective merits of the alleged discoveries, but merely to collect whatever may serve to illustrate the history and chronology of the Old Testament, or the customs and ideas by which its phraseology has been influenced.

Gen. i. 6, "And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters." On the true meaning of the word רָקִיעַ in this passage much has been written, and many persons, unwilling to admit that the author entertained so erroneous a notion of the structure of the heavens as to suppose that a solid arch was extended above the earth, have strenuously argued for rendering it "expanse." It appears, however, from M. Champollion that the Egyptians, from whom the Jews are most likely to have derived what little knowledge they might possess of the system of the universe, conceived of the heavens as a real firmament. "The sky is represented as a real ceiling of a temple, sometimes covered with stars;" and he adds in a note, "such was the popular idea of the firmament in Egypt, as we are warranted in believing from the homily of a Coptic Father, who tells his audience 'that they must not suppose that the heavens were placed over the earth *like a roof upon a house.*'" Précis, p. 277.

Gen. x. 1—4. The sons of Japheth, Javan, &c.; and the sons of Javan, Elishah, &c. It is generally agreed among commentators that this curious document is to be understood as exhibiting a table of national rather than individual genealogies. The name Javan is given throughout the Old Testament to the Greeks, Is. lxvi. 19, Ezek. xxvii. 13, Dan. viii. 21, and it appears to have been used by the Syrians and Arabs, probably by the Persians too, (Æsch. Pers. 183, Blomf.) in the same sense. The Rosetta stone contains a resolution that the honours decreed to Ptolemy should be recorded $\text{τοῖς τε ἱεροῖς καὶ ἰεργωροῖς * καὶ Ἑλληνικοῖς γράμμασιν}$ and the hieroglyphic in-

Champollion,) "the third, *on the contrary*, suggests them by means of certain allegorical enigmas." But what *contrariety* can there be between a *tropical* and an *allegorical* representation, when the latter is nothing but the former pushed to excess? Ἀντικρυσ is here used in a sense in which it may be found in Homer and many other authors—*plane, omnino*: "the second is expressed in a certain degree tropically; the third runs into *downright allegory*;" the qualifying ὡσπερ and the absolute ἀντικρυσ have now their proper contrast. Most unfortunate of all is the Reviewer's rendering of the concluding words $\text{τῶν βασιλέων ἐπαίνους θεολογουμένοις μύθοις παραδίδοντες, ἀναγράφουσι διὰ τῶν ἀναγλύφων}$ "they describe them by means of *anaglyphs* (that is, by transpositions or transformations of the hieroglyphs);" and in his tabular view of the different modes of Egyptian writing, he gives the *anaglyphic* as a species of the tropic. Now ἀναγλύφη is neither more nor less than a *basrelief*, and the passage describes the monuments of Egypt most exactly; they are praises of their kings, conceived in theological fables, (Son of the Sun, Beloved of Ptha, Guardian of the Upper and Lower Regions, &c. &c.) and recorded in basreliefs. The origin of the Reviewer's translation appears to be this. M. Latronne, to whom Champollion applied for a version, renders ἀναγλύφων , *basreliefs allégoriques*; on this Champollion founds the supposition that the anaglyphs contained mystical doctrines of theology, morals and physics, (Précis, pp. 360, 361,) contrary to the express declaration of Clemens, that it was the praises of their kings which they recorded; and last of all, the Edinburgh Reviewer, dropping the word *basreliefs* altogether, creates an *anaglyphic* writing with the same propriety as he might attribute to the English a *lithographic* or a *chalcographic* mode of writing as a distinct species.

* Dr. Young, though he has much cause to complain of M. Champollion, blames him without reason (p. 9) for calling the character in common use in Egypt *demotic*, and not, after his own example, *enchorial*. *Enchorial*, *native* or *vernacular*, is evidently used as a contrast to *Greek*, and therefore when the sacred writing is to be distinguished from the popular, *demotic* is the more proper word.

scription (which is here phonetic) has for Greek "Ionian" letters. (*Précis, Explic. des Planches, No. 315.*) It is not wonderful that the orientals, and especially the Egyptians, becoming acquainted with the Ionian Greeks before any other tribe of the nation, should have given their name to the whole people. But a difficulty occurs here which does not seem to have struck the commentators. If the book of Genesis was written or compiled by Moses, it must have been in existence 1500 years before Christ. But the Greeks tell us that Asiatic Ionia and the Ionian nation derived their name from Ion, whose birth and parentage are not indeed distinctly known, but who lived long after the time of Moses, and whose descendants did not pass into Asia till after the Trojan war, i. e. till about 400 years later than the mention of Ionians in the book of Genesis. Either, therefore, the whole book or this portion of it are later than the age of Moses, or the name must have had some other origin than that which the Greeks assign to it. I feel very little hesitation in adopting the last supposition, believing Ion, Hellen and Achæus, to be personages of equal pretension to historical existence, with Lochrine, Albanact and Camber, the sons of Brutus the Trojan.

Gen. xli. 45. The name of the priest of On or Heliopolis is written in the Coptic version *Petephre*; and M. Champollion (*Précis, 125*) observes how exactly it is descriptive of his office. *Pet* is a Coptic prefix denoting "he who belongs to," and *Phre* is the sun, *Re* with the Coptic definite article. Now the divinity worshiped at Heliopolis was the Sun, as even the Greek name sufficiently implies. Asenath, the name of the wife of Joseph, he thinks has been formed from Neith, a goddess corresponding with the Athene of the Greeks. (*Précis, 127.*) The name of one of the Hebrew midwives, Siphrah, Ex. i. 15, is evidently formed from that of *Phre*, and of the other, Puah, from *Pooh*, (*Deus Lunus*), the Egyptian names being usually compounds of those of their gods. *Précis, 109.*

Gen. xli. 34. "Every shepherd is an abomination to the Egyptians." The causes of this hatred have been variously explained by commentators. It is most commonly referred to the animal worship of the Egyptians, which made them abhor shepherds, who, living on the flesh of their flocks, must have put to death the animals which the Egyptians held sacred. But though the ram, the bull and the goat were objects of religious worship, it does not appear that the Egyptians abstained from the flesh of the whole species, or punished those who took away the life of one of them as they did the man who killed a hawk, an ibis, or a cat. Shepherds existed among them, and Pharaoh himself had cattle. (xlii. 6.) Others, therefore, have thought that it was part of the policy of the Egyptian priesthood to inculcate upon the minds of the people a salutary horror of the nomadic tribes in their neighbourhood, whose ferocity and want of civilization were so opposite to the character which the priesthood are supposed to have been desirous of impressing on the Egyptians: while others, with still greater probability, suppose their horror of shepherds to have been the consequence of what they had suffered from the invasion of a nomadic horde who, under the name of Hykshôs, or shepherd kings, are so famous in Egyptian annals. The researches of M. Champollion tend greatly to confirm this opinion. The account of their occupation of Egypt has been preserved only in Manetho, quoted by Josephus in his work against Apion, *lib. i. c. 14*. The priest of Sebennytus has generally laboured under the imputation of committing forgery to exalt the antiquity of his nation, but his lists of kings have received such a remarkable confirmation from the discoveries of M. Champollion, as to entitle him to credit respecting those earlier periods of which no monu-

ments have yet been brought to light. About the year 2080 before Christ, a people distinguishable from the inhabitants of Egypt or the adjacent countries by their red hair and blue eyes, which seem to connect them with the tribes of the North, possessed themselves of the valley of the Nile, and established a sovereignty under one of their chiefs named Salatis. Under him and his successors they carried on a cruel war against the native population with the hope of entirely destroying it, imprisoned the magistrates, burnt the cities, and laid the temples in ruins; and having massacred all whom they could of the men capable of bearing arms, reduced the women and children to slavery. To the ravages of the shepherds M. Champollion (Lettre II. à M. le duc de Blacas, p. 8) attributes the almost entire destruction of all the monuments of the preceding dynasties of Manetho. The native race of kings, however, was not extinct; in a distant part of Egypt and in Nubia they still retained a precarious power, and at length succeeded in raising an insurrection against them. Mispheutmosis drove them from the rest of the country, and obliged them to confine themselves in the fortress of Avaris, on the frontiers of Arabia, constructed by their first king, Salatis; and Thoutmosis finally compelled them to evacuate this place, and delivered his country from them for ever. The events of this war are recorded in the great historical bas-reliefs, of which Belzoni and the French commission have given plates. No wonder that "every shepherd should be an abomination to the Egyptians." "The priests," says M. Champollion, (Lettre II. p. 142,) "neglected no means of keeping up in the minds of the Egyptians a profound horror for the Hykshôs; they covered the public monuments with the scene of their defeat and destruction; and this patriotic sentiment, consecrated by religion, had penetrated the minds of all the castes. They even trampled under foot the memory of these barbarians; *the shoes of the living and the dead which have been collected in Egypt, have on their outer soles the figure of a Hykshôs on his knees and loaded with chains.*" With such recollections and feelings, can we wonder at the alarm which they afterwards felt at the increase of the Israelites in Goshen, at the means which they took to make them abandon their nomadic habits, and convert them into servile labourers, or even at the inhuman methods to which they had recourse to check their growing population?

As the kings of Egypt are mentioned only by the title of Pharaoh in Genesis and Exodus, it is impossible to say with certainty in whose reign either the going down of the Israelites into Egypt or their departure took place. According to the common chronology, however, the Exodus which occurred 1492 B. C. must fall in the reign of Rameses V. or Amenophis-Rameses, the last of the eighteenth dynasty, and immediate predecessor of Sesostrius. From this the going down into Egypt will of course be differently calculated, according as the 400 or 430 years (Gen. xv. 13, Exod. xii. 40, Acts vii. 6) are reckoned from the commencement of the bondage of the Israelites, or from the promise to Abraham. The martyr Stephen, following the Hebrew, the expression of which is not at all obscure, makes the "evil entreatment" of the people to have lasted 400 years; which added to the "sojourning" of those who had been born in Canaan, and in whose life-time they were kindly treated, agrees not only with the Hebrew but even with the reading of the Samaritan* in Exod. xii. 40, while

* Mr. Wellbeloved, who adopts the Samaritan reading, thus renders the verse: "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel and of their fathers who had dwelt in the land of Canaan and in the land of Egypt, was 430 years." This

the Apostle Paul (Gal. iii. 17) following the Septuagint, makes the whole interval, from the covenant with Abraham to the giving of the law, only 430 years. The weight of textual authority is in favour of the longer period, and 215 years would be indeed a narrow term for the increase of 70 souls to 600,000 males. Great difficulties, however, remain, even if the longer time be adopted.

Job xxxi. 26, 27. "If I beheld the sun when it shined, or the moon walking in brightness, and my heart hath been secretly enticed, or my mouth hath kissed my hand, this were an iniquity for the judge." "In a fragment of a homily composed by S. Schenouti," says M. Champollion, *Précis*, p. 96, "he inveighs strongly against those of the inhabitants of Egypt who persist in their idolatry. Woe, says he, to him who, lifting his hand towards his mouth, adores, saying, Hail, O *Pre*, or, Be victorious, O Pooh!" See note on Gen. xli. 45. This was probably the prevailing idolatry of Arabia. Herodotus, iii. 8, represents the Arabians as worshipping Urotal and Alilat, on which Wesseling observes, "Designantur duo totius orientis præcipua numina, Sol et Luna."

Ps. cx. 1. "The Hykshôs," says M. Champollion, (*Lettre I.* p. 57,) "are represented prostrate and bound upon the footstools of the thrones of the Pharaohs, which recalls, in a lively manner, the verse of the Psalmist; *ponam inimicos tuos in scabellum pedum tuorum.*" The "*ponam in scabellum*" of the Vulgate has made the resemblance appear more close than perhaps it really is, but the fact mentioned may still serve as an illustration of the general meaning.

From the departure of the Israelites, there is a long interval during which no connexion is recorded between Judea and Egypt. Solomon is said to have married a daughter of the King of Egypt, 1 Kings iii. 1, but as he is only designated by the general name of Pharaoh, we can fix nothing in chronology by this mention of him. In the reign of Rehoboam, however, we find, for the first time, a sovereign of Egypt, designated by his proper name, Shishak, invading the Holy Land and plundering the temple and palace of Jerusalem, 1 Kings xiv. 25. It was the opinion of Marsham and Newton, that the Shishak or Sesac of the Scriptures was the Sesostris of Egyptian history, and indeed the desire to establish this identity and reduce the ancient history of other countries into conformity with it, may be said to have given birth to our illustrious countryman's system of chronology. The century which has elapsed since his death has placed his fame, as a discoverer in physics and astronomy, on a pinnacle which no other human being has approached, but has produced a very different effect on his chronological speculations. Sir Isaac Newton was above the danger of error in the astronomical calculations which are the basis of his system, as applied to the Grecian history; but astronomy alone could not solve the question; it was necessary to connect its data with historical testimony, and the first link which was to create this connexion proved unsound;* while the assumption

admits, I think, only of the interpretation given in the text. The LXX., by rendering יִשְׁבּוּ אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁבּוּ not *οἱ* but *ἦν κατ'ὀψῆσαν*, gives it a different turn. Even their rendering, however, might have been reconciled with the Hebrew, considering the words only in themselves; but it is evident from Josephus, *Ant.* ii. 15, 2, and Gal. iii. 17, that those who used this version understood them as including the whole residence of the Patriarchs in Canaan.

* This application requires that the colures should have passed originally through the middle of Aries and Cancer, &c.; that their present distance from these points and the rate of their precession should be known; and that they should have been

on which he everywhere proceeds, that the gods of the Heavens were the kings, queens, and chiefs, of the countries in which they were worshiped, is neither probable in itself nor supported by history. The discoveries of M. Champollion have fixed Rameses or Sesostris (the Sethos of Manetho) at the head of the nineteenth dynasty, and Sesonchis, Sesac or Shishak, at the head of the twenty-second. The name *Scheschonk* has been found on one of the colonnades of the palace of Karnac, and on a statue of the Museum of Turin. These monuments of course afford no data, but according to the lists of Manetho, whom it is reasonable to trust after so many confirmations of his account, he began his reign in 971 B. C., which corresponds almost exactly with the close of Solomon's and the commencement of Rehoboam's reign. The alliance of this powerful monarch with Jeroboam, who had taken refuge at his court and had married his daughter, no doubt contributed to the dismemberment of Judæa and the establishment of the kingdom of Israel. In the reign of Abijam, the successor of Rehoboam, we meet with no mention of the kings of Egypt, but in that of Asa, his son, we are told, in the 2d book of Chronicles xiv. 9, that Zerah, the Ethiopian, came up with an immense host, and was defeated by Asa at Mareshah. The successor of Sesonchis, in Manetho, is Osoroth or Osorthon; and M. Champollion, having found the name Osorchon engraved after that of Scheschonk at Karnac, supposes him to be the same as Zerah or Zarach. Mr. Salt, however, has found (Essay, p. 52) the name of Zera (written Ssera) at the mines near Mount Sinai; and we think that Champollion himself, when acquainted with this fact, will be ready to admit that this is the Zerah of the Scriptures. He accounts for the circumstance of his being called an Ethiopian, by supposing his conquests to have included Ethiopia, which was certainly subject to or in alliance with Sesac (2 Chron, xii. 3); but this seems not a probable explanation. One of the results most confidently to be expected from the recent discoveries in hieroglyphics, is the elucidation of the political condition of Ethiopia and its relations with Egypt. Their inhabitants appear to have been as much a kindred people as the English and the Scotch. The hieroglyphic writing was common to both, as we learn, not only from Diodorus, but from the evidence of monuments; it was even more used in common life in Ethiopia than in Egypt: the Ethiopians claimed the Egyptians as their colonists; and Mr. W. J. Bankes has ascertained, that the present language of Nubia (the Barâbra) is, in great measure, identical with the ancient Coptic. (Salt, p. 57.)

From the reign of Asa a long interval occurs, during which no mention is made of Ethiopian or Egyptian monarchs in Jewish history. The princes of the twenty-third and twenty-fourth dynasties appear to have been men not distinguished by activity or talent, who confined themselves within the limits of their own dominions; and the growing power of the Assyrians may have prevented any attempts at Asiatic conquest. A sense of mutual danger from this monarchy occasionally united Egypt and Judæa in alliance. It is un-

fixed in their original position at some given event; Newton says, the Argonautic expedition. Now, the first is in itself probable, the second is a well-ascertained fact, but the proof of the third fails altogether. It is said by Diog. Laert., Pref. iii., that Musæus ποιῆσαι διογονίαν καὶ σφαῖραν πρῶτον, i. e. according to Newton, "first constructed the sphere," (Chron. p. 84,) and consequently fixed the colures. But it has been shewn by Larcher, Her. Vol. II. p. 287, and Wesseling on Her., lib. ii. § 53, that the words mean, that Musæus first wrote a poetical description of the sphere.

certain who was the So, King of Egypt, to whom Hosea is said to have sent messengers (2 Kings xvii. 4) when he meditated a revolt from the power of Shalmaneser. Mr. Salt supposes, (p. 52,) as indeed others have done, that he is the same as Sabaco, whose name he has discovered at Abydos, an Ethiopian conqueror and founder of the twenty-fifth dynasty. The Taracus of Manetho, third of this dynasty, is evidently the Tirhaka, King of Ethiopia, (whom Shuckford made an Arabian, II. p. 167,) and whose invasion compelled Sennacherib to draw off his forces (2 Kings xix., Is. xxxviii). His name Mr. Salt has found written TIRAKA, at Medinet Haboo, and at Birkel in Ethiopia. Of the twenty-sixth or Saitic dynasty, the name of Necho (the Pharaoh Necho of Scripture) has been found on an Egyptian tablet by Signor Anastasy. The name of the Uaphris of Manetho, the Apries of the Greek historians, and the Hophra of Scripture, does not appear to have been yet discovered on any Egyptian or Ethiopian monument.

It will be evident from this detail, that there is nothing in the discoveries recently made in Egyptian antiquities, which tends in any degree to impair the credibility of Scripture, but that, on the contrary, they illustrate its customs and phraseology, and its chronology harmonizes with theirs wherever they can be placed side by side.* Connected with this latter point, however, there is a subject attended with considerable difficulty. We have seen that the invasion of the shepherd kings is placed, according to M. Champollion, on the combined authority of Manetho and inscriptions, about 2080 B. C. According to the chronology commonly received and supposed to be founded on the authority of Scripture, this was only about three centuries after the Deluge; and to say nothing of the difficulty of the diffusion and multiplication of the human race in that interval, so as to furnish powerful monarchies, how can we find room for the first fourteen dynasties of Manetho, all of which were anterior to the invasion of the Hykshôs? It has been thought that the dynasties of Manetho were contemporaneous, not successive; but now that this hypothesis has been shewn to be without foundation, as concerns the later dynasties, it must appear an unwarrantable assumption with regard to the earlier. Will the adoption of any other reckoning than that which is founded on the *Hebrew* text give us a larger space for the events which are so inconveniently crowded in the common chronology of the world from the Deluge? The chronology of the Septuagint and the Samaritan undoubtedly furnish an interval longer, by some hundred years, between the Deluge and the birth of Abraham, than the Hebrew; but the Septuagint bears very strong traces of a systematic alteration in order to obtain this interval, and being made in Egypt, may naturally be suspected of a forced conformity or at least accommodation to the Egyptian chronology. The Samaritan seems also to have been systematically altered, and probably for a similar reason; for though the extraordinary coincidence of the Samaritan and the Septuagint, in numerous readings *against* the Hebrew, has never been satisfactorily explained, it seems difficult to account for it, except by some direct influence of the one upon the other; and as the motive to a systematic change is obvious in respect to a version made at Alexandria, it is reasonable to suppose that it began with the Septuagint. The Hebrew text,

* We perceive from M. Champollion that a work has been published in Holland, entitled "Lettre à M. Ch. Coquerel sur le Système Hiéroglyphique de M. Champollion considéré dans ses rapports avec l'Écriture Sainte: par A. L. Coquerel. 1825." We have not been able to obtain a sight of it; it appears to relate entirely to chronology.

then, with whatever difficulties it may be embarrassed, seems to represent most faithfully the genuine tradition of the Jewish people. And even the adoption of either of the other systems would still leave us straitened for room, in which to dispose of the Egyptian dynasties.

It should, however, be remembered, that as yet the chronology of Manetho, anterior to the invasion of the shepherds, has not received that confirmation from monuments which has given credibility to his subsequent history. Nor is this all; from the statements of M. Champollion it should seem that there is no hope of our ever obtaining such a confirmation. "The more," says he, "we became acquainted with the inscriptions which cover the edifices which remain on both banks of the Nile, and by their means with the date of their erection, the more we shall be convinced *that there remains scarcely any thing anterior to the 18th Diospolitan dynasty.* It is to the long residence of the Hykshôs, and the devastations which accompanied their dominion, that we are to attribute exclusively the almost entire disappearance of the public edifices, reared under the kings of the preceding sixteen dynasties." Lettre II. p. 8. Such an event, while it deprives us of the means of confirming history by monuments, must also impair the certainty of the history itself, because these very monuments were the materials from which, had they been spared, copious and authentic history would have been constructed. The invasion of the shepherds was to Egypt, what the invasion of the Gauls was to Rome; and as Livy, when he tells us that historical documents, "*incensâ Urbe pleræque interiere,*" absolves us from the obligation to believe implicitly what he had related before, so the history of the earlier Egyptian dynasties must always be received with considerable doubt. Indeed, independently of this violent annihilation of monuments, Time destroys even in Egypt, and therefore remoter periods are *ipso facto* attended with more obscurity and doubt.

We must be content, therefore, to leave this question at present undecided: but supposing the result of further inquiries to be an extension of the Egyptian history to a longer period than we can reconcile with the chronology of Genesis, no friend of revelation need be alarmed at such a discovery. Had we indeed been told, either by the historian who has preserved the genealogies of the patriarchal ancestors of the Jews, or by any other of the sacred writers, that the transmission of them had been miraculously guarded from those errors or imperfections to which every other tradition is liable, or that they had been derived not from tradition but from immediate inspiration, the case would have been different: but no such authority is claimed, and we are not at liberty gratuitously to assume it. Those who think that when the accuracy or the completeness of a narrative is questioned, they can quiet doubts by appealing to its inspiration, forget that in so doing they beg the whole question and more besides. It is a perilous expedient for the honour, and even the security of religion, to bring her authority to decide questions in science, *against* the evidence of facts and arguments. Yet such is the practice of many persons at the present moment, who will not allow the philosopher to read any thing in the archives of nature, nor the historian in the early annals of the world, which is not consistent with what they deem the authority of revelation. They acknowledge no difference between the blind and eager spirit of scepticism, which to destroy the authority of Scripture thinks all weapons and all modes of attack legitimate; * and the

* It is a lamentable fact, that during the ascendancy of the Constitutionals in Spain, an abridgement of the work of Dupuis, *Origine de tous les Cultes*, was widely

spirit of cautious but free inquiry, which refuses to close its eyes to the conclusions to which it has been led, by an examination conducted in the sincere love of truth, and with the use of all the means which are calculated to secure its attainment. In the particular case which we are now considering, obstinately to reject the evidence of an undue contraction of the Jewish chronology (always supposing that further investigation supplies such evidence) would be in effect to declare that belief in revelation is inconsistent with historical criticism, and that we must choose which we will renounce; while, on the other hand, it is difficult to see how the admission of it would affect a single truth in the doctrines, or fact in the history, of religion. The records of the human race, from their dispersion to the birth of Abraham, are contained in sixteen verses of the eleventh chapter of Genesis—a naked list of descents—a species of record very liable to alteration, both in regard to the number of its members and its individual dates. It is impossible to read the book of Genesis, and not perceive how much its character is changed from the point where the history of the Jewish people begins—the calling of Abraham. From a collection of fragments it becomes a full and connected narrative; from a style in which the acutest critics have been at a loss to determine in many passages whether they were reading a history or an allegory, it changes to one in which the distinctness, the vividness, the circumstantiality of real and authentic history are marked in characters not to be mistaken. Now this gradation is precisely what might have been expected, and confirms the fidelity of the historian, by corresponding with the necessary gradation in the copiousness and distinctness of his documents. What preceded the calling of Abraham belonged to the Jews only in common with the other nations of mankind; what followed it was exclusively their own, and therefore would both be known more perfectly, and preserved with greater accuracy. It is very possible that the family of Abraham may also have preserved the chronology of their own descent from the postdiluvian Patriarch with equal accuracy; all that is contended is, that should subsequent investigations prove that they have not, it will be equally unjust to reject the evidence of history, in order to uphold the inspiration of Jewish genealogy, or to reject the evidence of revelation, because the Jewish chronology of an obscure and primæval period appears to be imperfect or erroneous.

K.

circulated in that country, by some who wished to disabuse the Spaniards of their superstition. The object of this work is to prove that Christ was the Sun, his mother the constellation Virgo, the Apostles the twelve signs of the Zodiac or the *Dii Majores*, Peter with his keys being Janus. Thus it is that the prohibition of reason, in matters of religion, produces a reaction towards the most irrational extravagance of scepticism. The Romish Church has been the mighty parent of infidelity, and some Protestants seem desirous that their churches should rival her fecundity.

THE CHRONICON OF EUSEBIUS.

IN every point of view, the recovery of a long-lost treasure of antiquity, the work of a man so justly celebrated as Eusebius, the Bishop of Cæsarea, is an event highly interesting to the literary world. The result of the researches of a distinguished writer and indefatigable inquirer to whom the long-lost stores of antiquity lay open, and who knew how to employ those stores to the best account, must at all times be valuable, and still more when it preserves considerable portions of the very authorities from which he drew.

Eusebius lived at a most important era. Christianity had begun to rear her established head in courts and palaces. From being regarded as the depraved superstition of rebels and schismatics, it became the favourite religion of the state; councils were assembling under temporal authority to give law in matters of faith; and Christians, who had just escaped from the persecutions of Heathens, began to whet the sword of religious zeal in the hands of the magistrates against their fellow-worshippers. But there was still a literary warfare to maintain with the votaries of ancient superstitions, and the opponents of every system of revealed religion. Even Paganism had been purified to a certain extent in the conflict, and its philosophers maintained a vigorous literary warfare on the merits and preliminary principles and opinions held up by the Christians for their adoption. It was obviously the time for talent and research to come forward in the foremost ranks of the defenders of the newly-adopted faith of the state, and a fitter champion could hardly be found than the Bishop of Cæsarea. When we consider the impediments which must have lain in the way of an extensive cultivation of any pursuits that required an acquaintance with the works of many authors of various ages, at a time when such works existed only in scattered manuscripts, and could only be perused with severe labour, the extent of his acquirements seems prodigious. Besides a personal acquaintance with all the learned men of his time, his writings shew that he had read the works of every species of Greek writers, philosophers, historians, or divines, and the catalogue of his productions is a sufficient demonstration of the indefatigable industry with which he devoted himself to the support of the cause he had at heart.

The general scope of the arguments used by Eusebius in discussing in his principal works the respective claims of the rival systems of religion in point of authority and antiquity, naturally led him into historical and chronological investigations. The Christian religion, he argued, (without much notion apparently of what are now called its *peculiar doctrines*,) though new in name, was instituted and observed from the beginning of the world by good men accepted of God, from those natural notions which are implanted in men's minds. The patriarchs were Christians in reality, though not in name. For what else, he said, did the name of Christian denote, but a man who by the knowledge and doctrine of Christ is brought to the practice of sobriety, righteousness, patience, fortitude, and the religious worship of the one and only God over all? Christianity was anterior to Judaism. Judaism was a republic, established according to the law delivered by Moses. It was anterior to Heathenism, which was a superstition consisting of the worship of many gods and deified men. Anterior to either of these there was a third religion, neither Judaism nor Heathenism, the most ancient institution, the oldest philosophy, which had lain dormant but had been lately declared and revived agreeably to the predictions of Moses and the prophets; and he who

forsook Heathenism or Judaism and became a Christian, embraced in so doing that law and course of life which had been followed by the ancient patriarchs, the friends of God.

In discussing these subjects with the philosophers and advocates of Heathenism, Eusebius of course maintained the superior authenticity and credit of the Jewish records. The historical accuracy of records connected with religion became a point of great importance at a time when the only memorials for fixed chronology were intimately connected with hieratic registers. Berosus, from such materials, had compiled the annals of the Assyrians, Manetho, those of Egypt, Acusilaus, those of Greece. Assuming the substantial accuracy of many of these records, and investigating and correcting them where wrong, Eusebius devoted himself to ascertain and determine their correspondence with the chronology of the Jewish Scriptures, intending at the same time to prove that the dates which heathen chronology assigned to those worthies who had become the objects of heathen worship was far later than those of the patriarchs and prophets recorded in the authentic history of the Old Testament. Moses, he intends to shew, even according to their own chronology, lived prior to the worship of Jupiter, to the birth of Latona, of Bacchus, Apollo, and most of the heathen deities; to the flood of Deucalion, the fall of Phaeton, the rape of Europa, and ages prior to the first poets, philosophers and historians of Greece.

The fruit of inquiries of this sort was a series of chronological tables, forming his *Χρονικοῦς Κανονας*, compiled in parallel columns, graduated by a scale of years much on the same plan as our modern historical charts, preceded by a work on which it was grounded, and which formed its development and illustration. This Eusebius entitled his *παντοδαπην ιστοριαν*. It was, in fact, a digest, with copious extracts, of all the writers of note who could be regarded as the original sources of information on the subject. The work was, as it deserved to be, highly valued, both for the original materials which it preserved, and the industry, skill and originality of its compilation.

These books, now long lost to the world, or at least only preserved in scattered and imperfect fragments, have lately been restored in an Armenian version, of which a Latin translation has been published under the title of "Eusebii Pamphili, Cæsariensis Episcopi, Chronicon Bipartitum, nunc primum ex Armeniaco textu in Latinum conversum, adnotationibus auctum, Græcis fragmentis exornatum, opera P. Jo. Baptistæ Aucher, Ancyрани, Monachi Armeni, et Doctoris Mechitaristæ. Venetiis, 1818. 2 Tom. quarto." We derive our information as to this book and its valuable contents from the analysis of it in a contemporary (the British Critic). If opportunity shall occur, we shall gladly avail ourselves of it to present a more minute account of it to our readers, comparing it with the fragments preserved, and, as he fancied, reunited and connected into almost their original form by Scaliger; and we shall also examine how far the system of such inquirers as Bryant are affected by an addition like this to the slender materials they possessed. At present we can only perform the humbler office of recording as matter of interesting intelligence such information as we have been able to procure.

There is every reason to believe that the original text of Eusebius is irretrievably lost; for though many searches were made during the two last centuries in the libraries both of the East and West, not a single copy has been hitherto discovered. The version of Jerome, indeed, still exists; but it cannot supply the place of the original for two reasons. First, it contains

only the second part of the chronological tables. Secondly, Jerome informs us, that he had taken on himself the duty of author, as well as translator, and had inserted numerous additions with the view of rendering the work more interesting to the Latin Christians. The liberties which he took with Eusebius his transcribers have taken with him; and at the present day there exist not two manuscript copies which resemble each other. Scaliger, however, consulted with diligence all the Greek chronologists and historians who wrote after Eusebius, extracted from their works every passage which *they* stated, or which *he* supposed to have been taken from the pages of Eusebius, translated other passages from the Latin version of Jerome, added a few improvements of his own, and then, having arranged his materials in order, produced a work which he persuaded himself to be a correct representation of the Greek text, and accordingly published under the modest title of *Εὐσεβίου τῆ Παμφίλου Χρονικῶν λόγος πρῶτος*, as if he were perusing the identical text of the Greek chronographer.

The work of Eusebius has, however, at last been recovered, not indeed in the Greek language, but in an almost entire and, as far as it is possible to judge, a faithful version. It was contained in an Armenian manuscript found in Jerusalem by Isaac, the Vicar of the Armenian Patriarch, a little before the close of the last century, and afterwards deposited by him in the library of the Armenian seminary in Constantinople. The monks of the isle of St. Lazarus, near Venice, have long been distinguished by the industry and success with which they have cultivated the antiquities and literature of their country. Their curiosity was awakened by the fame of this discovery; they requested a copy; suspicious of its fidelity, they procured a second; and in 1802 they sent Aucher of Ancyra, one of the fraternity, to Constantinople. During the seven years that he resided in the Turkish capital, he had numerous opportunities of correcting the two copies by the original, and of inquiring into the age and authenticity of the Armenian manuscript. With respect to its age, its appearance bore testimony to its antiquity, and the form of the characters resembled that which is known to have been in use in the twelfth century. From the impression of a seal on one of the pages, it seems to have belonged to the patriarch Gregory. But Gregory was a favourite name among the Armenians, and no fewer than six prelates of that appellation sat in the patriarchal chair between the years 1065 and 1306. Any one of these may have been the owner of the manuscript.

In the year 406, the Armenian characters were invented by the teacher Mesropes. The patriarch Isaac availed himself of this fortunate circumstance to improve the education of his clergy. Of his disciples some were sent to Edessa, some to Alexandria, and some to Constantinople. They studied the languages of Syria and Greece; they procured copies of the most serviceable works; and they undertook the task of translating them into their vernacular tongue. The books of Scripture were the first object of their labours; the decrees and canons of the councils followed; to these were added a considerable number of treatises by theological authors; and so extensive was the benefit derived from their writings, that the national historians, in gratitude for their services, have denominated the fifth century "the age of the translators." Now there is convincing evidence to shew that the Armenian version of Eusebius before us, was executed at this early period. Numerous quotations from it, some of them of considerable length, are to be found in the ancient Armenian writers: and among the eight cited by the editor in his preface are two, Lazarus Pharpensis, and Moyses Choronensis, who were

contemporary with the patriarch Isaac himself. Moreover, there is reason to believe that it is accurate as well as ancient; for in every passage in which we have the opportunity of comparing it with the remains of the Greek text, it is found to render the sense of the original with the most scrupulous fidelity.

The plan of the work thus recovered is described by Eusebius himself as follows;

“ I shall begin with the chronology of the Chaldeans, and, in succession, of the Assyrians, Medes, Lydians and Persians. The second chapter will be confined to that of the Hebrews. In the third, I shall describe the numerous dynasties of the Egyptian kings with that of the Ptolemies, who, after the death of the Macedonian conqueror, reigned in Alexandria. The fourth will be devoted to the history of Greece. I shall enumerate the kings who reigned in Sicyon, in Athens, in Argos, Lacedæmon and Corinth; to these I shall add the several periods when different states obtained the empire of the sea, and shall conclude with the origin and succession of the Grecian Olympiads. The last chapters will contain the kings of Macedon and Thessaly; those of Assyria and Asia after the death of Alexander; the descendants of Æneas who ruled the Latins, subsequently called Romans; those who succeeded Romulus and were the founders of the Roman city; the emperors after Cæsar and Augustus, and the annual magistrates with the title of consuls. These divisions will form the first part: and from the materials thus collected I shall compose my general canon of times, in which the several successions will be placed in collateral columns, so arranged that, at the first glance, the reader may compare them together, and see who were contemporaries, and what relation of time the sovereigns of different countries, with the principal events of their reigns, bore to each other.”

The first of these chapters consists principally of extracts from the works of Berossus and Abydenus, detailing the Chaldean cosmogony and history of the world before the flood, the history of the deluge, and the escape from it of Xisuthris in an ark, the erection of the tower at Babylon by his children, and the confusion of tongues, and the succeeding dynasties to Semiramis, to Phul, Sennacherib, Samuges, Nabupalsar, Nabucodrosser, &c. Eusebius points out the derivation of this history from the same source as that of Moses disfigured by fables; he reduces the measure of the generations by contending the Chaldean Saros to have been only a short duration of time, and points to the account of the last race of princes as giving support to the testimony of the Scriptures concerning them. The passages thus preserved, many of which were before entirely unknown, are from the works of authors that perished more than one thousand years ago, and, we need not add, therefore possess the strongest interest for the scholar of the present day.

The second chapter, on the Chronology of the Assyrians, has for its sources the long-lost works of Abydenus, Castor, Cephalio and Ctesias, in addition to those which we still have in Herodotus and Diodorus, and in this Eusebius solves a difficulty which has sorely perplexed the learned, arising from the supposed identity of the Nimrod of the Scriptures and the Bel of profane history, whose son nevertheless was supposed to be Ninus, only the fourth from Noah, yet a builder of cities and leader of victorious armies. Abydenus, however, shews that Ninus was, in the Assyrian chronology, not the son of Bel, but of the second Arbel, the ninth not the fourth from Noah, and about contemporary with Abraham.

In the following chapter, on the Chronology of the Hebrews, the first

object is to fix the era of that patriarch, whose birth he takes as the starting point for further computations. In the difficulty between the Hebrew, Samaritan and Greek texts, he, after considerable discussion and hesitation, adopts the last, which he calculates at the year of the world 3184. In the remainder of his task he discusses the variances which occur from different statements in different parts of the Scriptures, with ability and judgment.

The early part of the chapter on Egyptian Chronology is founded on Manetho, and obviates some of the difficulties from the apparent length of its periods, by telling us, from Manetho, that the Egyptian year means no more than a lunar revolution. As to the thirty-one dynasties of Manetho between Menes and Darius, which have puzzled so many chronologers to compress within any limits assigned to them, Eusebius relieves us by the remark, that they are not to be reckoned in one continued line. At different times Egypt was divided into different principalities. Then comes the *questio vexata* as to the shepherd kings. Josephus in Manetho's history of them reads that of the Jews. Bryant (to whom the discovery of the subject of these remarks would probably have furnished materials for many a speculation) finds the shepherds in his favourite Cuthites, and makes the Jews their successors in the land of Goshen. Eusebius quotes Josephus, but adopts a different conclusion. He leads Jacob and his family into Egypt under one of the shepherd kings. At the expulsion of the latter, they are reduced to slavery by a king who "knew not Joseph," and are at last delivered under Achencheres, the third from Imosis.

The next chapter takes the history of Greece, which he arranges as well as he can from the authority of their historians, admonishing his readers that little credit is due to any event which happened before the first Olympiad. He has here preserved an ancient list of 249 Olympiads, which has been known before by a quotation of it from the text of Eusebius by an unknown author. It may be corrected, however, from the present work. The ancient Latin history is taken from Diodorus Siculus and Dionysius of Hallicarnassus.

The compilation of his tables forms the second part of his work, and having fixed his starting points he arranges his series in collateral columns. The first contains his Abrahamic era, then in due time his second containing the Olympiads, then a third from the foundation of Rome, and thence, with other columns appropriated to the history of each state as it arises, with historic notices of memorable events on each side.

The editor has concluded his work by an endeavour (which the assistance of the Armenian version made more easy and successful than that of Scaliger) to restore the Greek text, from various sources in which fragments of it are scattered, including the other works of the Bishop, who seems to have often copied himself.*

406.

* Since we received the above communication, the work in question has reached us, and we hope to be able to recur to the subject.

*Essex Street, April 2, 1827.**To the Editor.*

SIR,

ONE would suppose from the language of your correspondent W. H. Rowe, that I was the first and almost the only person, in modern times, who had ever called in question the genuineness of the prefaces to Matthew and Luke. I suppose he has never heard of such writers as Dr. Williams and Michaelis, not to mention Dr. Priestley and Mr. Evanson, &c., &c.

But it is not my intention to enter into the controversy. I have for some time been placed on the invalided list, and have no inclination to return to the battle. My only object was to remark on the great want of courtesy in my assailant: to which I can only reply, that he is perfectly safe in using whatever language he pleases, as he may rest assured that it will never be retorted by, Sir, yours, &c.

T. BELSHAM.

REMARKS ON MR. W. H. ROWE'S VINDICATION OF THE AUTHENTICITY AND CONSISTENCY OF THE PRELIMINARY CHAPTERS IN MATTHEW AND LUKE.

As Mr. Rowe appears to have concluded this part of his subject,* to the consideration of which this paper will be strictly confined, it is hoped that he will not feel himself unfairly dealt with, by a premature examination of what he has advanced, especially as it seems impossible that any thing should be added to rescue him from the dilemma in which it will be attempted to be proved that he is already involved.

It ought not to be forgotten, that the doubts respecting the genuineness of the chapters in question are not of recent suggestion, and that there is, at least, probable authority for believing that, by some sects, in the earliest ages of Christianity, they were rejected as spurious. Their original admission by the church, and subsequent continuation to the present time, as part of the Scripture canon, are in themselves but inefficient arguments in their favour: since, when we consider how soon after the apostolic age the church acceded to the pestilent adoption of the almost Pagan governments of those days, and infamously prostituted its spiritual interests to the acquisition of temporal power and worldly aggrandizement, by which it learnt the policy of exciting and perpetuating superstition as the surest means of betraying the liberty of the multitude, and enhancing its own secular domination, it ceases to be a wonder how such excrescences should have been first ingrafted and afterwards perpetuated amongst the genuine writings of the evangelists.

In the discussion, however, of the claims of these chapters to reception, diffidence in the partizans of either side is certainly more becoming than overweening confidence; and above all, a sneering and supercilious style of treating the subject, or an opponent, ought to be carefully avoided.

Whoever has minutely compared the several histories of the nativity of our Saviour attributed to Matthew and Luke, must have been struck with the very remarkable circumstance that they coincide in only two particulars,

* This communication was received soon after the appearance of Mr. Rowe's first paper in our number for March. EDIT.

namely, that Christ's conception was miraculous, and that he was born in the days of King Herod, in the town of Bethlehem. Their discrepancies are equally extraordinary, and it may be useful to enumerate a few of them, if it be only with a view of enforcing that moderation which has been recommended in the treatment of those persons who feel compelled to consider them as presenting formidable objections to the genuineness of the narratives alluded to. Matthew states, that *Joseph* was commanded to call the child Jesus — that the birth was announced to Magicians from the East—their interview with Herod, who was then at Jerusalem—Herod's consequent conduct—the flight from Bethlehem into Egypt—the slaughter of the infants—the death of Herod—the return of Joseph, and the subsequent dwelling in Nazareth. Luke states, that *Mary* was commanded to call the child Jesus—that his birth was announced to shepherds—that he was circumcised the eighth day—that the legal purification being accomplished (which required forty days) they brought him to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord—that when they had performed all according to the law, they returned to their own city Nazareth—and that his parents went every year to Jerusalem to the passover. Now it surely ought not to be objected to any one, that he is obstinate or blind, or captious, because he cannot conceive how both these accounts can possibly be true; how it can be a fact, as Matthew states, that Joseph went immediately from Bethlehem into Egypt to avoid the fury of Herod; and at the same time a fact, as Luke relates, that the family remained at Bethlehem at least forty days and then went to Jerusalem, where Herod was probably residing, and from thence returned to Nazareth, and finally went every year to Jerusalem to the passover. Every candid inquirer must allow that these are no trifling difficulties, and quite sufficient to justify a more minute scrutiny. Let us then proceed to examine Mr. Rowe's view of the chronology of those events in the Roman history, which the author of the narrative in Luke has identified with the circumstances which he relates. These are, the period of Herod, or the decree of Augustus, and of the fifteenth year of Tiberius.

Mr. Rowe admits that Herod died in the year 750,* or 751, and Augustus in the year 767. The principal points which he attempts to establish are, that the decree of Augustus was issued in the days of Herod, that the commencement of the *government* of Tiberius is a distinct period from the commencement of his reign, and that the former began in the year 764, and is the epoch from which Luke dates the public manifestation of our Saviour “when he began to be about thirty years old.”

Mr. Rowe assumes that the decree of Augustus was issued in the time of Herod, because the words “in those days,” contained in Luke ii. 1, must, as he contends, refer to the reign of Herod mentioned in chap. i. 5. It is, however, impossible to admit the solidity of an argument derived solely from the authority of a narrative, the whole of which is disputed, and it therefore behoves Mr. Rowe, in the first place, to prove from other and unquestionable evidence the date of the decree alluded to. From any thing that appears in the narrative, it does not necessarily follow that this decree preceded the census or taxing of Cyrenius any considerable time; but if Mr. Rowe's view be correct, it must have lain dormant at least nine years, since it is a fact too well established to be disputed, that the census or taxing of Cyrenius did not take place until after the banishment of Archelaus, the son and successor of Herod, in the year 759. The second verse is admitted to be parenthetical,

* All the dates refer to the year of Rome.

and it is also allowed, that the date of a decree, and its subsequent execution, must, in every case, necessarily mark "two different and distinct eras." Still, however, it remains to be proved, that there was in fact a chasm of nine years between the decree of Augustus and the census of Cyrenius: and without this, there is a manifest absurdity in supposing that all the inhabitants of Judea journeyed to their respective towns, preparatory to a taxation which was not to be *made*, according to Mr. Rowe, until a great portion of them were probably dead. But the fact is, that, under the Roman empire, the census and consequent taxing were always simultaneous operations, included under the single term "*censum agere.*"

The next point which Mr. Rowe labours to enforce, and from which he concludes that Mr. Belsham's *Calm Inquiry* "is completely falsified," is founded on his alleged discovery, that the word *ἡγεμονία*, applied by Luke to the 15th year of Tiberius, designates his *government* or *administration*, as distinctive from his reign, notwithstanding this term may, and sometimes necessarily does, signify *reign*. But admitting for a moment Mr. Rowe's interpretation to be correct, it still remains to be inquired, from what authority he states his supposed *government* of Tiberius to have commenced in the year 764? If any period must be assigned to this event, it ought surely to be that in which Tiberius was adopted by Augustus, and admitted to the joint administration of the affairs of the Roman empire; and there exists good evidence for believing this to have happened in the year 756, and that he received no subsequent accession of power until the death of Augustus. Allowing, then, that the undisputed history of Luke states our Lord to have been about thirty years old in the 15th year of the *government* of Tiberius, we must necessarily date his birth fifteen years prior to the year 756, or in the year 741; but this is a dilemma in which it is apprehended that Mr. Rowe would not willingly involve the Evangelist. We possess, however, other and most respectable means of ascertaining, with some exactness, the chronology of this period. It is well known that Herod died in the year 750, and was succeeded in the tetrarchy of Trachonitis by his son Philip. Now Josephus [*Jewish Antiq.* B. xviii. Ch. iv. Sect. 6] states, that this Philip died in the 20th year of the reign of Tiberius, after he had been tetrarch 37 years; therefore his death took place in the year 787, which was exactly 20 years after the death of Augustus. In the fifth chapter he gives an account of the war between Aretas and Herod the tetrarch, occasioned by the indignity offered by the latter to his wife, who was Aretas's sister, in proposing to divorce her that he might marry Herodias. He then proceeds to relate the destruction of Herod's army by the treachery of fugitives from the tetrarchy of Philip, and observes that this calamity was thought to have befallen Herod as a punishment for the murder of John the Baptist. Therefore, notwithstanding the detail of these circumstances immediately follows the history of the death of Philip, it is clear that they must have preceded that event, though probably not long, otherwise the fugitives referred to could not have been "from the tetrarchy of Philip." Now, if Luke, as Mr. Rowe asserts, intended to date the 15th year of Tiberius from the year 764, and if John, as was the fact, survived this 15th year at most only two years, he must have been beheaded in the year 781, at least six years before the death of Philip, notwithstanding Josephus, a most minute and accurate historian, states both events to have happened about the same time. There is, however, another passage in Josephus which seems to be completely conclusive against Mr. Rowe's suggestion. In Bk. xviii. Ch. iv. Sect. 2, he states, that Pontius Pilate, after residing ten years in Judea, was sent to Rome by Vitellius,

that Marcellus was appointed to succeed him, and that he arrived just after the death of Tiberius. Now, Tiberius died in the year 790, therefore Pontius Pilate was appointed Procurator of Judea in 780. But Luke states that he was Procurator in the 15th year of Tiberius, or, according to the common reckoning, in the year 782. According, however, to Mr. Rowe, the 15th year of Tiberius was in the year 779, which was upwards of a year before Pontius Pilate's appointment; therefore Luke could not have intended to date the 15th year of Tiberius from the year 764.

If the preceding view of chronology be correct, it necessarily follows, that our Saviour was not born until after the death of King Herod, and that, therefore, Luke could not have written the history attributed to him. It is presumed that this assertion will be further supported by a brief examination of his undisputed writings. Now Luke, as Mr. Rowe admits, rests the authenticity of his history on the fact of his having derived it from those who were *from the beginning* eye-witnesses and ministers of the word. Let it be asked, from what beginning? Certainly, from the beginning of the public manifestation of Christ, for until this period there were no "ministers of the word." It is just and natural, therefore, to conclude that he would commence his history from this event, rather than, without giving his readers any notice, make *another beginning* of a narrative which was to extend through twelve years, then leave a chasm of eighteen years, and finally leap to "the beginning" which he had previously announced. It is also not unworthy of remark, that Luke, in the commencement of the Acts of the Apostles, does not intimate that his former treatise, meaning his Gospel, contained the least information respecting our Lord, beyond "all that Jesus began both to do and teach until the day in which he was taken up." And in chap. ii. ver. 22, he relates that Peter addressed his audience in the following terms: "Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved (rather pointed, or marked out) of God among you by miracles, and wonders, and signs, which God did by him," &c. Now, neither the statement of Luke, nor the address of Peter, would have contained the whole truth, if the former, in his Gospel, had inserted a great deal more, and embracing a different period, than he here intimates that it comprised; and the latter knew that our Lord had been marked and pointed out in a most extraordinary and miraculous manner long before God did any miracle, wonder or sign, by him. Further, there is not the slightest evidence from which it can be inferred, that the apostles had the least personal knowledge of Christ prior to his baptism; and had they known or believed that he was designated to be the Messiah before he was conceived, his subsequent miraculous conception and birth, and the wonderful circumstances said to have attended the nativity, their whole conduct from their appointment until the ascension, and their uniformly profound silence on a subject so singular and important, are, beyond expression, most marvellous and unaccountable.

Considering, then, that the disputed passages in Matthew and Luke were by some sects rejected as spurious from a very remote age of Christianity; that since the church so early and infamously prostituted its interests to the favour of secular and half-pagan governments, the mere fact of their antiquity deserves little weight; that the two narratives of the nativity contain palpable contradictions; that it is impossible to reconcile the facts of ancient chronology with the times and circumstances with which they have been identified; that the undisputed writings of Luke are at utter variance with the suspected portions attributed to him; that our Saviour and his Apostles never betrayed any knowledge of these extraordinary events; and that the whole conduct of

the latter is totally inconsistent with the supposition that they believed them, —no person can justly be blamed, and much less ought any one to be treated with ridicule and contempt, who feels compelled to refuse his assent to the truth of histories so suspicious, and so surrounded by difficulties and contradictions.

J.

PEACE AND HOPE AND REST.

MOURNER ! thou seekest Rest.
Rise from thy couch, and dry thy tears unblest,
And sigh no more for blessings now resigned.
Go to the fount of life which ever flows ;
There thou may'st gain oblivion of thy woes,
There shall thy spirit own a sweet repose.
Seek rest, and thou shalt find.

Thou seekest Health ; and how ?
Let gloom and tears no more thy spirit bow ;
Health springs aloft upon the viewless wind :
Up to the mountain-top pursue her flight ;
Over the fresh turf track her footsteps light ;
In hawthorn bowers, 'mid fountains gushing bright,
Seek her, and thou shalt find.

But Hope hath left thee too,
'Mid many griefs and comforts all too few.
Think not her angel-presence is confined
To earth ; but seek the helps which God hath giv'n
To aid thy feeble sight, and through the heav'n
See where she soars, bright as the star of ev'n.
There seek, and thou shalt find.

Dost thou seek Peace ? and where ?
'Mong thine own withered hopes ? She is not there,
Nor in the depths of thine own darken'd mind.
Lay thy heart open to the infants' mirth,
Tend the bright hopes of others from their birth,
Look round for all that's beautiful on earth.
Seek Peace, and thou shalt find.

Seek Peace and Hope and Rest :
And as the eagle flutters o'er her nest,*
And bears her young, all trembling, weak and blind,
Up to heav'n-gate on her triumphant wing ;—
So shall the Lord thy God thy spirit bring
To where eternal suns their radiance fling.
Him seek, and thou shalt find.

V.

* Deut. xxxii. 11.

CANONICAL AUTHORITY OF THE BOOKS OF THE PROPHETS.

(Continued from p. 248.)

3. FROM the testimony adduced under the first head of our inquiry, it appears that all the books of the Old Testament which are now deemed prophetic, were recognized as sacred by the authors of the Jewish Talmud, and consequently formed part of the canon of the Old Testament as early as the fourth or fifth century after Christ; and from the additional testimony brought forward under the second head, and supplied by the catalogues of Jerome, Origen and Melito, who flourished in the fourth, third and second centuries of the Christian era respectively, we learn that these books were regarded as authentic, and that no doubt was entertained as to their credibility by these learned Fathers of the Christian church.*

The next step in our inquiry will carry us back to the celebrated Jewish writers, Josephus and Philo; the former of whom flourished towards the close, and the latter about the middle, of the first century.

No formal enumeration of the books of the Old Testament is contained in the works of either of these writers; but the testimony which each of them bears to the authenticity and credibility of the prophetic books is highly important, and demands the attentive consideration of all who feel anxious respecting the issue of the present inquiry.

There is in Josephus's Treatise against Apion,† a passage in which he speaks of the sacred books of the Jews collectively as not exceeding twenty-two in number, and thirteen of these he ascribes to the prophets: but the terms in which he alludes to these books are so vague, that it is impossible to ascertain, from the passage itself, either by what particular individuals he supposes them to have been written, or what was the exact nature of their contents. We are enabled, however, to identify them with the books contained in the Jewish canon of the present day, by a reference to the catalogues of the Talmudists and the Christian Fathers. The actual number of books contained in the Old Testament, according to the division adopted in our printed Bibles, is thirty-nine. These are reduced by Origen and Jerome to twenty-two, by considering Ruth as a supplement to the book of Judges, Nehemiah as a continuation of Ezra, Lamentations as an appendix to Jeremiah, and the two books of Samuel, those of Kings, those of Chronicles, and the twelve minor prophets, as each one book. The Talmud makes the number of books twenty-four, by detaching Ruth from Judges, and Lamentations from Jeremiah; but its enumeration does not differ in other respects from those of Origen and Jerome. It is morally certain, therefore, that the "twenty-two books, which," according to Josephus, "contain the records of all past times, and are justly believed to be divine," were in substance the same as the twenty-two enumerated by Origen and Jerome, the twenty-four specified by the Talmudists, and the

* Similar testimonies occur in the writings of other Christian Fathers; but Jerome and Origen have been selected on account of their pre-eminence as biblical scholars, and Melito on account of his great antiquity. The reader who wishes for further evidence may consult Hody de Text. Bibl. (*Oxon.* Fol. 1705) L. iv. C. 4, p. 644, and Doederlein, *Institutio Theologi Christiani*, (Ed. Sexta, *Norimbergæ et Altorfi*, 1787,) Proleg. C. iii. Sect. ii. § 40, pp. 160—164.

† Lib. i. C. viii.

thirty-nine contained in the English and other modern versions of the Jewish Scriptures.

Of these twenty-two books Josephus attributes five to Moses; and it is evident, from his description of them, both as to the period of history which they comprise, and the general nature of their contents, that they must have been the same as those which still exist under the name of the great Jewish Lawgiver. Of the other books he ascribes thirteen to the prophets who succeeded Moses; and the remaining four, he informs us, contained "hymns to God, and precepts for the conduct of human life." But of the particular books included under each head of this three-fold division, if we except the first, we possess no certain information. The second probably contained all the books usually ascribed to the prophets, historical as well as prophetic, including that of Daniel; and the third appears, from the description given of the writings contained in it, to have included the books of Psalms, Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, with the addition of some other book usually placed by the Jews among the Chetubim or Hagiographa.

But although Josephus does not expressly enumerate the books of the prophets in this triple classification, other passages occur, in various parts of his writings, which amply supply the deficiency, and from which we are led to infer, without hesitation, that the whole of these books were familiar to him, and that he not only consulted them as forming part of the literature of his country, but reposed the most implicit faith in the predictions which they contained, and regarded those predictions as the infallible oracles of divine truth.

He styles *Isaiah*, "the prophet from whom Hezekiah obtained an accurate knowledge of all future events:"* he quotes the prediction contained in Isa. xix. 18, 19, which Onias is said to have alleged, in order to promote his design of erecting a temple at Leontopolis, in Egypt; and says that the accomplishment of this prediction took place about six hundred years after its delivery: † he speaks of the book of prophecies which Isaiah left behind him, and alludes to the restoration of the Jews, and the rebuilding of the temple, as events which had been foretold by Isaiah nearly a century and a half before the temple was destroyed: ‡ and, at the close of his account of Hezekiah's audience with the ambassadors of Merodach Baladan, and his subsequent interview with Isaiah, (Isa. xxxix.) he says, that "this prophet was universally acknowledged to be a holy and wonderful man in speaking that which was true, and that he committed all his prophecies to writing, and left them behind him in books, in order that their accomplishment might be traced by posterity from the events." § Of *Jeremiah* he says, that he prophesied concerning the calamities by which Jerusalem was to be overtaken, and left behind him a written account of the capture of Babylon, and the final destruction of the Jewish nation under Vespasian and Titus: and of *Ezekiel* he remarks, that he delivered similar predictions, and was the first who bequeathed to posterity written descriptions of these events. || He speaks of "the book of *Daniel*" as occupying a place "among the sacred writings;" quotes and refers to it repeatedly; attests the accuracy of the predictions which it contains; and sums up his testimony to the excellence of Daniel's character, as a prophet of God, in these words: "All these things Daniel left

* Antiq. Lib. ix. C. xiii. § 3.

† Ibid. Lib. xiii. C. iii. § 1, 2; Bell Jud. Lib. vii. C. x. § 3.

‡ Antiq. Lib. xi. C. i. § 2.

§ Ibid. Lib. x. C. ii. § 2.

|| Ibid. Lib. x. C. v. § 1.

behind him in writing, as God had pointed them out to him; so that those who read his predictions, and see how they have been accomplished, wonder at the honour which God conferred upon him." *

The writings of the twelve *minor prophets*, it is well known, were formerly regarded as one book, on account of their being generally written upon one roll, and this division of them appears to have prevailed in the time of Josephus; for we find him speaking of them as "the *other* prophets, who were twelve in number." In this collective form, however, he alludes to them no more than once, and that in the most incidental manner possible: † nor does he mention more than four of them by name in the whole of his writings. *Jonah* he styles a prophet; and he gives the particulars of his history as related in the book which now goes under the name of *Jonah*, referring his readers to "the Hebrew books," as his authority. ‡ *Nahum* he also styles a prophet; and from him he quotes a long passage relating to the destruction of Nineveh, (*Nahum* ii. 8—13,) introducing, however, according to his general practice, such verbal alterations as he deemed necessary to adapt it to the taste of his Heathen readers, § for whose use his "Antiquities" were composed, and to please whom he has often made additions to the concise and simple language of the sacred writings, which tend rather to obscure and disfigure than to embellish his narrative. In the eleventh book of his *Antiquities*, || he mentions *Haggai* and *Zechariah* by name, as two prophets who flourished after the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity; and describes the difficulties which his countrymen experienced in rebuilding the temple and city of Jerusalem, and the encouragement which they received from these two prophets, but makes no direct quotation from the books which we now have under their names.

The above testimonies, brief and incidental as they are, possess no small value, as coming from a writer who was thoroughly acquainted with the books esteemed sacred among the Jews, and who not only regarded the writings attributed to the prophets as the genuine productions of those whose names they bear, but was also fully impressed with an idea of their great importance as vouchers for the truth and divine origin of the Jewish religion. But the evidence in favour of the authenticity and credibility of the prophetic books of Scripture, contained in the works of Josephus, though not so full and circumstantial as we may now wish, is just such as the nature of the works themselves would have led us previously to expect. A Christian, writing for the information of Christians, or a Jew addressing himself exclusively to Jews, would have proceeded in a more systematic manner; and, if he had found it necessary to allude to the fulfilment of predictions contained in the writings of the prophets, would have done it in a more confident and triumphant tone: but a Jew engaged in the composition of a work, the professed object of which was to interest strangers in the history of his own nation, would naturally and almost necessarily pursue the plan which Josephus has pursued, not forcing upon the attention of his readers those parts of the narrative which partake of a miraculous character, but glancing at them sparingly and with caution, and even apologizing, on some occasions, for their introduction. Hence it is that Josephus so frequently has recourse to such qualifying expressions as the following, whenever he finds himself called upon to make any allusion to the writings of the prophets: "I cannot

* *Antiq. Lib. x. C. x. xi.*; *Lib. xii. C. vii. § 6.* † *Ibid. Lib. x. C. ii. § 2.*
 ‡ *Ibid. Lib. ix. C. x. § 1, 2.* § *Ibid. Lib. ix. C. xi. § 3.*
 || *Cap. iv. § 5.*

but think it necessary for me to describe the actions of this prophet, so far as I have found them recorded in the Hebrew books." * "I have given this account as I found it written." † "This prophet predicted many other things besides these concerning Nineveh, which I do not think it necessary to repeat; and I here omit them, that I may not appear troublesome to my readers." ‡ "Let no one blame me for writing down every thing of this nature, as I find it written in our ancient books; for I have plainly declared, at the beginning of this history, to those who may think me faulty in this respect, or who may complain of my management, and told them, that I intended to do nothing more than translate the Hebrew books into the Greek language." § "For my own part, I have related these things just as I found them and read them: but, if any one feels disposed to think otherwise respecting them, he is at liberty to enjoy his own opinions without incurring any blame from me." || These are evidently the remarks of one who is fully convinced of the divine origin and authority of the prophetic writings, but who is not eager to obtrude his opinions concerning them upon the attention of his readers, lest he should weary their patience, or diminish the interest which they might otherwise feel in the perusal of his narrative. The work in which they occur is strictly historical; and, though many of the events which the author has to relate, in giving a connected view of the Jewish history, assume a miraculous character in the hands of the sacred writers, it is one of Josephus's main objects to explain them as much as possible upon natural principles. It is only when he has occasion to mention the name of a prophet, or to describe an event of which the Bible contains some recorded and striking prediction, or to refer to an historical fact contained in the writings of a prophet, that he ventures to make an express allusion to the sacred oracles; and the casual notices of this kind which are scattered up and down in his Jewish Antiquities, while they answer every purpose contemplated by him in the publication of that celebrated work, afford at the same time so many indirect proofs of the high estimation in which the writings of the Jewish prophets were held by himself and the rest of his countrymen at the close of the first century.

By the rest of his countrymen, however, the reader must be apprized, are meant, in this place, the Jews of Palestine only, and not the whole body of Jews dispersed throughout the world; although there are good and valid reasons for supposing that the sacred books used by the Hellenistic Jews were precisely the same as those which were acknowledged as sacred by their brethren in Judæa. For the canon in use among those Jews who spoke the Greek language, and the principal seat of whom was at Alexandria in Egypt, we must have recourse to the writings of Philo, whose references to the books of the prophets are of the same incidental character as those which we find in the works of Josephus, and whose testimony to the divine origin and authority of those books must therefore be estimated by the same rule, and valued according to the weight rather than the number of the passages from which it is collected.

When Philo has occasion to speak collectively of those books to which he attributes a divine origin, he calls them by various names, such as the "The Sacred Writings," "The Sacred Books," "The Sacred Word," or, as they are styled in 2 Pet. i. 19, (προφητικὸν λόγον,) "The Word of Prophecy." In his account of the Therapeutæ, contained in his Treatise "On a Contemplative Life," ¶ he divides the Jewish Scriptures into three classes,—the

* Antiq. Lib. ix. C. x. § 2.

† Ibid.

‡ Lib. x. C. viii.

§ Lib. x. C. x. § 6.

|| Lib. x. C. xi. § 7.

¶ Eusebii Hist. Eccles. Lib. ii. C. xvii.

first containing "the Law;" the second, "the Divine Oracles of the Prophets;" and the third, "Hymns and other books by which knowledge and piety are promoted and perfected." But of the books which compose each of these divisions he has given no list; although the second division undoubtedly contained the books of Isaiah and Jeremiah, and that of the twelve minor prophets. To *these*, repeated allusions are made by him in different parts of his writings. The books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea and Zechariah are quoted, as containing oracles and prophecies, and the sacred characters sustained by their authors are set forth in terms of high panegyric.* But it does not appear to have fallen in the way of Philo to make any direct reference to the books of Ezekiel and Daniel; though there is no reason whatever to doubt, as we shall see under the fifth head of our inquiry, that these books formed parts of the canon of the Alexandrine Jews. It is sufficient just now to have shewn that Philo and Josephus both adopted the same threefold division of the books of the Old Testament, as the authors of the Jewish Talmud, and the early Christian Fathers did after them; that the second head of this threefold division contained the writings of certain prophets; and that no reasonable doubt can exist, in the mind of the most sceptical, as to the literal identity of these writings with the books which now exist under the names of the Jewish prophets, abating for those accidental variations which are inseparable from the act of frequent transcription.

(To be continued.)

W.

JOURNAL OF A RESIDENCE OF TEN WEEKS AMONGST THE WALDENSES,
OCT. TO DEC. 1826, BY G. KENRICK.

IN a wild romantic situation at the foot of the Cottian Alps, in Piedmont, under the government of the Catholic Kings of Sardinia, exist at this day a small body of men who profess to have received Christianity from the hands of the apostles themselves, and to have preserved it uncorrupted from father to son to the present time, without ever having submitted to the usurpations, or imbibed any of the errors, of the Church of Rome, or having needed to take any part in that REFORMATION which agitated Europe from one end to the other. There is no record existing of the first planting of Christianity in the valleys of Piedmont, but there are abundant testimonies to its having been firmly rooted and in a flourishing state early in the fourth century *all over Italy*, which included the whole country on the other side of the Alps. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, A. D. 376, declares that the injunction of celibacy on the clergy (which was one of the earliest innovations of the Church of Rome) was not received or obeyed in the *remote mountainous* places under his jurisdiction; by which he must, in all probability, have intended the most distant part of the adjacent country of Piedmont, at the Western extremity of which are the remote and mountainous glens and vales which conferred on the inhabitants the appropriate name of Valdesi or Vallenses. It appears highly probable that the disciples of Christ, driven from the South of Italy by the persecutions of Nero and succeeding emperors, would take refuge among the rocks and caverns of the North, and there is no place in Italy, or perhaps in Europe, so peculiarly calculated by nature for affording them a safe and undisturbed asylum. The early writers of the Romish com-

* Eichhorn, Einleit. ins A. T. § 30.

munion who have directly attacked the doctrine of the Waldenses, do not bring the charges of novelty and innovation against them, but make it a subject of bitter complaint and a reason for exterminating them, that "there have always been heretics in the valleys." Reynerus, the Inquisitor, A. D. 1250, complains of them that "they are the most pernicious because the most ancient of all heretics, some representing them as the followers of Leon in the time of Constantine, and others representing them as having taken their rise in the days of the apostles themselves." Claude de Seyssel, Catholic Bishop of Turin, in the year 1500, professes himself unacquainted with their origin, but observes, "there must be some cogent reasons for the existence of this sect of Waldenses for so many centuries." M. Aur. Rorengo was directed by the Propaganda at Turin to inquire into the origin of this sect, in his "Historical Memoirs," published in 1645, and in his "Narrative," published in 1632; and he declares, in the latter, that "nothing certain could be known respecting the first entrance of heresy into the valleys;" and in the former, that "the heresy of the eighth century continued there the whole of the ninth and tenth." By the heresy which prevailed in the valleys in the eighth century, Rorengo intends, no doubt, the opposition made to the introduction of image-worship by the Christians of the North of Italy at that period, who sent for Claude, then in Spain, and well known for his zeal against the corruptions of the Church, to be their Archbishop at Turin, A. D. 826. Of his diocese, the valleys formed a part. The Monk Belvidere sent by the Pope into the valleys in 1630, writes of them, "*hanno sempre e da ogni tempo avuto heretici*"—"they have from all times and always had heretics."

But whatever obscurity may hang over the earlier history of this people previously to the year 1100, from that period they are fortunately their own historians in the manuscript compositions of their pastors, or *Barbes* as they were called, deposited in the University library of Geneva and that of Cambridge, by Sir Thomas Morland, Ambassador at Turin, from the Protector Oliver, in 1655. They are written in that Patois of the Italian which is still, with some alterations, the language of the common people, and display great talent in combating the doctrines of the Romish Church, and great piety in enforcing the grand moral precepts of Christianity. Amongst them are a Catechism dated 1120, a Confession of Faith of the same period, and the *Noble Lesson*, one of the most curious monuments which any age presents. It is a poem of considerable length, (intended, probably, to be sung or chaunted in their assemblies,) in which, four hundred years before the Reformation, the great principles for which the Reformers wrote and laboured and bled are embodied, and the doctrines of auricular confession, indulgences, absolution and image-worship are exposed. The authenticity of this singular production has never been called in question, and the date is embodied in the poem itself, in which it is said, "there are now a thousand one hundred years complete, since it was written that we are in the last times." The name of the people for whose use it was composed is contained in the following sentence: "If there be found any man who will love God and fear Jesus Christ, who will not speak evil, nor blaspheme, nor lie, nor commit adultery, nor kill, nor steal, nor revenge himself of his enemies, *Illi dison quel es Vaudes e degne de murir*,"—"they say he is a Waldensian, and worthy of death." It has been supposed by many persons that Peter Valdo of Lyons, who began to propagate the doctrines of reform in the year 1175, was the founder of the sect of Waldenses. But the pas-

sage just quoted, together with the absence of all proof that Valdo ever visited or made disciples in the valleys, and the testimonies of their early opponents to the high antiquity and unknown origin of this sect, are sufficient to shew that this supposition is unfounded. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the advocates of reform multiplied in France and Piedmont beyond all calculation, and, flying from persecution, extended their doctrines into every part of Europe, under various names, chiefly taken from those of their most celebrated preachers, Petrobruysians, Arnaudists, Eperonites, Lollards, from Peter Lollard, a celebrated Waldensian Barbe, who preached in England, and *Vallons* or *Walloon*s in Holland, a corruption of the term Vallenses or Waldenses. But the name by which they were most generally known was that of Waldenses, in French Vaudois, Vaud in old French signifying valley, the name of the sect or religion being taken from the place in which the doctrine flourished or originated, just as *Moravian* is employed to denote a follower of the doctrines first taught in Moravia.

The little church of Christians in the valleys may be considered as the mother of the other Protestant churches. Their Barbes travelled all over Europe to preach and confirm their disciples, and kept a sort of college for the education of ministers in a grotto or in the open air, whither the youth resorted to them for instruction from the most distant places previously to the Reformation.

The sufferings of this people on account of their religion have, indeed, shewn that they were regarded as the most formidable, as they were the oldest, enemies which a corrupted church had to encounter. The tortures inflicted upon them are too shocking to be related, and too horrible to be believed, were they not authenticated beyond the possibility of doubt. Eleven persecutions are enumerated by their historians as having been endured by them previously to the year 1686, when they were for a time completely exterminated from their country. But under the command of the celebrated Arnaud they returned again three years after, and, animated by the love of their native land and the religion they had exercised in it, performed prodigies of valour, and, in defiance of the combined armies of the Pope and the Duke of Savoy, re-entered and kept possession of their ancient abodes. All modern travellers who have visited them agree in representing their pastors as the most laborious and self-denying, and their hearers as the most religious, simple-hearted and amiable people in Europe. Vide Leger's *Histoire des Vaudois*, 1669; Brez's ditto, 1794; Gilly's *Narrative*, 1824.

Such were the people whom I determined on visiting, partly from my state of health, which rendered relaxation necessary, and partly from curiosity to ascertain the two following points: 1, Does the real character of the modern Waldenses correspond with that of their virtuous and constant ancestors? And 2, On what religious principles and views is such distinguished excellence founded? Solely with a view to the amusement of a few intimate friends, I noted down every thing remarkable I heard or saw. It having since been suggested that my journal might interest others besides my particular friends, I now transcribe it for insertion in the *Monthly Repository*, should it be deemed of sufficient interest.

Venice, March, 1827.

(To be continued.)

CHRISTIAN SYMPATHY.

“ Rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep.”
Rom. xii.

I SAW a dark and mournful sight:
Young, lovely, and belov'd, there lay,
Cut off in one eventful night,
The lover's hope, the parent's stay; —
I saw the darkness of despair
Sit on the troubled faces there.

I saw a gentle form draw nigh
To soothe that anguish vast and deep;
Well had she read the mandate high,
And learnt to “ weep with them that weep,”
And well she knew to make each tone
Of kind compassion all her own.

I heard a strife of many woes,
I heard a harrowing tale of care;
The sigh, the prayer of anguish rose:
I look'd again—that form was there;
And still she seem'd intent to keep
The charge, to “ weep with them that weep.”

I could not choose but love the zeal
That led her ready footsteps on,
And yet, methought, I seem'd to feel
But half the Christian's errand done;
And oft I hop'd to hear the voice
“ Rejoice with them that do rejoice!”

I turn'd—there came before mine eyes
A scene,—no theme for poet's song;
A calm display of tranquil joys,
Joys such as oft to earth belong;
But, largely giv'n, too seldom raise
The heart to Heav'n in grateful praise.

And ONE was there—and she was kind
And gentle as the last had been;
But yet her glance was not behind,
But ever on the forward scene,
Intent the cup of bliss to fill,
And warding off impending ill.

I saw her smoothing o'er the way
Of tottering age,—I saw her hand
Deal out enjoyment, day by day,
And bid the grateful thought expand;
And still, where'er she mov'd, to Heav'n
More cheerful praise, methought, was given.

I saw the threatening cloud pass by
 Before it fell in show'rs of woe,
 No time for dark despondency
 To gather on the gloomy brow ;
 Life brighten'd— and I heard the voice
 “ Rejoice with them that do rejoice.”

I would not take the meed of praise
 From kindness, soothing, pitying, tried ;
 I love the friend of adverse days,
 In sorrow ever at our side,
 Whose watchful eyes attentive keep
 The mandate, “ Weep with them that weep :”

But when I look through all the round
 Of mortal life, and see its good
 So vainly sought, so rarely found—
 Unknown, because misunderstood—
 I prize yet more the friend whose voice
 Instructs my spirit to “ rejoice.”

E.

ON THE TENDENCY OF THE CATHOLIC RELIGION.

To the Editor.

SIR,

County of Cavan, April, 1827.

I HAVE been anticipated in a few observations I had to make to your Reverend correspondent CLERICUS ANGLICUS: I wish much I could promise myself I would as probably be anticipated in those to which I have to solicit the favour of your best attention, on a subject comprehending the religious, philosophical and civil interests of the human race.

I must entreat you not to be alarmed at this formidable, but, to my apprehension, strictly true enumeration of the principles involved in a disposition which I too frequently perceive to exist on the part of the liberal writers of the present day ; I mean the degree of respect, almost approaching to praise, with which they think it proper, almost upon all occasions, to speak of the Roman Catholic religion. I am not at present about to enter at any length upon these topics ; but I do request your permission to declare, through you, to that portion of the liberal public of England which has access to your pages, that as warm a friend to Catholic emancipation as any amongst them, and as uncompromising an advocate for the rights of man as any in existence, protests against that inadvertency which has induced so many of their number, in their advocacy of one great measure, to write and speak in terms of deference and of false candour of that religion connected with it, which is, of all others upon earth, the most opposed to those principles by which they exist as a religious body in this kingdom. I have many evidences of this feeling in my recollection : and on the part of the Dissenting interest in England, I mean of the freer denominations, I really know of no exception to the imputation, save a spirited, though on one point, I conceive, a much mistaken, letter in the Morning Chronicle of the 6th of February, (one of the most inconstant prints in the world on this subject,) commenting on a certain amusing, but not unimportant, speech of Mr. O'Connell's in the Catholic Association.

In one of the numbers of the late series of the Monthly Repository, not many months ago, was given at full length one of the most appalling samples of modern Roman Catholic pretension which has been put forward for many years; I mean the Pastoral of the renowned Bishop Doyle, commanding his clergy to abstain from all disputation with Protestants, *not for peace' sake*, as Mr. Plunkett would have it, (vide Debates of March 2,) but, by a convenient refuge in the Holy Ghost, from an affected conviction that the truth having been already infallibly and irrevocably declared by the Italian Bishops at Trent, (these were the vast majority,) so much as to revive the mere question so complacently answered by our blessed Master, "How can these things be?" would be in itself nothing short of apostacy and blasphemy!

And yet to that document, surrounded as the Repository was by all the talent, and all the energy, and all the freedom, of the Dissenting community of England, those "Hebrews of Hebrews, those Protestants with regard to Protestants," as Mr. Aspland, in his admirable Charge, has strikingly expressed it, not one syllable of reply, not one whisper of indignation was opposed! We had, it is true, a due supply of information as to Unitarian institutions, of lamentations and outcries against the occasional incivilities or petty oppressions which that class have experienced from the ministers of the Establishment; nay, we had the usual amount of aspirations in favour of religious liberty, and of triumph at its apparent progress throughout the land; but the moment Bishop Doyle advances his towering front, and, heading, as he does, five millions of people who are perpetually before the country and the Legislature as applicants for political equality in their character of Christian brethren, puts forward a set of propositions which go to the annihilation of every shadow of religious right, then straightway the course is left free to him, and every trace of opposition retires,—as if from the very excess of his presumption he derived the power to intimidate and disperse it!

This is inexplicable, but it is past. Let us see whether any thing of a similar tendency is discoverable in the vigorous and truly hopeful scion which the parent-work has thrown out, and to which it has resigned its place.

I regret that my researches have been so easily arrested.

That Dr. Lingard is a very able man, I can have no doubt, nor am I less disposed to believe him a very amiable one. I have not, however, read his works, nor have I entered at all minutely into the charges by which the Edinburgh Review has sought to lower his historical reputation. I do not mean to do so, until I have received Dr. Lingard's much-extolled reply, which I have written for, together also with the *reply to it*.

But, arguing from the presumption which a very unexceptionable critical canon of your own has furnished, I must confess my entire inability to discover, abstracted from the most rigorous evidence of the particular point he would establish, why it is that I am to be charmed by Dr. Lingard's name, or forego my suspicions that I may not be *quite* safe under his direction, seeing that, as a Roman Catholic writer, English history can hardly be expected to meet with impartial consideration at his hands. You do not mean, I would suppose, Sir, to withdraw or to modify your canon whenever a case shall be brought to claim the admission of the truth which it has affirmed.

At page 117 of your Repository, "The time is not yet come," you say, "for writing English history in characters of truth; and it never can come while" (among other things) "man considers difference of opinion as

a moral blot, and heresy from his own creed a sufficient ground for the punishment of the presumptuous offender.”

Exactly in this predicament Dr. Lingard stands; in proportion, at least, to his sincerity (and I have never heard that he has given occasion to question it) as a divine of the Roman Catholic church.

I will not weary you by introducing authorities in confirmation of this remark: the controversy on the tenets of that church has been too rife, within a recent period, to render that either a difficult or a necessary task, and I shall therefore forbear. But, willing as I am to acknowledge, that Dr. Lingard may have been so far influenced by a characteristic honesty of mind, as to treat with as little partiality as any Catholic historian could be expected to do, those events in which his church has been conspicuously engaged in times which are past, I humbly venture to suggest that that original sin of Catholicism, its undisguised and unquenchable abhorrence of all dissent from its own dogmas, and all resistance to its own authority, is too deep and radical not to render it probable that some degree of artifice must be employed to intercept the too natural conclusion, that a fountain so embittered would send out streams which would be noxious in proportion to the limits they described, or the expanse they might acquire.

Unquestionably, power is a dangerous ally to religion; but with all the disadvantages it brings, and the prejudices it creates, there is that primary and essential distinction between the respective natures of Protestantism and Catholicism, that when spiritual oppression has been inflicted by the former, we feel that it has abandoned its own principles; that the deviations we lament are susceptible of an intrinsic correction; and must, when circumstances permit such inconsistencies to stand clearly and prominently out, by the mere force of the *argumentum ad hominem*, eventually vanish in the natural and progressive action of the rational and healthy principle out of which it first grew. Now this is not so with Catholicism; there oppression is in natural accordance with the theoretical despotism of a church which has never remitted its pretensions, and which, by a fatal distinction from every thing else which is human, never can. Its connexion with temporal establishments, and its existence in an æra comparatively enlightened, even in countries where it is still predominant, must regulate its present phenomena; but until Catholicism abjures its nature, and loses its name, I am irresistibly led to believe that it is mild from accident only: ecclesiastical domination is as the life's blood to it; and this grounded upon a superhuman exemption from error, which for ever cuts off all possibility of correcting its once-asserted pretensions, or of abridging the disastrous dominion which ages of ignorance, and violence, and barbarity, may have permitted it to promulgate.

In a word, by conceding toleration in its amplest extent, by looking upon heresy as an offence which none but the great God of hearts is competent to impute, and by leaving every human being, provided he lead a peaceable and decorous life, to the unquestioned enjoyment and utterance of his opinions, Protestants would only become the *more* protestant—the more conformable to their original principles: whereas, by such an alteration of practice on the part of the Pope, or his dependent authorities, we should only witness a departure, *toto cælo*, from the essence of the papal system.

To apply, then, these remarks. When controversial or historical works, in connexion with these subjects, appear, and when I find the liberal Reviews and Journals of the day tendering their humble services to him who shall lift his voice the loudest in behalf of Catholicism, and, because upon reasons of state it would be most wise to remit the remaining disabilities which

affect the Roman Catholics of these countries, saying and believing all sorts of smooth things of the religion of these Roman Catholics, I confess I feel surprised and pained; because to me they appear very evidently to take the most unsound and precipitate views of the state of the case.

When I am told by many concurrent authorities, that Queen Mary, at a period when the Pope and Papal Courts were peculiarly virulent, did exercise many judicial severities upon her Protestant subjects, as such, I am only required to believe what, upon previous grounds, it is highly credible she would think it her duty to do.

On the contrary, when I am told by rival authorities, that Queen Elizabeth and her advisers, who had abjured, not totally, indeed, but to a considerable extent, the despotic theory of the Romish church, committed similar atrocities upon Catholics, in their character of dissidents merely, I am called upon to believe a thing not so credible in its own nature, and which, therefore, I require to be supported by evidence much more forcible than had sufficed to obtain my assent to the former proposition.

Intolerance is the crime of ecclesiastics, but in the hands of one denomination, professing to leave every man to his own conclusions, it is suicidal. Whereas, in those of another, which assumes the privilege of deciding for the rest of mankind, and boasts of its "holy incompatibility" with any permission of dissent, intolerance is as natural, and its sanguinary enforcements, when historically reported, as credible as any other effect from an adequate cause.

I renounce, then, and I think I must speak the feeling of every considerate lover of freedom, when I renounce in their name, that very questionable superiority to prejudice which, because they may sometimes approximate in practice, however remote in their theory, would lead us to confound the merits of all religious systems. Nor can I be a party to that species of candour which, from the fear of embarrassing the political prospects of modern Catholics with the vicious nature of their system, would induce us to hail with alacrity every attempt which is made to disarm that aversion to their religion, which ought to be as deep as its own foundations, and which we know, in despite of all such special pleading, and all such glossing of records, to repose upon the most abject and irreclaimable prostration of the human mind.

Dr. Lingard may succeed, in a degree, in the particular controversy in which the Edinburgh Review has involved him: but why such compliments, and why such cheering, as if Catholicism, by a few touches of his pen, were really become that amiable thing which its infatuated admirers would have it to be?

Above all things, why, on the part of Unitarians—themselves the most free of all religious sects—the most opposed (because the least believing) to all spiritual authority of man over his fellow-man—this tampering, I had almost said this adulation, towards the character of Catholicism which we sometimes meet with in their publications? May I, with the most unaffected respect, be permitted to ask, why so studiously, not alone in your comments on Dr. Lingard's Vindication, but in your review of the "Narrative of the Sufferings of a French Protestant Family," more expressly still, appear to regard it as the mere dotage of the bigot, that Catholicism is, inherently, an intolerant, usurping, and, with your permission, I will say it, a something more than repressive system?

That "all the crimes of those who profess it" are chargeable to the religion of Catholics, God forbid I should assert; but, Sir, can you seriously maintain, that the revocation of the edict of Nantz (the subject upon which

you were remarking) was so irreconcilable with "the spirit of the Catholic religion," (such are your words, p. 119,) as to hesitate in imputing to such spirit that besotted and iniquitous measure of the *grand monarque*? If you do, then you differ in opinion from no less an authority than the defender of the Gallican liberties; for that idol of Mr. Butler, Bossuet himself, exclaimed, in reference to this feat of Louis, "You have given stability to the true faith, you have exterminated the heretics; this is the work worthy of your reign, this is the glorious distinction by which it will be known in history!"

I think the inferences to be drawn from this passage are obvious; but I shall not enlarge, as I fear I am trespassing on your anticipated indulgence much too considerably. I shall only observe, once for all, that I defy any genuine friend of religious liberty to shew that a body of people who profess the opinions and subscribe to the sentiments contained in the Encyclic of Leo XII., of 1824, those contained in the Pastoral Charge of the Irish Catholic Bishops of the same year, those of Bishop Doyle's Pastoral, of August, 1825,—that a people so professing, and bound down in spiritual obedience to such pastors, are, upon any principles of their own, in their character of Roman Catholics, worthy of that political brotherhood which they claim with the other religious denominations of this country.

And yet, with my whole soul, I would emancipate them; for I would not even bind a madman who could be safely entrusted with his liberty; and, because I would encourage them, by generosity and confidence, to mingle in that free strife of mind, both in Parliament and the country, which would, in no long time, I believe, prove the most powerful of all solvents in operating on those chains of bigotry and priestcraft which now enter into their souls; and detain so fine a portion of the general intellect from aiding in the public weal and giving additional force to the public freedom.

Pardon me, Sir, let your liberal readers pardon me for the sake of my intentions, if I have overstrongly stated what I esteem to be an important truth.

Your Whigs and your Tories, your Churchmen and your Plunketts,* these all may have their designs to serve, may be time-servers and faction-servers; but those who argue for truth and freedom's sake alone, should scorn these grovelling flights, and, borne on nobler pinions, should look with unshrinking eye upon that moral light which alone can extricate us all, whether Protestant or Catholic, from the difficulties which beset us—from the sophistries which would abuse us—and from that darkness and tyranny in which the priests and politicians of all sides would, for their own selfish and ignoble ends, perpetually retain us. Sir, I wish these feelings to be apprehended, to be acted upon, and written upon, by the truly liberal classes of England—would to God I could say of my own poor country! but here we have none such.—I wish them, in their advocacy of that one great measure which I think would give peace to Ireland, which I am satisfied would no more endanger the empire than it would shake the foundation of the Pyramids, and equally satisfied, would give a force and plausibility unfelt before, to Protestant efforts to detach the Catholic mind from a faith unfit for freemen; not to forget, at the same time, so much as they do, the recorded and uneffaceable pretensions of that religion to which its modern

* Against this gentleman's ecclesiastical doctrines there is not a Dissenter in Great Britain, nor any genuine friend of religion and intellectual independence, who ought not to raise his voice. Neither one atom of gospel feeling, nor of constitutional habits of thought, ever enters into this person's harangues on the religious institutions of his country.

popes and bishops are as loudly and boldly attached as in any former period of their history.

CLERICUS HIBERNICUS.

[We have to apologize to our correspondent, whom we hope to meet again, for curtailing his communication to suit our limits. Wishing not to embark in a controversy on this subject, of which we do not see the utility, we have only to observe, once for all, that we and our brother Unitarians are strangely misunderstood by our correspondent if he thinks us in danger of conversion to Catholicism, or imagines that there is any necessity to rouse our antipathies against ecclesiastical dominion of *any* sort. At present the persecutors are *Protestants*, and this leads us to have more to do with *them* than with the sufferers. Situated as the Catholics are, they, in fact, form a powerful body of nonconformists, and so far have an interest in common with other dissidents, which draws them somewhat together, in opposition to that kind of popery which happens to oppress both. Political proscription, moreover, has a tendency to create prepossession, on the one hand, for, and, on the other hand, against the objects of it. The No-popery party has taken great pains to confound the political rights of the Catholics with the merits of their religion, doctrinally and practically; and it is not, perhaps, to be wondered if something of the same confusion has taken place on the other side. Penal laws disarm part of the moral resistance even to a bad system; for a generous opponent dislikes grappling with an antagonist who is previously bound and branded. Remove the disabilities under which the Catholic labours, and those who are now suspected of giving him a sort of countenance, will be upon principle, not from political motives, his most active opponents;—if indeed it be necessary at all, in a well regulated state of society, to be thus perpetually carrying on the war of recrimination, to which *politics* give the real stimulus. We do not find that Protestants in the United States (where one party does not oppress the other) feel any necessity for discussing with acrimony the tendencies of the religious opinions and discipline of their Catholic fellow-citizens, and for the same reason those tendencies lose much of their force. The friend of religious liberty is disposed to leave his neighbour and his opinions alone, as he wishes so to be treated himself, unless they can enter upon discussion fairly and on equal grounds; but it is *always* his business to protest against power being called in, either on the one side or the other, to enable the disputants to do mischief and disturb the harmony of society. EDIT.]

ALEXANDER AT PARADISE.*

'T WAS a soft and sunny land
 To which the Conqueror came,
 Though now the place of the radiant strand
 Is a blank in the chart of fame.
 It was far in the Indian regions lone
 The delicious land he found;—
 Oh, when shall there be of its brightness thrown
 A glimpse upon earthly ground?
 It passed, Alexander's eyes before,
 Like a beautiful dream:—it is now no more.

* Founded upon a story inserted in Mr. Hurwitz's "Hebrew Tales."

He came to an unknown stream,
 And he traced its banks along ;
 It rolled with an all unearthly gleam,
 And a murmur more rich than song :
 The flowers of this world were round—
 But in more than earthly bloom ;
 The bird's lay mixed with the river's sound—
 But it waved a brighter plume,
 And sang with a voice more melting there,
 Than ever was heard but in that sweet air.

It was seldom peace came o'er
 A breast to the war-field given ;
 He loved to muse on the battle's roar,
 And the steed o'er the dying driven :—
 Yet the lone and lovely scene
 Flung over his heart its calm ;
 His eye was mild, and his brow serene,
 As if some mysterious balm
 Had been sprinkled over his stormy soul,
 And bidden its war-waves cease to roll.

A moment there he stood,
 No more Ambition's slave,
 Entranced by the sound of the warbling flood,
 And the light of its shining wave.
 At length by his wondering train
 The voice of the King was heard,
 But so changed in its tone that they wished again
 To dwell on each silver word—
 " We will trace this mystic stream to its birth,
 If it be indeed a river of earth."

Against its course they strayed,
 Through meads of the softest bloom,
 While the breeze, o'er the fairy stream that played,
 Drew from it a strange perfume.
 Swans, whiter than ever were seen,
 Their wings on the wave unfurled,
 Or sung, from their bowers in the islets green,
 Songs meet for a fairer world ;
 The lotus in unknown lustre blèw,
 And the rose seemed starred with elysian dew.

The scene, at each step they took,
 Still became more wondrous fair ;—
 Oh, at that bright stream a single look
 Were enough to heal despair !
 At length, they saw where the river dived
 Underneath a lustrous wall
 Of gems, and the King at a gate arrived
 Wrought of a burning diamond all :
 Trees within, unnamed in mortal bowers,
 Drooped under the weight of their splendid flowers.

The eager King struck long
 At the radiant gate in vain ;
 But at length within a voice of song
 Replied to his call again :—
 “ Who has traced the sacred springs ?
 Who knocks at the blissful gates ? ”
 “ Alexander, King of the wide world’s kings,
 Too long for an entrance waits. ”—
 “ Too long, proud spoiler ? return thee home—
 No blood-stained feet in these pure bowers roam. ”

“ And who will dare refuse
 What the Victor of Earth demands ? ”—
 “ He is One, thou man of blood, whose dues
 Must be paid by holier hands,—
 In whose eye thou art a worm,
 In whose scale thou art but dust,
 Who gave thee that mind, and power, and form,
 Which have been too much thy trust :
 Retire from these walls with thy guilty swords—
 This Paradise is the ALMIGHTY LORD’S ! ”

Alexander felt it vain
 To press for an entrance more ;
 Yet it was with grief and pain
 That he left the diamond door :
 But scarce had his steps been turned,
 When open the bright gate flew,
 And a Form, in whose eye the Immortal burned,
 Before him a Veiled Gift threw :—
 “ Let this, ” said the Seraph, “ a token be,
 Thou hast stood so near the Paradise-tree. ”—

The Conqueror reached his camp,
 Of the strange adventure full ;
 But how did the Gift his warm hopes damp—
 ‘Twas *the fragment of a skull !*
 — “ Is *this* my prize ? Was it but for *this*,
 That I stood by the Rainbow Wall—
 That I heard, upon the winds of bliss,
 The musical life-stream’s fall ?
 What this may mean, it were vain to try,
 Unless the Giver himself were nigh. ”

Just as the words he spoke,
 An Old Man entered there ;—
 His strength by the weight of years was broke,
 And in silver flowed his hair.
 Yet his brow, though pale, was high ;
 His form, though frail, was grand ;
 And the light of youth yet flashed in his eye,
 Though the staff was in his hand :—
 He passed through the midst of the courtly ring,
 And in calm, sweet tones addressed the King :—

“ Lord King, the Immortal’s Gift,
 Has that which passes show ;—
 Though light enough for a babe to lift,
 It outweighs all the wealth below.
 Let the balance straight be brought,
 And the gold of thy rich stores laid
 Against it—all will be as nought
 With that light fragment weighed.”—
 The treasure was brought, and in heaps uprolled—
 But the bone weighed down the Conqueror’s gold !

“ I see thee, Prince, amazed
 At the marvel I have shown ;
 But know, the more the pile is raised,
 The more will the Gift sink down.
 Dost thou ask me how or why ?
 I have come to answer *all*—
 That bone is *the cell of a human eye*,
 And it once contained a ball,
 Whose thirst of gain nought ever could slake,
 Though the Sea had been changed to a Golden Lake.”

“ Can there nought,” said the musing King,
 “ To sink the rich scale be found ?” —
 The Old Man stepped from the tent to bring
 A turf from the broken ground ;
 He crumbled the earth on the bone—
 Down sunk the golden scale :
 “ Behold, proud Monarch ! the moral shown
 Of thine and of every tale !
When the dust of the grave shall seal it o’er,
The insatiate eye can desire no more.”

“ My guards !” — Alexander cried—
 “ Dares the dotard brave me here ?” —
 With an eye of death the Seer he eyed—
 But it soon was fixed in fear !
 The snows of earthly age
 Became locks of starry prime ;
 The form and face of the Stranger-sage
 Wore a glory unknown to time ;
 And they, who had seen the bright gates expand,
 Remembered the Guard of the Paradise-land !

“ Farewell, proud Prince !” — he said,
 And his voice like music rung—
 “ Farewell, proud Prince !—thou hast ill repaid
 The lore of a Seraph’s tongue !
 Farewell for ever !” — and bright
 His rainbow plumes unfold,
 And the radiant form is lost to sight
 In a cloud of purple and gold.
 Ere a pulse could beat, was the Bright One gone,
 And behind was left but the Gift alone.

REVIEW.

ART. I.—*Noticias secretas de America, escritas, &c., y presentadas en informe secreto á S. M. C. el Señor Don Fernando VI.* Por Don Jorge Juan y Don Antonio de Ulloa, &c.; sacadas á luz por Don David Barry, Londres, 1826.

Secret Report on America, written according to the Instructions of the Secretary of State, and presented to Ferdinand VI. By Don Antonio de Ulloa and Don Jorge Juan; now published by Don David Barry. London, 1826.

IT is clear that Dr. Robertson's account of the administration and policy of the Spanish authorities, as well as of the state of the Indians, the clergy, &c., in America, was sketched in very favourable colours. The cunning of the government veiled every thing in mystery, their records were invisible to the eye of the inquirer, and the historian was candid or credulous enough to believe, "that upon a more minute scrutiny into their early operations in the new world, however reprehensible the actions of individuals might appear, the conduct of the nation would be placed in a more favourable light." The Spaniards certainly did little justice to themselves if they concealed their good deeds; and considering that this word "nation," in fact, meant nothing more than a series of kings as treacherous, cruel, and tyrannical, as ever were raised up to grace the cause of legitimate monarchy, one would not easily conceive that this self-denial in the manifestation of their actions, bad or good, was without its motives. Robertson's defence of the conduct of the government rests on the old ground of the apparent benevolence of laws which certainly were not enforced, and as certainly were never meant to be so; and on a supposed ignorance on the part of the authorities at home of what was going on abroad. He does not appear to have recollected that those authorities always consisted, in a great measure, of persons who had served in America, and who knew very well, having themselves practised, all the iniquities complained of. These are the very men who, year after year, made the regulations the professed equity of which is to wipe away the sins of the government and acquit it of connivance, knowing perfectly well, by their own experience, that not a tittle of them would be obeyed.

But the most damning proofs of the perfidy and tyranny of this court are those now produced in the folio volume before us, which the Editor has drawn from the manuscript Records in Spain, and has lately caused to be printed in this country, not for regular publication, but chiefly for the use of the revolted colonies. The work will read them a striking lesson of the wickedness and duplicity of those whose yoke they have happily shaken off, of the vices inherent in the old system, and the judicious remedies suggested by so observant an eye-witness as Ulloa near a century ago. Ulloa is already well known as a traveller who visited Peru about 1735, and published his travels and general observations, from which Robertson and others derived much information. It now appears that he was desired, on the part of the government, and avowedly for the private information and direction of the king, to inquire and report upon the state of the provinces of Southern America, in a political and military point of view, on the administration of the government, and

of justice in the tribunals, the treatment of the natives, the ecclesiastical establishments, and, in short, every thing necessary to furnish an honest court with the means of doing that justice which it professed to desire. This task Ulloa and his companion have most boldly and faithfully performed in the Report before us. A more plain, manly, straightforward and judicious document never was drawn up; but while it reflects the highest honour on its compilers, it brands with eternal infamy the cold-blooded policy which could silently receive such an exposure of the iniquity of its agents, and consign it to oblivion, without any attempt at punishment, redress, or reform.

The details as to the military administration of the American provinces are in themselves very curious and interesting. The authors shew how easily Anson, if he had possessed the least knowledge of the real weakness of the state of defence, could have made himself master of the whole navigation of the Southern Ocean; and how Vernon might have had nearly equal success in his undertakings. It is not within our limits to enter at much length into many of the details of this singular exposure of the scheme of administration of the Colonies, and we will, therefore, only shortly notice a few of the particulars most likely to be interesting to our readers.

One of the most important points to which the authors direct their attention, is to redeem from calumny the character of the native Indians, whose supposed incapacity has been made the pretext of so much injustice and cruelty. The country is still covered with the ruins of more magnificent works of public utility, erected by them, than the Spaniards ever thought, or were capable, of executing. Solid paved roads, of 400 leagues in length, aqueducts, which brought water 120 leagues, temples and palaces of the most splendid character, were the monuments of an empire only 400 years old, when Pizarro visited Peru and found a people eminent in the arts which adorn a highly advanced state of civilization; and yet this people, because they have sunk under the bigotry and oppression of their plunderers, are further libelled with the charge of natural imbecility and incapacity.

The authors draw a faithful picture of the miseries of the barbarous law of the *mita*, or conscription, by which the Indians were drafted for a limited service in the mines, which ended generally in their destruction. Robertson has glossed over this oppression;—the laws of the Council of the Indies forbid it;—yet, as the editor observes, this dilemma can never be escaped;—either the *mita* was established by the law, or by the local authorities against the law. If the first, the law itself was inhuman and unjust; if the second, not only were the viceroys criminally remiss, but the government at home, which knew and sanctioned the abuse, was hypocritical and wicked.

The disgusting particulars which this Report contains of the disorders, negligence, ignorance, and rapacity of the priests and members of the monastic orders, which Spain sent forth to prey upon these ill-fated countries, are very striking; and one would have thought that they could not have failed to lead the government to some measures for redressing the evil, the cause and aggravation of which, in fact, rested more with itself than with the church. Robertson is here too disposed to paint matters in colours not very accordant with the real state of things. From his pages we fancy a crowd of missionaries, tempted, indeed, somewhat by the prospect of wealth and advancement, to qualify themselves to “perform all spiritual functions, and to receive the tithes and other emoluments of the benefices” of the Western churches, but actuated also by nobler passions: they are, as he represents them, “men of the most ardent and aspiring minds, impatient under the

restraint of a cloister, weary of its insipid uniformity, and fatigued with the irksome repetition of its frivolous functions, who offer their services with eagerness, and repair to the new world in quest of liberty and distinction."

Now unfortunately a great deal of this is mere imagination. The Spanish possessions were subjected to tithes, but the king had one half as patron of the church, and the bishop, or religious establishments at a distance, which had little actual duty to perform, got the other half. The regular clergy, who were generally of a respectable character, were overrun by the members of the religious orders; and the "*curas*," most of whom moreover belonged to those orders, being robbed by the government of the proper source of income in a tithe-paying country, were left to live upon the profits of the altar and on extortion of the most flagrant kind. Their evil courses brought contempt and hatred upon themselves and their religion. Nothing can be expressed in stronger language than the indignation and reprobation of Ulloa at the scandalous way in which the poor Indians were made Christians in order to become assessable to their iniquitous imposts. To shew to what account the offerings of the altar were turned, he mentions, that in a single cure, and that not a large one, the cura had extorted, in one year, more than 200 sheep, 6000 pullets, 50,000 eggs, and other articles in proportion.— Their lives were most profligate, many not contenting themselves either with one wife or one concubine. Ulloa mentions an instance of a holy father advanced in years, whose congregation was made up of his children of every age, some assisting him in the service of the altar, and many older than the woman he then lived with, who was the fourth or fifth in succession.

To explain the object and destiny of the missionaries who were so eagerly invited over, it may be as well to give some idea of the system, for which the editor prepares us by an account of the mode in which these men were, down to his time, collected and exported. The religious houses having the patronage of many of the good things, which it was necessary to occupy for the benefit of their communities by a supply of Spaniards, (the Creoles and they being perpetually at war,) regular agents were kept at work to beat up at home for missionaries under pretence of preaching the gospel to the Indians. All the idle, disorderly, refractory, and disreputable characters, were thus brought together, enlisted, and marched to the port for embarkation. The governors there forced the vessels at hand to take these men; for it was an important part of the policy of the administration to keep up the delusion and stock the Colonies with these useful supporters of the existing system. The state paid a small sum for each passenger; but so offensive and odious was the office of taking out these adventurers, that every artifice was used to evade it, and soldiers were often obliged to enforce the duty.

On their arrival, instead of going to preach to the Indians, as those who were really zealous had expected, they were employed and turned to account for the mercenary purposes of the different orders who had thus been recruiting; and thus added, by their profligacy and extortion, to the misery of the country, the annoyance of the regular clergy, and the emoluments of the religious orders. Ulloa acknowledges that the most respectable of the regular clergy expressed their wishes to him that the English should subjugate the country, and thereby free them from the intolerable burthen which the profligacy of the government threw upon them, provided they could be sure that the English would allow them the free exercise of their religion.

For these, and indeed all the enormities which Ulloa details, he points out obvious and efficient remedies; and their neglect is a proof that the state

never was in earnest in repressing the abuses of which it is clear now that it was well aware.

One bright example of excellent discipline, unwearied diligence, strict morals, humanity, judgment, and zeal, he continually dwells upon in the conduct and plans of the company of Jesuits, as opposed to all the other orders; and it is only of a piece with the rest of the policy of the Spanish government, that it could not tolerate in its dominions even one body of persons apparently disposed to do its duty, but seized, plundered, and expatriated those who appear to have been, not only almost the only conscientious instructors of youth, and missionaries, and civilizers of the Indians, but to have been the most valuable subjects in the protection and extension of the civil interests of the government. The removal of this body is considered one of the most effectual causes of the gradual decay and final dissolution of the European interests in South America.

One never-failing cause of anarchy and division was the distinction which the pride of the Spaniards created between European blood and that which had any tincture of the Indian. The stop which the emancipation of these countries has put to the perpetual importation among them of adventurers of the Spanish unmixed blood, must soon remove this cause of distinction, and will contribute more than any thing to the union of interests and equality in the administration of the laws. The religious establishments will be purified by the same cause. Whatever is set apart for their maintenance will be so applied, instead of swelling the fortunes of needy and profligate men seeking to enrich themselves in a foreign land. The influence which the mother country gave to these objects of general execration is now removed. The tendency is to lessen the power and emoluments of the priesthood; and there can be little doubt but that here, as well as elsewhere, there will be a correspondent increase in their conscientious discharge of their duty, and in their consequent usefulness and moral excellence.

ART. II.—*The Ecclesiastical History of the Second and Third Centuries, illustrated from the Writings of Tertullian.* By John, Bishop of Bristol, [Lincoln,] &c.

(Continued from p. 273.)

RESUMING an examination of this excellent and important work, we enter upon the fourth chapter, in which the learned author, following the arrangement of Mosheim, proceeds “to inquire what information can be derived from Tertullian respecting the government and discipline of the church in his day.” Near the conclusion of his “Apology,” we find the Presbyter of Carthage thus stating the nature and purposes of the Christian assemblies :

“We form,” he says, “a body; being joined together by a community of religion, of discipline, and of hope. In our assemblies we meet to offer up our united supplications to God—to read the Scriptures—to deliver exhortations—to pronounce censures, cutting off, from communion in prayer, and in every holy exercise, those who have been guilty of any flagrant offence. The elder members, men of tried piety and prudence, preside; having obtained the dignity, not by purchase, but by acknowledged merit. If any collection is made at our meetings, it is perfectly voluntary; each contributes according to his ability, either monthly, or as often as he pleases. These contributions

we regard as a sacred deposit; not to be spent in feasting and gluttony, but in maintaining or burying the poor, and relieving the distresses of the orphan, the aged, or the shipwrecked mariner. A portion is also appropriated to the use of those who are suffering in the cause of religion: who are condemned to the mines, or banished to the islands, or confined in prison."—Pp. 222, 223.

If this were the only passage in the writings of Tertullian relating to this subject, we might conclude, so far at least as his testimony is concerned, that the simplicity of the apostolical times had been preserved to the close of the second century. But from various other passages it is too clear that those innovations were gradually taking place, which at length entirely changed the appearance and character of the Christian Church, and ended in an usurpation of authority over the minds and consciences of men that cannot be reflected upon without astonishment and indignation. A distinction, falsely claiming the sanction even of the apostles, already existed between the clergy and the laity. The former also were divided into the three orders of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, who were studiously represented by the Christian doctors, as Mosheim observes, as having succeeded to the rights and privileges of the Jewish priesthood, so that the *Bishops* considered themselves to be invested with a rank and character similar to those of the *High Priest*, while the *Presbyters* filled the place of the *Priests*, and the *Deacons* that of the *Levites*. It is, however, manifest, from different parts of the writings of Tertullian, that all the apostolic churches were independent of each other and equal in rank and authority, and that one bishop presided over each assembly. If the Church of Rome was ever mentioned with any peculiar respect, it was not because it had been founded by Peter, but because both Peter and Paul had, according to tradition, suffered martyrdom in that city. That some bishop had, in Tertullian's time, arrogantly styled himself Pontifex Maximus and Episcopus Episcoporum, is certain; and Tertullian has also spoken of some one as "benedictus Papa:" but it is not certain that these titles were then either assumed by the Bishop of Rome or conferred upon him; and, on the other hand, there is abundant evidence to prove that the titles Summus Pontifex and Papa, were bestowed on ordinary bishops.

We learn farther from the writings of Tertullian, that Synods were held in his time, both in European and Asiatic Greece, composed of deputies from all the churches. But the practice did not extend to other countries till very near the end of the second century. In a long and interesting note subjoined to the 22nd Section of the 2nd Book of the *Commentaries on the Affairs of the Christians, &c.*, the origin of these Synods is traced by Mosheim to the political constitution and habits of the Grecian states, and the passage in Tertullian which relates to them is minutely examined. These assemblies may for a while have been attended with some advantages, but they were also the source of many serious evils. We cannot concede that they merit the eulogy bestowed upon them by the learned professor, who observes, that "in them all the more important questions which arose from time to time were discussed; and thus the unity of doctrine and discipline was preserved." (P. 245.) Tertullian himself, indeed, seems to have viewed them in the same light; for the very mention of them leads him to exclaim, in the words of the Psalmist, "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!" Such commendations remind us of Le Clerc's more correct judgment of these associations, when he says in his *Ars Critica*, "Verum hæc est abstracta notio synodorum, quæ in inconspicua idearum republica coguntur, non imago earum quæ inter miseros

mortales olim congregatæ fuere." They were a novelty in Tertullian's day, and he had no opportunity of witnessing what animosities they occasioned, and how generally they fomented instead of healing divisions. Had he lived a century or two later, he might have addressed the assembled fathers in the words of the Jewish lawgiver, "Sirs, ye are brethren; why do ye wrong one to another?"

In the latter part of the second century, the converts to Christianity were not admitted to baptism, as in the days of the apostles, merely upon their professing to believe in Christ, but were required to pass through a previous course of instruction and probation. While in this state they were called *Catechumens*; when baptized, *the Faithful*: and for this last class some points of doctrine, or, at least, some interpretations of the Scriptures, were reserved, which it was not thought right to communicate to those of the first class. The writings of Tertullian afford much information respecting penitential discipline and the distinction of offences; but as the sentiments and practices, relating to these subjects, of the Catholic church and of the Montanists were very different, his testimony must be received with caution. In no part of his works has he any allusion to "auricular confession."

In conformity with the plan of Mosheim, our author next briefly mentions the ecclesiastical authors to whom Tertullian, in the course of his writings, alludes. These are Hermas, Clemens Romanus, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Miltiades, Irenæus, Proculus and Tatian. Of the "Shepherd of Hermas" he speaks in his later treatises with great bitterness, and asserts that it had been "pronounced apocryphal by every synod of the orthodox churches." It deserves no higher character.

In the fifth chapter, the learned Professor enters upon the most important and extensive branch of his inquiry, "the information which the writings of Tertullian supply respecting the doctrine of the church in his day." And in treating this part of his subject he has thought that he could not adopt a better course "than to consider the different doctrines in the order in which they occur in the Articles of the Church of England." (P. 262.) We suspect that he would not have adopted this course had he kept strictly to the professed object of his work, "the illustration of the ecclesiastical history of the second and third centuries." He must have seen that articles "composed chiefly," as Dr. J. Hay acknowledges, "with a view to separating from the Church of Rome, in which, consequently, the doctrines of that church are treated with peculiar attention," could not form a proper guide in the arrangement of passages relating to the doctrines and discipline of the age of Tertullian. Accordingly we find that there are some articles to which nothing in the works of the Presbyter can be referred, several concerning which it is more than doubtful whether the doctrine they are designed to maintain was known to him, and others, which the Professor candidly allows, derive from him no plain and direct support. This support, however, it is evidently his object to obtain in its fullest extent, and at the same time to withdraw it, wherever it has been claimed, from the Roman Catholic church. It appears to us that it would have been a fairer and more satisfactory course, to select from the works of Tertullian the substance of all they contain relating to doctrine, discipline and ceremonies, and to place the result in a systematic form, without reference to any existing formula or summary of faith.

In pursuing the course which he has thought it best to adopt, the Right Reverend Author defers the consideration of the 1st, 2nd, and 5th Articles to the chapter relating to heresies, and the 27th, 28th and 30th, to that concerning

the rites and ceremonies of the church. The 12th, 29th, 31st and 35th, are altogether omitted. In conformity with the *third* Article, Tertullian maintained that Christ descended into hell, or to that part of the invisible mansion of departed spirits prepared for the souls of the faithful. He held also, as does the *fourth* Article, that Christ ascended into heaven with the same body that was crucified and buried. While treating on this subject, our author takes occasion to give a short account of the work *De Resurrectione Carnis*, written against those heretics who were induced to deny the doctrine chiefly on account of their opinions relating to the evil nature of matter. With the sixth Article, "Tertullian uniformly speaks of the Scriptures as containing the whole rule to which the faith and practice of Christians must be conformed in points necessary to salvation:" and though in his controversies with those who rejected the authority of Scripture, he was compelled to appeal to tradition, it is in such circumstances and with such restrictions as not to afford any sanction to the notions on this subject which have since prevailed in the Roman Catholic church. Tertullian gives no professed catalogue of the canonical books of either the Old or the New Testament, but his quotations include nearly all the books that are now received. He also quotes the book of Enoch and some of the Apocryphal books, and discovers in many of his citations from the canonical Scriptures, the incorrectness which is too generally and too justly chargeable on the ancient Christian Fathers. In the course of the very interesting remarks of the learned and candid Professor in this part of his inquiry, he successfully defends Tertullian on the subject of tradition against the translator of *Schleiermacher's Essay on the Gospel of St. Luke*, and briefly refutes the theory of the author of a recent work entitled *Palæoromaica*. Speaking of tradition, he observes,

"If we mistake not the signs of the times, the period is not far distant when the whole controversy between the English and Romish Churches will be revived, and all the points in dispute again brought under review. Of those points none is more important than the question respecting tradition; and it is, therefore, most essential that they who stand forth as the defenders of the Church of England should take a correct and rational view of the subject—the view, in short, which was taken by our divines at the Reformation. Nothing was more remote from their intention than indiscriminately to condemn all tradition. They knew that as far as external evidence is concerned, the tradition preserved in the Church is the only ground on which the genuineness of the books of Scripture can be established. For though we are not, upon the authority of the Church, bound to receive as Scripture any book which contains internal evidence of its own spuriousness—such as discrepancies, contradictions of other portions of Scripture, idle fables, or precepts at variance with the great principles of morality—yet no internal evidence is sufficient to prove a book to be scripture, of which the reception, by a portion at least of the Church, cannot be traced from the earliest period of its history to the present time. What our Reformers opposed was the notion, that men must, upon the mere authority of tradition, receive, as necessary to salvation, doctrines not contained in Scripture. Against this notion in general, they urged the incredibility of the supposition that the apostles, when unfolding *in their writings* the principles of the Gospel, should have entirely omitted any doctrines essential to man's salvation. The whole tenor, indeed, of those writings, as well as of our blessed Lord's discourses, runs counter to the supposition that any truths of fundamental importance would be suffered long to rest upon so precarious a foundation as that of oral tradition. With respect to the particular doctrines, in defence of which the Roman Catholics appeal to tradition, our Reformers contended that some were directly at variance with Scripture; and that others, far from being supported by an un-

broken chain of tradition from the apostolic age, were of very recent origin, and utterly unknown to the early fathers. Such was the view of this important question taken by our Reformers. In this, as in other instances, they wisely adopted a middle course: they neither bowed submissively to the authority of tradition, nor yet rejected it altogether. We in the present day must tread in their footsteps and imitate their moderation, if we intend to combat our Roman Catholic adversaries with success. We must be careful that, in our anxiety to avoid one extreme, we run not into the other by adopting the extravagant language of those who, not content with ascribing a paramount authority to the Written Word on all points pertaining to eternal salvation, talk as if the Bible—and that too the Bible in our English translation—were, independently of all external aids and evidence, sufficient to prove its own genuineness and inspiration, and to be its own interpreter.”

These anticipations will, most probably, be realized, and the defenders of Protestantism, who will have to contend with no weak or unskilful adversaries, will do well to take the Professor's advice. His observations must be allowed to be judicious; even to his concluding remark we give an assent, although it is probable we might differ from him, on a mutual explanation, as to the nature and extent of the external aids which are necessary to the right interpretation of the Bible.

The well-known but much-disputed terms *authenticæ literæ*, applied by Tertullian to the Apostolic Epistles, are considered by our author as meaning no more than “epistles possessing authority.” The interpretation of Beriman, to whom he refers, and of Griesbach, of whose laboured criticism he makes no mention, though he appears to have had it in his mind, who suppose the terms to denote “the genuine unadulterated epistles,”—“*genuina et a nullo hæretico depravata exemplaria*,” is, we apprehend, most correct.

That the two Testaments were not at variance, which is one point in the *seventh* Article, and the only point noticed by our author, was certainly maintained by Tertullian. The learned Professor, we think, might have bestowed a few remarks upon the sentiments of Tertullian respecting the particular topics included in this article, especially that concerning the promise of a future life to the Jews.

The eighth Article is entitled, “Of the Three Creeds.” The Professor acknowledges that the Apostles' Creed in its present form was not known to Tertullian as a summary of faith; but from a comparison of different passages scattered through his writings, he infers “that the various clauses of which it is composed were generally received as articles of faith by orthodox Christians.” They are, indeed, found to agree very nearly with the “*regula fidei*,” as exhibited both by Tertullian and Irenæus. There is, however, cause for doubt as to the clauses relating to “the holy Catholic Church,” and “the communion of saints.” Something like the former may be found in the writings of Tertullian; but they contain no traces of the latter, at least as it is explained by Pearson. How far the doctrines of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds were known in the second century is considered in the last chapter of this work.

On the subjects of the ninth and several following Articles, relating chiefly to the doctrines of original sin, free-will, grace, justification and predestination, the writings of Tertullian are either silent, or they are chargeable with inconsistencies and contradictions, or they are at variance, certainly not in clear and manifest accordance, with the true exposition of these articles. The learned and ingenious Prelate has endeavoured, indeed, to vindicate the orthodoxy of the Presbyter of Carthage, but, as it appears to us, by no means successfully. He allows that Tertullian did not admit the

total corruption of human nature, which is decidedly the doctrine of the ninth Article, and the ground-work of those that immediately follow; that he speaks of "infancy as the age of innocence," an expression utterly inconsistent with the language of modern orthodoxy; that his later opinions were directly opposed to the doctrine of the Church in its *sixteenth* Article, on the possibility of falling from grace; that no trace of the doctrine of predestination is to be found in his writings, as the term is defined in the *seventeenth* Article; and that the question involved in the *eighteenth* concerning the salvation of virtuous heathens, never presented itself to his mind. To this portion of his inquiries, which certainly does not yield in importance to any other branch of them, the learned Professor has devoted only a very few pages. He has cited a few passages from the writings of Tertullian on the fall of Adam, on the nature and condition of the soul, and on the freedom of the will, the language of which, he thinks, differs little from that of the Articles, and he draws from other parts of his writings inferences favourable, as he imagines, to the object he has in view: yet we suspect he is not completely satisfied with the result. Certainly we are not. He has recourse to the expedient adopted by preceding writers, alleging that "no controversy on these subjects existed in Tertullian's time," and that "we must not expect him to speak with the same precision of language that was used by those who wrote after the Pelagian controversy had arisen." With such an apology we cannot be contented. They only, we are inclined to think, take the right view of this matter, who own that these doctrines, as they are expressed in those summaries of faith which have been drawn up since the Reformation, were unknown to the ancient Fathers, both of the Greek and Latin Church, prior to the time of Augustin. Flacius Illyricus, as quoted by Dr. Lardner, (see *Lardner's Works*, Vol. IV. p. 61,) complains that "the Christian writers who lived soon after Christ and his Apostles, discoursed like philosophers of the law and its moral precepts, and of the nature of virtue and vice, but were totally ignorant of man's natural corruption, the mysteries of the gospel, and Christ's benefit." Similar acknowledgments and complaints have been made by Basnage and others of later times. The attempt to account for the absolute silence or the inconsistent or indefinite language of the early Christian Fathers, in relation to these subjects, on the ground that no controversy had arisen respecting them, appears to us exceedingly futile, and utterly repugnant to the representations so commonly made of their supreme and vital importance. These doctrines are extolled not merely as the doctrines of the Reformation, but as the essential doctrines of the Gospel; as embracing truths of infinite concern to the whole human race; those truths which it was the great object of Jesus and his apostles to teach. If such be their character, (and in this light they must be regarded by those who receive the Articles of the Established Church,) the ministers of the orthodox church could in no age be ignorant of them; if such be their importance, and such it must be if they be true, they could not fail to be openly professed and fully developed from the very commencement of the Christian era; and if extensive and correct views, distinct and precise language respecting them might be expected to distinguish one period more than another, that must surely have been the period nearest to the times of the apostles. If these doctrines now constitute the most valuable portion of the Christian system, if they are absolutely essential to salvation, they must have been so esteemed from the first, and must have formed the principal topics of public instruction in the days of Tertullian, as they do in our own?

And if we consider the nature of these doctrines, the passages in the sacred writings on which they are founded, the topics of dispute between the orthodox and the heretics of the three first centuries, and the constitution of the human mind, we must feel assured that had these doctrines been professed by the earliest Fathers, they could not have failed to give occasion for controversy before the time of Augustin and Pelagius. They have been subjects of debate and contention ever since that period, and had they been previously taught, it would not have been reserved for the British monk to excite attention to them, or to lead those who maintained them to greater precision of language than they had hitherto employed. The truth we apprehend to be, that these doctrines owe not only the precision of language in which they are supposed now to be expressed, but even their origin, to the successive controversies that have been agitated since the days of the Bishop of Hippo; and that the unsuccessful attempts of the learned Professor and of all who have preceded him, to discover those doctrines in the writings of the early Christian Fathers, are the natural result of seeking after what did not then exist.

The nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first Articles relate to the government of the church, already considered by the Professor in the fourth chapter. As to the subjects of the twenty-second Article, Tertullian is claimed both by the Church of Rome and the Church of England. He maintains something like the doctrine of purgatory, alludes more than once to the practice of praying and offering for the dead, and of making oblations in honour of martyrs, but gives no countenance to the doctrine of pardons, or of the invocations of saints. In agreement with the *twenty-third* Article, he considered no one at liberty to preach the word of God without a regular commission, but allowed laymen to administer baptism in cases of necessity. That the service of the church was not performed in a tongue not understood by the people, the subject to which the twenty-fourth Article relates, is indisputable. He admits strictly only two sacraments, according to the twenty-fifth Article. The subject of the twenty-sixth Article is not anywhere noticed by him. The five following Articles are deferred or omitted. That the clergy were not obliged to live in celibacy, which is agreeable to the doctrine of the thirty-second Article, must, the Professor observes, be admitted by every person who has perused the writings of Tertullian. Excommunication, the subject of the next Article, in the age of Tertullian, implied only an exclusion from religious exercises. The lawfulness of war, in the case of Christians, the only point in the thirty-seventh Article to which any passage in the writings of Tertullian could be expected to apply, is denied by him. He has nothing concerning a community of goods among Christians, against which the thirty-eighth Article is directed: "but with respect to oaths," the subject of the thirty-ninth, "he appears to have understood our Saviour's injunction, 'Swear not at all,' literally, and to have thought that an oath was not under any circumstances allowable."—P. 366.

Having thus gone through the Articles of the Established Church, and laid before the reader such passages of Tertullian's works as appeared to throw any light upon them, the author briefly compares the result of his inquiries with the account given by Mosheim of the doctrines of the church in the second century. This affords him an opportunity of confirming the major part of the statements of the historian, of correcting some particular inaccuracies, and of vindicating the character of Tertullian from some charges

brought against him both by Mosheim and by Barbeyrac, to whose controversy with Cellier on the merits of the early Fathers as moral writers, the historian alludes. Our limits forbid us to notice this part of the learned Professor's labours any further than to say, that it is conducted with the learning, judgment and impartiality which characterize almost every page of the work.

(To be continued.)

ART. IV.—*Observations on the History and Doctrine of Christianity, &c.*
By William Mitford, Esq.

[Continued from page 217.]

THE author begins the Second Part of his Observations in Sect. I. with some remarks upon the "State of the World when Christ was born," designed to shew that the period of his birth was the fittest that could have been chosen for the purposes of his mission. We think it likely that Mr. Mitford was unacquainted with another historian's essay in the form of a sermon upon this subject. His mode both of thinking and of writing appears to great disadvantage, when the subject compels us to compare him with so judicious a reasoner and so elegant a writer as Dr. Robertson.

In Sect. II., entitled "Of the Evangelists," Mr. Mitford suggests some unborrowed thoughts on the inspiration of the sacred writers, which, though containing nothing that is not familiar to theologians, deserve to be extracted as an exposition of the ingenuous mind of the learned writer:

"That the whole of the Old Testament, and of the New, has been written under authority or control of the Holy Ghost, appears to have been so generally held by Christian writers and teachers, that, with my small reading, I have not learnt whether it has been controverted by any. That it is derived from very early times of the church I doubt not; but, so it has been assumed as undeniable, by authors whose works have fallen in my way, that on what it is founded remains to me unknown. Habituated from instruction in earliest years, and from observation, ever since, of the reception of the opinion by writers and teachers whom I most respected, I have been struck, not till I set myself to methodize and note in writing my thoughts on the subject, with observing that not only none of the evangelists claim such authority, but, on the contrary, two of them seem virtually to disclaim it; Luke declaring that he received his information from those who had attended Christ from the beginning of his ministry, and John twice asserting, as authority for what he wrote, that he bore record of what he saw, and that he knew his record to be true.*

"I the less scruple so far to express myself on this interesting but difficult subject, (difficult all the ablest ecclesiastics who have written with any view to controvert objections shew they have felt it,) as it appears to me that the testimony which the Gospels themselves, as they have been transmitted to us, afford, combined with what the Old Testament offers, is sufficient for establishing their title to be the ground of the Christian religion; hardly wanting support from our assurance of the acceptance they obtained on their first publication, and the extent of respect ever continued to them, though the support these afford is powerful. Inspiration, frequently mentioned in Scripture, is so little explained that it remains a mystery. Nevertheless, though not knowing what it is, it seems to me quite consonant to human reason to

* "Luke i.; John xix. 35, and xxi. 25."

believe all concerning it that is found in Scripture clearly affirmed. Its effect, in the confession of all, I think, has extended, if to make, yet not to keep the Scripture perfect. The Roman Church has assumed authority, claiming it to be divine; to decide on all points. It may become Protestants, I would humbly suggest, rather to believe it to have been for the purpose of our trial, the ultimate purpose of our being on earth, that difficulties have been allowed; which are however not such but that, the imperfections of human language, and the hazard of translation from languages no longer spoken, practice is so commanded that little is left to human reason for either objection or doubt; though, of belief, much is found remaining open for controversy. The zeal of believers to assert divine authority for the whole of the Old and New Testament, under necessity to admit that its influence, if ever producing perfection, has not been so exerted as to maintain it in any of the copies of either Testament which have reached us, has afforded great opportunity for their opponents. In truth, none can say from scriptural authority, hardly then, unless in very general terms, from human reason, where, with regard to the matters for which it is claimed, the inspiration has begun, or how far gone. I will venture to add, however, none can say, from authority of either Scripture or human reason, how far under God's providence, it may not have gone, or may not go, unknown to those directed by it. The Almighty Author of the human mind cannot but have power to dispose that mind as he pleases. The inferior animals we see he disposes to love, guard and feed their young while needful; the need ceasing, that disposition of the animal's mind ceases. It appears to me to be quite consonant with what we are enabled to see of God's providence, that he should, as may seem to him good, occasionally enlighten or direct the minds of men, when they may be no more conscious of it than the male bird that assists its incubant mate. Scripture assures us that, in the early ages of the world, and after the ascension of Christ, many were made sensible of such divine direction. Where clear information in Scripture fails, supposition, with just respect for the Divine attributes, may be allowed; but certainty, and of course all right of man to impose belief, ceases; and with much satisfaction I have observed some of our most eminent ecclesiastical writers of the English Church, of former times, and of the present day, to the utmost that, under human restrictions imposed on them, might be, teaching so."—Pp. 131—136.

Regarding the gospels as literary compositions, the author makes some free remarks upon their style and method. He appears to have been most deeply impressed by the perusal of Matthew, of whom he says, (p. 129,) that, like the writers of the Old Testament, he is "strong in detached sentences," but "utterly unhabituated to arrange thought for advantageous communication." He observes, (p. 131,) that John had been less qualified by education for a writer than any of the other three evangelists: "nevertheless," he adds, "though Luke had more of Grecian learning, and wrote in better style, yet there is in all the other three Gospels, but especially in Matthew's, often a superior energy, and, with it, sometimes, a grace beyond art, the more striking for the abruptness with which they are introduced, and the uncouth diction and rugged arrangement of all around them."

The whole of Sect. III. is "Of the Gospel by St. Matthew," consisting of critical and expository remarks upon some passages of this Gospel. The author compares (pp. 140—142) our Lord's mode of teaching with that of the philosophers and poets. Of these last, having named Virgil and Horace, he says,

"The latter, in youth licentious, in advanced years, with whatever remaining disposition to sensuality, which no authority known to him restrained, giving himself anxiously to speculation on the condition and duties of man, seems to have been prepared to rejoice in such light, might it have reached

him, as the gospel affords. Of all Heathen writers, it may be not wholly foreign to the purpose of this little work to observe, he perhaps, in giving the result of such speculation and inquiry, has expressed the best sentiments of the Grecian philosophers, the best guides furnished by his opportunities, most nearly with Hebrew conciseness and force."—Pp. 141, 142.

Some further remarks are here made upon the Lord's Prayer, The author understands the clause relating to temptation to mean, "Put us not so to trial, but that thou wilt graciously deliver us from evil." He rejects the gloss which would make the concluding phrase to refer to the devil, "the evil one."

"'But I say unto you that ye resist not evil.' 'Εγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, μὴ ἀντι-
στῆτε τῷ πονηρῷ. Matt. v. 39. Here by τὸ πονηρὸν not only has not been meant the devil, but certainly not any moral evil. This so completely justifies the English translation, that it may appear almost superfluous to add that, in all known manuscripts, this last cited passage is found to have the article prefixed, but, the oldest has it not in the prayer."—Note, p. 148.

Mr. Mitford ventures in the IVth Sect. upon the difficult subject "Of Demoniacs." With little previous knowledge of the sentiments of learned men upon this much-agitated question, he decides, from a review of the New Testament, against the popular hypothesis. In answer to a remark of the late Mr. Gilpin's in his Exposition, that the devil had greater *visible* power before the time of Christianity than he has now, which it is necessary to suppose in order to meet many difficulties in profane history, with regard to oracles, the writer says,

"I wish the worthy author had specified the reported oracles which made any difficulty for him; being myself unaware of any which may not most reasonably be referred to either conjecture before, or invention after the fact; unless some of such ingenious duplicity, or of such obscure, if any meaning, that, whatever were the event, mistake could not be imputed to them: nor has this passed unnoticed by Heathen authors."—Pp. 155, 156.

We regret that our narrow limits will not allow us to extract some passages in exposition of several instances of possession related in the gospels, which Mr. Mitford considers to have been cases of disease, disease accompanied by some kind and degree of madness. He protests against the rendering in the English translation of the Greek words "dæmon" and "dæmonion," by the English word appropriated to the Greek "diabolos," as not only "utterly unwarranted," but "an offensive stumbling-block." (P. 182.) He says that the word "dæmon" was never used in Greek to express any thing evil; Luke, a Greek scholar, has therefore in his first notice of possession (iv. 33) used a distinguishing epithet to guard against an improper conception of his meaning,—“the spirit of an unclean dæmonion.” This phrase, or that of “unclean spirit,” he would have substituted in the English New Testament “for the offensive term ‘devil.’” (Pp. 162, 172 and 183.) Reasonable as is this call for an improved version, it will be disregarded by our ecclesiastical dignitaries who influence the measures of government with regard to the Church. All improvements have been hitherto, and will, we fear, long continue to be, made by individuals, not only unauthorized by Church and State in their useful labours, but exposed to obloquy for their officious exposure of defects and errors in the religious apparatus of the country.

The Second Volume or Part (for the book is strangely printed) of the Observations consists partly of "Letters to a Friend," we suppose a divine,

from which it appears that Mr. Mitford did not hope entirely to escape censure on account of the freedom of the foregoing strictures. He acknowledges with pleasing simplicity of manner his obligations to his friend for putting into his hands Dr. Mead's *Medica Sacra* :

“ Among laymen, then, who have so deserved well, I cannot but reckon that eminent physician, and scholar, and Christian philosopher, Mead; and I feel especial obligation to you for having made me acquainted with that little publication which, in my mind, gives him complete claim to the latter title, his *Medica Sacra*. It is highly relieving and encouraging to me to find that, on a subject so hazardous as that of the human disorder, so frequently described by phrases implying possession by unclean spirits, his authority, high certainly, if high reputation for medical science might make it so, was, unknown to me, prepared for my support. So warranted in my previous belief, that all those symptoms, mentioned by the Evangelists, of persons called possessed, are ordinary symptoms of human disorders, I remain quite satisfied with having dilated on the subject, beyond what was within the able and worthy physician's purpose.”—Part ii. pp. 5, 6.

It is well known that Mead, who wrote in Latin, professedly for the use of proficients in either theology or medicine, deprecated the publication of any translation of his work. A regard to the religion of the common people was the alleged plea of the learned and pious physician for this prohibition: the very same religious benevolence, Mr. Mitford reasons, (ii. 6—10,) justifies him in pursuing, in a different state of things, the opposite course. Infidelity has crept in amongst the common people, and no effort should be spared to shew them that the narratives of the gospels are credible and their doctrine agreeable to common sense.

His friend had warned Mr. Mitford of the wasp's nest roused by Mead, but in vain: he proceeds, in spite of the foreseen buzzing and sting of bigots, to disclose freely his inmost thoughts upon a review of the books of Scripture. One avowal of doubt and difficulty may alarm some of our readers and even contributors. Mr. Belsham little expected, we will venture to say, when he was penning his objections to the introduction to the Gospel of Matthew, that he should be hereafter supported in his theory by the Historian of Greece, the brother of the noble Lord that has been as a right hand to the present orthodox Lord Chancellor. Having remarked that the New Testament, taking the history and the doctrine combined, bears within itself evidence of the impossibility of its having been altogether the invention of man, he adds this exceptive passage :

“ But asserting this of the history and doctrine altogether, I deem it right to avow that, for one passage in St. Matthew's Gospel, as that Gospel has been transmitted to us, a passage merely historical, though not proposing to controvert it, I cannot assert so much; I mean the account of the flight into Egypt, and the slaughter of infants in Galilee. I understand this account is found in all the oldest known manuscripts of St. Matthew's Gospel, and thence is intitled to great consideration from Christian churches, and, perhaps, all that it has obtained. But as it has afforded more opportunity for the opponents of Christianity, and more difficulty for its defenders, than perhaps any other, I have thought it altogether unbecoming wholly to avoid declaring what has occurred to me on the subject. It will have been observed by all who read the New Testament, that not a syllable relating to it is found in any one of the other three Gospels; even St. Luke's, who is largest on the early part of our Saviour's life, and professes to have had information of all from the beginning. The narrative, then, it may farther deserve observation, not only affects not in the least the history given by the other Evangelists, but, if omitted even in the

Gospel in which it is found, would make no sensible interruption. The most important consideration however is, that it furnishes nothing of doctrine. Though, therefore, a defence of it may be esteemed of some importance, as the credit of the transmitted copies of that earliest and still eminent gospel, which alone gives it, is concerned, yet, as far as I am aware, it is important for nothing else."—Pp. 15, 16.

A Letter, entitled "Remarks on the Gospel by St. John," (pp. 32-3—32-31,) abounds with intimations, all of them not obscure, of an heretical leaning. We would try the reader's patience by extracts, especially of passages upon the Proem of this Gospel, if the author did not more commonly suggest than solve difficulties; but there are two paragraphs which we cannot pass over, so important is their testimony in favour of truth and charity, and so energetically do they express the state of a mind revolting from absurdity and imposition. Mr. Mitford had observed that the disputes of the learned are "evidence that the mysteries, so little unfolded to man's apprehension in the 1st chapter of St. John's Gospel, were not proposed for man to explain," and also that the same Evangelist in a part of his narrative soon following reports words of Christ himself ("Were I to tell you of heavenly things, how should ye believe?") reproving an over-busy curiosity about matters above human capacity, and then says, in a tone of deep religious feeling,

"Adding, then, to all these considerations that of the history of Creeds, when I am called upon, in the course of our Church-service, after the minister, to declare solemnly before God, my belief of the manner of the production of one portion of his Almighty Being, and the manner also of an occasional complicated existence (so I understand the expression) of another portion, unaware of anything in holy writ requiring, or, to my mind, sufficiently warranting such a declaration, but, on the contrary, Christ's admonition already noticed, cautioning against presumption on such subjects, I am led to hope, and even trust, it is excusable for me to hesitate at the awful ceremony.

"But when, moreover, in the creed, styled of St. Athanasius, though unknown by whom composed, or by what authority established in the liturgy of the Roman church, whence it has been received in ours, but clearly not till after the corruption of both Roman and Greek churches already wanted the correction of Protestantism, I am farther required to declare my belief of much that I cannot understand, and much that I find myself, to my understanding, admonished in holy writ, not to be over curious about; nor so much only, but farther to pronounce all those accursed of God for ever, who, understanding, or not understanding, cannot so believe, I think it not unbecoming me to own that, not without some horror, I shrink from the tremendous responsibility."—Pp. 32-18—32-20.

If our object were merely to conciliate the reader's esteem of the author, we would stop here; but as our end is truth, we must make a remark or two upon other parts of the book.

Allusion has been already made to Mr. Mitford's strong political partialities. These appear rather oddly in the Observations. He not only speaks superciliously of "the tyrant multitude" and "the sovereign populace," but even treats with respect the high rulers of the Jewish Church, and the Pagan authorities who resisted and took vengeance on the founders of Christianity. Another celebrated Greek historian, famous for his unbelief, avows that the religion of Christ appeared to him an innovation, and he was for the old religion: our author does not go so far, but he is evidently swayed by the same reverential feeling towards the "gods on earth." He justifies Caiaphas in pronouncing sentence upon Jesus (ii. 44—47), absolves

Pontius Pilate (47—49), and concludes (49) “that the sacrifice, predestined by Almighty Providence, was accomplished—if not without human crime, yet, the signal treachery of one man only excepted, without any that we seem warranted to impute”!

In the same manner, he ventures to remark in the “Observations upon Heathenism,” by far the least interesting part of the volume, that the alarm of the Roman government at the growing reception of Christianity was not unreasonable (176, &c.); and he asserts that persecution on account of religion was not unknown among the Greeks and Romans, and maintains that it was not wrong (p. 160). This frankness we cannot but admire, whilst we lament the secret influence of opinions and predilections, with regard to actual political parties and present disputes and dissensions, in perverting the writer’s historic and moral judgments.

Not willing to conclude this notice of the “Observations” in the language of censure, we shall give the author’s estimate of the “last thoughts” of Cicero upon religion, in which we are disposed to believe that he is not mistaken:

“The opinions on which he finally rested are marked in his treatise on Elderhood, that intitled *Scipio’s Dream*, and more especially that on the *Consolation of Philosophy*. In all these he has asserted, after Socrates, his confidence in the existence, the omnipotence, and the goodness of (*the*) Deity, in the immortality of the human soul, in the future reward of human virtue, and punishment of human wickedness.”—Pp. 169, 170.

ART. IV.—*A Letter to the Right Hon. the Earl of Liverpool, K. G., on the “Unitarian Marriage Bill,” in which is considered the Expediency as well as the Justice of redressing the Grievance complained of by the Dissenters.* By a Presbyter of the Church of England.

THIS Presbyter is verily a “Priest writ large.” He denies to the petitioners for the Bill the title conceded to them by the Episcopal Bench, by the Noble Lord to whom his Letter is addressed, and even by that cautious tolerator on the Woolsack, whose anxiety for the Church and its dignities and monopolies transcends that of its Right Reverend Fathers upon earth. He calls himself a “Trinitarian,” because he asserts the existence of *three persons* in the Godhead, but quarrels with the believers in God in *one person*, as “having very improperly chosen to denominate themselves Unitarians.” He “must be permitted to call them Socinians,” (a title which they disclaim as notoriously inapplicable to their faith and object of worship,) “until they think proper to select a less objectionable appellation.” The worshiper of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is stigmatized as an “open blasphemer of the Lord God of Christians;” and, not content with denouncing Unitarian devotion as imperfect, the Presbyter boldly “accuses the Socinians of worshipping a *false God*,” and “setting up an idol of their own.” Of course, after this it would be highly preposterous and unseemly for the “Socinians” to feel offended at the sedulous anxiety with which, throughout the pamphlet, their title to the Christian name is rebutted, and they must console themselves with the humble hope that the “Judge of all,” overlooking the petty distinctions of name and opinion, of which bigotry is so tenacious, may condescend to accept, under the more comprehensive

appellation of “works of righteousness,” many of that vilified sect, to whose moral respectability the Presbyterian thus bears his unsuspected testimony :

“With several Socinians I have the honour to be acquainted ; to their moral worth, the integrity of their conduct, and the respectability of their character, I am willing to bear testimony ; but, at the same time, I am obliged, with sorrow of heart, to confess, that I can only regard them in the light of virtuous Heathens. By a Heathen I mean one who, although he may be distinguished from the Atheist by worshiping a God, is equally distinguished from the Christian by denying the *true God*.”—Pp. 4, 5.

But our principal concern is with the argument of the Presbyterian in favour of some relief to Unitarians (as they “must be permitted” still to call themselves until some more correctly discriminating appellation shall be pointed out) from the operation of the present Marriage Law, and with the plan suggested by him. As to the first, he unqualifiedly admits that they are aggrieved :

“It may be expedient for a Government—nay, it is sometimes incumbent upon it—to prohibit the promulgation of doctrines opposed to the religion established ; but it becomes intolerance and persecution to compel men to adore with their lips a Being whom in their hearts they deny. The object of such a proceeding I cannot understand,—of the unlawfulness of it I am fully convinced.”

He further contends, that the grievance is equally oppressive and equally afflictive to himself and his clerical brethren ; he discovers a clear repugnancy between his duty as a servant of the State, and his obedience to the laws of her ally the Church ; and hesitates not to declare, that if any such blasphemous Protest were presented to him as that which we have lately read of in the newspapers, no power on earth, or *under the earth*, would induce him to perform the service for the protesting parties ; or, as far as his influence might extend, to permit it to be performed by another.—P. 7.

In discussing the mode of remedying the mutual grievance of the “Christian Priest” and the idolatrous Socinian, the Presbyterian glances at the plans which have been already proposed with this view, but betrays, we are sorry to say, no little want of information upon the points which it most concerned him to know. To describe the first Bill introduced by the Unitarians as proposing a “revision of the Marriage Service, and an alteration of it so as to accommodate it to the scruples of the Socinians ;” as calling upon a Christian clergyman “not only to deny his Saviour, by mutilating or omitting the form of adoration due to him ; not only to compromise his duty to Almighty God on the arbitrary bidding of those who exult in their denial of him, but to become a party to a religious ceremonial which, in his heart, he believes to be little better than a Pagan rite,”—as a profanation of the Christian temple, by the erection of the image of Baal, (see p. 8,)—is to use language equally harsh and inconsiderate, when it is recollected that this simple measure, in every other respect unobjectionable, merely adopted a distinction, which our author clearly admits and contends for, between the civil and religious celebration of marriage, and proposed to omit altogether the directly devotional part of the Church Service, retaining the solemn and expressive forms of matrimonial contract. As to the *imperative* nature of the enactment, it seemed difficult to effectuate the relief without investing the Unitarians with a legal right to it ; but even this offence might perhaps have been removed, if the minister had been merely *authorized* to comply

with the wishes of the parties, and the Episcopal Bench had undertaken to add the weight of their recommendation to the clergy under their respective jurisdictions ; and it might have been time enough to ask for the compulsory provision, or for some other mode of relief, if experience had demonstrated that the grievance was not practically removed by the tolerance of the great bulk of the national clergy. It is true that the Bill reduced the functions of the minister *quoad hoc* to those of a civil magistrate or registrar : but it is not denied that, for many purposes, he is the only civil functionary provided by the law ; nor is it esteemed as derogatory from his spiritual character, voluntarily to undertake the duties of a Justice of the Peace, Commissioner of Taxes, or Deputy Lieutenant : and let it be recollected, that the principal inducements for introducing the Bill in question, were, 1st, the great desirableness, in a civil point of view, that the *circumstances* attendant upon the Marriage Ceremony should be altered as little as might be ; and, 2dly, the impossibility of so accommodating the devotional parts of the established ritual to the religious notions of Unitarians, as to avoid the charge, now most unjustly preferred, of *mutilating* the forms of adoration to the God of Trinitarians.

We must allow the Presbyter to state the nature and design and consequences of the other measure proposed for the relief of Unitarian Dissenters in his own words :

“ Another measure has been suggested, in which it is proposed to permit Dissenters to marry in their own conventicles, and to recognize in law the validity of such marriages. But such a measure as this, my Lord, is directly opposed to the second of those two principles, by which I assumed, *in limine*, that both your Lordship and myself were to be guided, namely, the support of the dignity and privileges of the Establishment. It stands to reason that, if we have an Establishment, (whatever may be the religion established,) it ought to have not only the protection of Government, (for this should be equally extended to all the tolerated sects,) but its *exclusive* countenance and favour. *Privileges* are for the Establishment, *connivance* merely for the sectarians.

“ The Church is the general rule of the constitution—the Dissenting sects are exceptions to it. The clergy of the Establishment have, in consequence, an ostensible public character allotted to them ; the teachers in the conventicles, being regarded by church and by law as nothing more than laymen, have none. To obtain this, and to do away the distinction drawn by the Constitution, appears to be among the most influential of the motives which have really awakened the Socinians to a sense of a grievance to which they had long silently submitted. But, if the Establishment is to be supported, it is certainly incumbent upon our Legislators to resist the innovation ; for here the civil Government possesses the full power of defining the line of separation between the established and a tolerated religion. If schism be a sin, (as by the doctrine of the Church it undoubtedly is,) it most assuredly becomes the duty of that State to which the Church is allied, while it tolerates schismatics, to make the line of distinction between them and the Establishment as clear and precise as possible, in order to prevent the uneducated and ignorant from being led astray, and becoming the victims of heresy. Not only your Lordship, but all the better-educated members of our communion, who, like your Lordship, have attended to the duties and doctrines of the Christian religion, are aware that by schism we mean the desertion of an episcopal church, or the acting in opposition to its laws, when they do not inculcate doctrines which are contrary to Scripture. But this the unlettered cannot, and the self-willed will not, understand. Their reason for being members of the Church is, too often, merely because it is established by law ; but, although

these may be weaker brethren, we are not to despise them; we are, on the contrary, to remove the stumbling-block which our greater knowledge may perceive in their way. If on 'some we are to have compassion, making a difference,' 'others we are to save with fear, pulling them out of the fire.' But if these persons see the Meeting-house enjoying the very same privileges as the Church, they will not only be confounded into infidelity, as even now is too frequently the case; but every landmark erected by our ancestors to keep them in the right course will be removed: we shall thus allure them to schism, instead of restraining them by all lawful means.

"It is at this very point that the measure now under consideration aims. It is to place the clergyman and the Dissenting teacher—the church and the conventicle — on precisely the same footing that these persevering efforts are made. Conscience affords the plea, but ambition inspires the zeal."—Pp. 10—12.

We think we discern the marks of genuine apprehension in the passage above quoted; but fear is very apt to fabricate as well as magnify its objects, and not unfrequently betrays its subjects into gross and palpable injustice. One would be led to suppose, that by the alarming measure here adverted to, the whole body of Dissenting Ministers were at once to be invested with a definite and recognized character, instead of that comparatively small part of the body which is attached to a sect frequently represented as alike contemptible in numbers and in knowledge. But a slight glance at the history of this measure will convict our Presbyter of a hasty and injurious aspersion of the motives which prompted an application to Parliament in a new form. Indeed, his own statement of the nature of the first measure at once acquits the Unitarians and their "teachers" of all the sinister and insidious motives here imputed to them; and, however it may surpass the belief of the Presbyter, we can venture to assure him, that the great recommendation of the first Bill to its promoters, consisted in its avoiding all necessity for recognizing Dissenting Ministers as officers of the State. Whilst it was regarded as desirable and probable that parties taking advantage of the Act would give to their contract the additional solemnity of a devotional service, the idea of making such solemnity *legally* imperative was deprecated, precisely because the Dissenting Minister, being neither in "holy orders," nor "pretending to holy orders," must, in that case, be brought into competition with the Established Clergy. The Bill was introduced originally in the latter part of the Session of 1819, and was framed so as to include Dissenters of every description; but, after being read a first and second time, it was, upon the suggestion of Lord Castlereagh, deferred until another Session.

The death of the late King, and the absorbing interest of certain discussions which speedily followed that event, sufficiently account for the lapse of the year 1820 without any attempt to re-introduce the measure; and it was not until after the rejection of the Catholic Emancipation Bill, in the year 1821, that the subject was again brought before the House of Commons, by Mr. Smith, who, upon an objection from Dr. Phillimore, that the Bill formerly proposed would do away with marriage as a religious ceremony, observed, that the petitioners were not wedded to any particular mode of relief, and had suggested that mode as producing less change than any other in the existing system. On the 17th April, 1822, Mr. Smith obtained leave to bring in the Bill; but the highest authorities of the Church having been consulted, it was discovered, that though the right to relief was pretty generally conceded, the mode of affording it was strongly objected to, as involving an alteration of the Liturgy.

About the same period, a paper of considerable talent appeared in the

Christian Remembrancer,* (for May,) the general tendency and spirit of which went to the denial of the existence of any grievance, but which concluded by shewing how the wishes of the Dissenters might be reconciled with the spirit of the Marriage Law. "Let the banns of Marriage between Dissenters be published in their Parish Church, let a certificate of such publication be given by the minister, let the parties be married on the strength of such certificate by their own teacher, and let them bring a certificate of their marriage to the parish register." If we might be allowed a conjecture as to the author of this paper, we should name the most zealous opponent of the Unitarian claims upon the Episcopal Bench; and the Presbyter has probably to thank a Prelate of his own Church for the suggestion of a plan which he denounces as destructive of the dignity and privileges of the clergy, and the offspring of insidious ambition amongst Dissenting teachers. Certain it is, that the Unitarian Dissenters were indebted to a Civilian of considerable eminence, whose attachment to the Establishment is unsuspected, and who, as conductor of a morning paper, had publicly discussed and conceded the existence of the grievance complained of, for the sketch of a Bill which, with some few modifications, was presented to the House of Commons towards the close of the Session of 1822, and was necessarily postponed, after being read a second time and printed. In this Bill, however, great care was employed not to recognize an order of ministers for the solemnization of marriages in the places of worship which were to be registered for the purpose; but when the marriage had been celebrated, under sanction of a previous license or certificate of banns, the parties married and two witnesses were to attend the parochial minister or his deputy, and sign a certificate of the marriage in the register book, with a slight alteration of the form. All the civil precautions as to publicity were retained; the clergy of the Establishment were relieved from the performance of any thing approaching to a religious ceremony; whilst the necessity of registration secured to them their usual emoluments; and a religious celebration of the marriage was, in a great degree, secured, without any express recognition by the State of any new class of functionaries. The proceedings upon the general Marriage Law materially and necessarily impeded the prosecution of the particular measure; but the question of relieving the Roman Catholic as well as Protestant Dissenters from an enforced submission to the ritual of the Church, having been seriously entertained by the Committee upon the general law in the House of Lords, considerable hopes were indulged, that some broad and liberal plan of relief would have suggested itself. The Committee explained the grounds of their omitting to recommend specific provisions in the following paragraph:

"The Committee think it not proper entirely to omit that their attention has been called to many other topics connected with the general subject of Marriage, and that they have been laboriously employed in considering them, particularly the cases of Roman Catholic Marriages and those of other Dissenters, especially Unitarians, which latter have been brought under their consideration in numerous petitions referred to them by the House; but after inquiry and discussion they have thought it more advisable, upon the whole, not to recommend that specific provisions respecting them should be included in the proposed Bill; the cases of the various denominations of Dissenters being extremely diversified in their various circumstances, and ap-

* See Mon. Repos. Vol. XVII. p. 354.

pearing to require a diversity of provisions much more proper to be suggested by communications of their own to the Legislature.”

In conformity with this suggestion no time was lost in presenting to the Upper House the Bill dropped in the Commons at the close of the preceding Session, with such alterations as were necessary to constitute it a measure of relief to Dissenters of all classes. The discussion on the second reading was very interesting. Even the Lord Chancellor conceded that some descriptions of Dissenters had just claims to relief, and promised his assistance to the noble mover in maturing some plan of relief in the next Session. Lord Liverpool, deeming the arguments for relief unanswerable, suggested the propriety of a short comprehensive service for those who objected to the present one, and the Bishop of Worcester judiciously remarked that an abridgment of the service ought not to be deemed an alteration. The Archbishop of Canterbury and many other Lords expressed their intention to confine relief to the Unitarians, and the debate terminated by an equal division of the members present for and against the second reading, but with a majority of six proxies against it. On the 11th of March, 1824, Lord Lansdowne introduced the Bill, narrowed to a measure for the relief of Unitarians, and after an animated debate on the 29th of that month, distinguished not less by the frank and liberal admissions of the Premier, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and other Bishops and Lords in favour of the Unitarians, than by the Lord Chancellor's utter obliviscence of his pledge of assistance given in the preceding session, the second reading of the Bill was carried by a majority of two. In the mean time, the sentiments of the Episcopal Bench had been consulted as to the details of the Bill, and a variety of clauses suggested in that quarter were prepared and intended for insertion in the Bill when committed, although many of them appeared to be uncalled for by any civil or religious necessity, and were liable to the objection of conferring upon the Dissenting minister an official character, in order to affect him with the civil penalties attaching to the Established clergy. A zeal for the Church transcending that of the Prime Minister and of the bench of Bishops was, however, organizing an opposition even to the further discussion of the subject: and in defiance of the general admission in 1823, that the Unitarians were labouring under a grievance, (the Bill *then* before the House being objectionable as too general,) a jesuitical attempt was now made to stigmatize them as religious outlaws, and therefore less entitled to relief than any others. Lord Liverpool's indignant reprobation of this quibbling will not be readily forgotten; but the Bill was thrown out by a large majority upon an undefined principle of opposition, which would have been equally exerted whatever had been the plan proposed, and which even the Presbyter sanctions us in stigmatizing as morally unlawful and essentially intolerant.

The subsequent history of the Bill it is not necessary to dwell upon; it was presented to the House of Commons early in the session of 1825, and received the most liberal attention from the Secretary for the Home Department. Upon suggestions, principally emanating from the highest ecclesiastical authorities, clauses were reluctantly added for the registration of Unitarian places of worship and ministers for the purposes of the Act, and ultimately, the registration itself was to be removed from the shoulders of the parochial minister, leaving him little except the onus of receiving his fees. The Bill, thus loaded with precautionary clauses, passed the Commons without any opposition deserving notice; but in vain had the petitioners sought to conciliate support, or at least neutrality, by adopting all the sug-

gestions which the legally constituted guardians of the Church had made,—in vain had they expressed their readiness to accept the already over-loaded Bill, even with the addition of further restrictions to any extent which did not render it impracticable as a measure of relief. Bigotry again successfully gnashed her teeth, and by a majority of *four proxies* the Bill was rejected in the Upper House without going into a detailed examination of its provisions.

Such is the history of this measure, and we are much mistaken if every man of common candour will not readily admit the absence of indirect views in the course which Unitarians have pursued on this subject, and that they have kept their eye steadily fixed on their grievance, evincing a sincere desire to obtain its redress with the least possible sacrifice of the general system of law. That the frequent discussions of the subject must have opened the eyes of many to the impolicy of blending functions purely civil with the religious duties of the Clergy of the Establishment, we can readily believe; and we sincerely hope that Nonconformists in general will, ere long, be completely emancipated from any necessity of coming into contact with a body, too many of whose members express contempt for every thing relating to Dissenters, save their money.

We must not omit to notice the remedy suggested by the Presbyterian in the place of the measures hitherto proposed. "It is this: that we should acknowledge the validity of marriage contracts, entered into before a civil magistrate, according to certain forms prescribed by Act of Parliament." With respect to the plan itself, if there be any thing remarkable, it is not its novelty in the abstract, but that it is founded upon a distinction which, however evident, so many politicians in and out of the Church contrive to overlook. That the marriage contract stands high in the scale of religious as well as moral obligations, we are most forward to admit; but from this admission, to argue the duty of the State, as such, to prescribe a religious ceremonial, is as absurd as it would be to contend for the interposition of a religious *rite* in every important contract between man and man, because its violation would be an offence against religious principle. With the desultory and not very perspicuous historical discussion into which our author enters, and his distinctions between the sufficiency of a contract in *foro civili* and one in *foro conscientie*, (from which an uncharitable critic might infer, that a Churchman's conscience is not to be bound by the former,) and between "the extreme of Popery, which improperly has made matrimony a sacrament," and the more accurate and well-defined notion of our Protestant Church, which only considers it "as a holy estate entered into by a religious ordinance," we have no concern farther than to observe, that the Presbyterian perpetually confounds the very distinguishable ideas of "religious ordinance" and "religious obligation," like a Churchman of ancient breed. We feel obliged to him for introducing to more extended notice the act of the Protectorate, alias the Grand Rebellion, for regulating the solemnization of marriage and the registration of marriages, births, and burials, which we concur with him in hoping "may be found useful in supplying hints." That it would better comport with the dignity of the Establishment to permit its ministers to act as mere registrars of the acts of a lay-magistrate, (as the Presbyterian suggests,) than that they should be the functionaries for receiving as well as recording the vows of the married parties, (as Lord Liverpool recommended,) we are utterly at a loss to understand; but we are not much in the dark as to the motive for wishing the banns to be proclaimed in the market-place, and higher fees to be imposed upon licences in London.

and large towns. Yet our author exceedingly disdains the idea of persecuting error indirectly, and appears to lament that "our different acts of toleration have been too often granted, not upon any broad principle, but from mere motives of expediency." (P. 27.)

We understand that the Committee of Civil Rights has determined to revert, in a great degree, to the simplicity of the original proposition, and to present a Bill authorizing the parties to appear before the parish minister in the church or vestry, *at his* option, and after contracting marriage in the solemn and expressive form prescribed by the act of the Commonwealth, so as to avoid the most distant pretence of interfering with the Liturgy, to have the marriage registered upon payment of the usual fees. Banns and licences to continue upon the footing of the general law. That the Bill so altered will please all parties in the Church, past experience forbids us to hope; but recent events justify the expectation that Unitarians, with an admitted grievance, will not be again thrust out of parliament upon a series of inconsistent and ill-disguised pretences, that their Bill is too comprehensive, or too partial—that it provides too little or too much for religious celebration—that it asks the established priest to mutilate his forms, or that it sets up a rival body of religious officers—or, to crown the whole, that the petitioners are, by the common law, aliens from civil as well as religious privilege, and, therefore, ought to be compelled to bend the knee to the God of Trinitarians.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

ART. V.—*Les Jésuites Modernes, &c. Modern Jesuits.* By the Abbé Martial Marcet de la Roche-Arnaud. 8vo. pp. 200. Paris, 1826.

THE revival of the order of the Jesuits in France under the restored dynasty of the Bourbons, has produced a very powerful sensation in the public mind. Their insidious and arbitrary proceedings, countenanced as they are understood to be by the court and the ministry, have been viewed with serious alarm by a large portion of the enlightened population, and the press has teemed with publications which were intended to weaken or subvert their influence by exposing their principles, and holding out their practices to general contempt and abhorrence. Among the works of this class the "Modern Jesuits" of the Abbé de la Roche-Arnaud has attained pre-eminent celebrity. The author is a young ecclesiastic, who may be considered in some respects as a spy in the enemy's camp. He had mixed much with the society, but whether with a view of becoming a member does not appear; and he avails himself of the knowledge he had acquired to reveal

secrets, which would have been sought in vain from a faithful adherent to the Company of Jesus. His book has obtained a most rapid and extensive circulation; and it forms one, if not the principal, of those works which led to the late famous project for restraining the liberty of the press in France, which its sage authors have lately been compelled to abandon. In an address to the reader the Abbé gives a short view of the present constitution of the Society of Jesuits, specifying the principal officers, and describing their functions. The Chief is called the *General*, who is deemed amenable only to Jesus Christ or to the Pope. The next in rank are his *assistants*, who have the charge of provinces, and divide among them all the countries of the earth. Next follows the *Provincial*, who is the chief of a province, and, like the *General*, has his council, consisting of his Secretary-General, Procurator-General, &c. Every college has its *Rector*, who is sometimes styled the *Master-Father*, having also his council of assistants under different denominations. Every house has besides its *Prefect in spiritual things*, to whom alone the members of the society are to make confession;

without special permission from the Father Provincial. The *privileged orders* are the *Professed*, who are at the head of the order, and derive their name from having sworn to be obedient in all things to the commands of the Pope; the *Coadjutors Formés*, who have sworn to assist the *Professed*, and are their agents; the *Scholars*, who may obtain the highest ranks; and the *temporal Coadjutors*, who are employed in the meanest offices, and frequently undertake the most important negotiations.

In the body of the work the author aims at placing before the public view a series of portraits of the leading members of the society, with whose characteristic lineaments he seems to be perfectly familiar. The likenesses are sketched with great freedom and spirit, and have all the appearance of being true to nature. The colouring is said to be, in some instances, overcharged, but the leading features are nevertheless allowed to be correctly drawn. Our limits do not allow of our presenting many of them to our readers; we shall content ourselves with selecting one as a specimen, referring them for the rest to the book itself. As the author has attached the name to the portraits, we shall willingly do the same, and therefore announce that the person represented is GURY, of Franche-Comté (p. 79).

“During the Revolution he was a soldier, priest, missionary, and wished to be a Jesuit. He joined the Ex-Jesuits who had united themselves under the severe regime of *Paccanari*. His zeal, his fanaticism, and his unconquerable firmness, caused him to be placed at the head of the noviciate established at Rome. Here he distinguished himself by a despotism even more dreadful than that of his master. He exacted from his novices a ready, blind, and entire obedience. At his command they would throw themselves from the summit of the Capitol, or into the Tiber, just as, at the voice of the Old Man of the Mountains, his miserable slaves would cast themselves from the summits of precipices to evince how far they could carry their submission. He imitated this tyrant in the measures he pursued. Pleasure, plenty, perpetual gratification, the empire of the world, were promised to them if they were submissive to the will of their superior.

“Owing to the fanaticism of *Paccanari*, the Fathers of the Faith quitted his livery: some retired to Russia, under the orders of Father *Brosossoski*, the rest

placed themselves under Father de *Varin*, formerly a colonel in the regiment of *Condé*, in order to re-establish the Society of Jesus under the empire of *Napolcon*. In the number of these was Father *Gury*; he was employed in the establishment formed in the South, and had the mortification to be left in obscurity during the reign of Father de *Varin*. When the French Jesuits were united to those of Russia, Father *Gury* was appointed to succeed him. He was called to Paris and put at the head of the Jesuits of *Mont Rouge*, over whom he presided during ten years.

“If there be any thing strange in France it is certainly this religious house of *Mont Rouge*. Whilst a king of France may not be able to find in his kingdom men freely devoted to his service, there is one man not far from the palace of the Bourbons, at the gates of the capital of France, and in the bosom of the most generous and civilized of nations,—a man without arms, without power, without money, without rank, without reputation, and without glory,—who rules at his pleasure those who would extend his empire throughout the provinces. His will, nay, even his look, can raise a thousand hands armed with poignards to assassinate princes and destroy emperors. During ten years the provinces were filled with his formidable slaves, and every day he sends forth others of a more terrific character.

“In an obscure apartment of *Mont Rouge*, the novices, every day of the week, follow in the train of Father *Gury* to the feet of the statues of *Ignatius* and *Francis Xavier*, to learn the mysteries of the society. Here every novice is obliged to proclaim all the faults and conversations of his associates: every novice in his turn, upon his knees, before the statues of his founders, is required to declare his tastes, his inclinations, his defects, his character, and his disposition as to the company. They all swear to sacrifice their personal wishes to the good of the society, to spare no labours to exterminate the race of the wicked, and to place at the feet of their Father *Ignatius*, all the crowns of the earth. They proceed, with their Father Master, to cast at their feet the vanities of the world, represented by a king invested with his regal ornaments, surrounded by broken sceptres, shattered crowns, and ruined thrones. All around, the nations of the world are seen loaded with chains, typified by three animals, the bull, the lion, and the eagle, and by a sublime

genus which represents more particularly the nations of Europe.

“During the two years of the noviciate, no novice is allowed to mix with the world. He is taught the history of the generals of the order, whose portraits are displayed in every house; and the lives of the most celebrated Jesuits from Edmund Auger, Confessor of Henry III. All these young hearts, already corrupted by the most barbarous fanaticism, are filled with a hatred of the world. It is even said, and I repeat the fact with horror, that on Good Friday, after the ceremonies of the passion of Jesus Christ, all the novices strike with poignards the statue of Ganganelli, whom they believe to be bound by chains of fire in the depths of Hell;—another statue of a king of France, and of his minister Choiseul;—and another of Pom- bal, and of his weak sovereign, who suffered the society to be oppressed.

“If you would form an idea of the power of Father Gury over these poor novices, read the history of the ‘Old Man of the Mountains.’ Perhaps, in the Old Man of the Mountains, you would discover some traces of moderation. In the view of the tyrant of *Mont Rouge* every one trembles: he speaks, and all are silent. His prophetic air, his threatening looks, his mysterious words, his severe and imperious tone, raise the spirits of his novices to such a pitch that they would reduce the world to ashes to secure the merit of a rare obedience.”

An English translation of this curious work has lately appeared, which seems, on the slight view we have had of it, to be respectably executed.

ART. VI.—*The Lives of the Right Hon. Francis North, Baron Guildford, the Hon. Sir Dudley North, and of the Hon. and Rev. Dr. John North.* By the Hon. Roger North. With Notes and Illustrations. 3 Vols. 8vo. London, 1826.

THE first two of these Lives are republications of very interesting Memoirs, well known and deservedly popular. The third is the life of Dr. John North, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Clerk of the Closet to King Charles II. The whole family were of a school of politicians and reasoners, which we cannot better describe than by calling it the Eldon school by anticipation, over which, however, as it now exists, they had one advantage in the spirit of the

times allowing them to do openly, and with a sort of eclat, what public opinion will now only suffer to be covertly aimed at by indirect courses and plausible speeches.

It is rather curious that Dr. North prognosticated, even in those days, that evil was to come from Socinianism; and he had it in his heart, or, at least, in his pocket-book, as appears by the following extracts, to extinguish heresy in its infancy. It is a consolation to posterity to reflect that he never summoned courage to carry his benevolent intentions into effect.

“It hath fallen out, that one of his pocket-books, in 8vo., containing some of his extemporaneous thoughts upon various subjects, out of all order, some with ink, but most with red chalk, or black lead, clapped down there on a sudden, lay out of the way, and escaped this general conflagration. And, however I am suspended from communicating these notes in any way, (for such extemporaneous scraps must needs carry many defects,) I shall, nevertheless, give a short account of the chief of them, and thereby demonstrate the tendency of his designs and studies.

“The subjects may be ranged under these general heads: 1, Divinity; 2, Criticism; 3, Philosophy; 4, Politics. As to the first, it appears the Doctor was prepared to batter the Atheists, and then the Arians and Socinians. After having laid open their strengths, he meant to attack them with their own arms, (as they pretend,) right reason. And in order to this, he hints somewhat of the reason of the Christian religion, and the holy sacraments of it; and finally to support the authority of the Holy Scripture; which done, he thought there would be an end of Socinianism. There are some remarkable touches concerning Arminius and Calvin. He is manifestly of opinion with the former, but looks upon the other, with respect to ignorant men, to be more politic, and thereby, in some respects, fitter to maintain religion in them, because more suited to their capacity. But that is referred to art and not to truth, and ought to be ranked with the *piæ fraudes* or holy cheats; which seems no good character of Presbytery. It hath been known that the worst of heresies have been popular. There are some remarks upon the Roman Catholics and Latitudinarians, but not so copious as upon other heads.”

“In Christian theology he had a full intention to publish a thorough confutation of the Socinians; and some shrewd

touches that way were found in the note-book which by chance escaped the fire. I have heard him speak much of the importance of *that controversy*; and he was so far a prophet as to declare he thought *that* heresy would soon break out and insult Christianity itself. I do not remember he discovered any disposition to attack the Papists or sectaries, though he had considered them well; but he might think there were labourers enough at that oar."

"And he had a dread lest this little note-book, of which I have given an account, might happen to stray and fall into unknown persons' hands, who possibly might misconstrue his meaning. In contemplation of which contingent, he wrote upon it this pleasant imprecation: 'I beshrew his heart, that gathers my opinion from any thing he finds wrote here.'"

ART. VII.—*An Historical View of the Plea of Tradition as maintained by the Church of Rome.* By George Miller, D. D. 8vo. London.

THIS tract arises out of that controversy between the Catholic and Protestant Churches into which the discussion of the political questions between them has, as we think, most unfortunately and injuriously deviated. Dr. Miller's design of investigating the plea of tradition in favour of doctrines and practices, as a question of history, is one which at any other time would be felt by all to be useful and interesting. At present, it is too obviously directed towards increasing the current of popular odium against a class of persons labouring under proscription for opinions' sake; and, little disposed as we must be to view with any sort of favour the doctrines or discipline of the Roman Church, we cannot say that, considering the temporal injustice dealt out to its adherents, we are inclined to view controversial attacks as likely to do much good either to friends or enemies.

Dr. Miller's book, however, will have its value, and we extract his summary of the history of the argument drawn from tradition, which we believe to be in the main correct:

"Such appears to have been the history of that tradition which is now maintained by Roman Catholics in Ireland, as indispensably necessary to the just interpretation of the sacred writings. Apparently unknown to the apostolic fathers, who might naturally be supposed

to have been inclined to announce their possession of a deposit so important to the church and so creditable to themselves, it is discovered first among the *Gnostic* heretics, who in the affectation of a superior knowledge of divine things had corrupted the simplicity of the gospel with many inventions, which required some other sanction than the authority of the Scriptures. It was then adopted from *them* by two Fathers of the Church, (Irenæus and Tertullian,) but only to repel the arguments of those who had first pleaded against the Scriptures a spurious tradition, and had then so falsified the records of Christianity as to embarrass any inference from their genuine communications. When this use had been made of the argument, it seems to have been felt that such an appeal was incongruous and unnecessary, for it was immediately abandoned by the church; nor does it appear to have been resumed in the great controversy of *Arianism* by either party for the support of their tenets. After an interruption of almost two centuries and a half among the western Christians, and in Greece of the much longer period of more than five centuries and a half, we again find tradition pleaded as an authority; but in each case for a *practice*, not for a *doctrine*; each practice also plainly condemned by the written word. The argument was then abandoned, and each plea disowned by one of the two churches, until the very crisis of the Reformation, when it was once more brought forward to oppose the appeal which the Reformers had made to the Scriptures; and as these reformers had objected to doctrines, not less than to practices, the tradition of the church was then, for the first time, pleaded in favour of doctrines. Even then, however, in the very agony of the papal power, it was not pleaded that the Scripture was not intelligible without the aid of tradition, the latter being represented only as entitled to equal reverence, and not as a superior and controlling authority for divine truth. This last step was taken about the close of the sixteenth century, by Cardinal Bellarmine, who in his too candid defence of the Church of Rome, did not hesitate to maintain that the gospel without unwritten tradition is an empty name, or words without sense. The Roman Catholics of Ireland, imitating the boldness of the Cardinal, have declared that the Scriptures are not intelligible without the aid of tradition."

OBITUARY.

M. LAPLACE.

THIS celebrated geometrician was at the period of his death entering his seventy-ninth year. He was the son of a gardener, and was born at Beaumont-en-Auge, near Pont l'Evêque, on the 27th March, 1749. After having for some time studied mathematics in the military school of that town, he went to Paris, where his talents obtained him some powerful patrons. He succeeded Bezout as inspector of the royal artillery corps, became a member of the Academy of Sciences, and subsequently of the Institute, and of the Board of Longitude. He filled no public situation before the 18th Brumaire, at which period he was nominated *Ministre de l'Intérieur*; but he retained this post only six weeks, being then called to the senate. In 1814, he was made a member of the *Chambre des Pairs*. We abstain from any remarks on his political life, for M. Laplace was not a political character, and he would never have fixed public attention, but from his previous renown. We shall, therefore, consider him only as a philosopher, and shall give a brief summary of those labours which have placed him first in the rank of those of whom France has reason to be proud.

In 1796, appeared the *Exposition of the Mundane System*, a celebrated work, which, even in a literary point of view, is a masterpiece, for its elegant simplicity of style, and for the clearness with which the author has given the most abstruse demonstrations. Among the number of new and important results which this book contains, we must remark especially the explanation of the courses of Saturn and Jupiter. These two planets, in fact, present so singular an inequality in their motion, that some astronomers have founded upon it an objection to the theory of attraction, while others, in attempting to explain it by that theory, have considered themselves under the necessity of admitting the existence of a celestial body, invisible, yet of vast dimensions, whose influence had the power of causing an irregularity in the motion of the two planets. It is true that since the epoch of this conjecture, Herschel has discovered the planet which bears his name, but the distance of this body renders it incapable of producing such a perturbation; and it was reserved for M. Laplace to shew, by a more rigorous calculation of the mutual effects of the attraction of Jupiter and Saturn, that the remarkable inequality observable in their movements, far from furnishing an

objection to the theory of attraction, presents, on the contrary, a striking confirmation of its truth.

Every body is aware of the precision with which astronomers can now determine the elevation of the tides, for any distant period whatever, and every body is aware, too, that we are indebted to M. Laplace for this admirable acquisition. Newton had demonstrated, it is true, although rather vaguely, that the phenomenon of the tides is the result of the attraction of the moon; but he furnished no means of calculating exactly to what height the tides would rise in every given position of the planets. M. Laplace, by reducing to calculation the influence of the planets on the sea, has rendered the world a service analogous to that of D'Alembert, relative to the calculation of the precession of the equinoxes. In both cases, the question related to a blank left by Newton, which genius alone could supply.

The science of physics is not less indebted than astronomy to M. Laplace; he has, in particular, enriched it with one important truth: we allude to the pains which he has taken to demonstrate, that the particles of bodies affect each other, by means of forces different from those which govern the attraction of large masses,—of forces to which the law of attraction, varying inversely as the squares of the distance, is inapplicable. The human mind has so strong a tendency to generalize ideas—the adoption of a single principle is so favourable to the natural indolence of the mind, that it has ever been the fate of the greatest discoverers to lead to error, by being exaggerated. Thus the followers of Descartes were desirous of explaining every thing by a single principle of action, *impact*. At a later period, Newton demonstrated that, in addition to that unquestionable force, it was impossible not to allow the existence of another, viz. *attraction*, the influence of which acts in the inverse ratio of the square of the distance, and from that period this was the only accepted theory. M. Laplace opened a new way, by demonstrating that there are powers which decrease much more rapidly than attraction, and so much so, as to become insensible at any assignable distance. The most evident of these forces is the molecular attraction; and the true theory of capillary attraction, the credit of which is due entirely to M. Laplace, is an application of his ideas upon this subject.

M. Laplace had the the honour, while yet very young, of sharing the labours of

Lavoisier. It is known, for example, that he concurred with the illustrious Cherint in the invention of a calorimeter, the use of which, it is true, is now abandoned, but which for a long time offered the only means of attaining the end to which it was destined.

It would be unjust in speaking of the labours of M. Laplace to say nothing of the calculation of probabilities; for if he may be justly reproached with having endeavoured to reduce to his system questions which no calculation can touch, it must not be denied that he arrived at the solution of many problems of great importance.

We shall conclude this notice with hinting at a proposition, made a short time since to the Académie des Sciences, by M. Laplace, and which may be regarded as the expression of his last solicitude for the progress of science. This illustrious old man desired that documents should be prepared for the purpose of supplying posterity with information, the want of which has been so severely felt by the learned of the present day, by determining, as correctly as the actual state of knowledge will allow, the principal elements of the constitution of the terrestrial globe. The academy took this request into consideration, and decided that a preparatory commission should be nominated for that purpose. This commission has not yet been appointed. Would it not be paying a just and appropriate tribute to the memory of Laplace, to hasten the execution of this proposition?—[*Translated from Le Globe.*]

Mrs. ROGERS.

March 8, at the Glebe-House, *Sproughton*, in the county of *Suffolk*, at an advanced period of life, and most highly and deservedly lamented, Mrs. ELIZABETH ROGERS, the beloved wife of the Rev. GEORGE ROGERS, A. M., Rector of that parish, whose mild and unassuming manners will long render her memory esteemed by her family and friends, as well as by every one with whom she was personally acquainted.

In every relation of life, the whole course of this venerable person was truly exemplary, inasmuch as she exhibited a bright pattern of conjugal affection, parental love, and benevolence of heart; whilst her death was in perfect unison, being marked by that placid serenity which is the sure and certain criterion of the expiring Christian.

'Tis past: dear venerable shade, farewell!
Thy blameless life, thy peaceful death
shall tell.

Clear to the last thy setting orb has run,
Pure, bright and healthy, like a frosty
sun;
And late old age, with hand indulgent,
shed
Its mildest winter on thy favoured head.
For heaven prolong'd her life to spread
its praise,
And bless'd her with a patriarch's length
of days:
The truest praise was hers, a cheerful
heart,
Prone to enjoy, and ready to impart;
An Israelite indeed, and free from guile,
She shewed that piety and age could
smile.
Religion had her heart, her cares, her
voice;
'Twas her last refuge, as her earliest
choice.
Matur'd at length for some more perfect
scene,
Her hopes all bright, her prospects all
serene;
Each part of life sustain'd with equal
worth,
And not a wish left unfulfill'd on earth;
Like a tir'd traveller with sleep oppress'd,
Within her children's arms she dropp'd
to rest.
Farewell! thy cherish'd image, ever dear,
Shall many a heart with pious love re-
vere.

Her remains were interred in the chancel of the church of *Sproughton*, where, on a flat stone, is the following inscription to her memory:

Hic jacet quicquid mortale est
ELIZABETHÆ, charissimæ Uxoris,
et nunquam satis deflendæ,
Viri Reverendi GEORGI ROGERS, A. M.,
hujusce Ecclesiæ Rectoris,
Quæ ex hac vitâ migravit
8 Id Mensis Martii
Anno Christi MDCCCXXVII.
et Ætatis suæ LXXXII.
In Memoriam tam cari Capitris
Hoc posuit Marmor
Mœrens et orbatus MARITUS.
I. F.

Mrs. ANNA CHALDECOT.

April 2, at *Chichester*, in the 67th year of her age, sincerely lamented by numerous and respectable friends, ANNA, second daughter of the late JOHN CHALDECOT, Esq., Banker, of that city. She was a member of the Unitarian congregation under the charge of Mr. Fullagar, and was endeared to her friends by the many excellences of her character.

INTELLIGENCE.

Corporation and Test Acts.

WE are happy to be able to congratulate our readers on the energy and activity which have at length manifested themselves among the various denominations of Dissenters on this important object. More unanimity has seldom been evinced than at the meetings which have taken place; and the wonder has only been, with all present, how men, so feeling on such a subject, have kept themselves, or been kept, so long quiet by doubts and hesitations and mistrusts, which discussion dissipates in a moment.

In consequence of energetic remonstrances sent both by the Board of Congregational (or Independent) Ministers and by the Unitarian Association to the Society of Deputies, urging them to some consideration of the important duties which they were established to perform, an aggregate meeting was requested by the Committee of that Society, with deputations from the General Body of Ministers of the Three Denominations, from the separate Body of the Congregational Board, from the Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty, and from the Unitarian Association, for the purpose of discussing in common the course to be pursued.

March 28, 1827.

The different Societies having acceded to the proposal, this Meeting accordingly took place, and was attended by the following gentlemen :

Committee of the Deputies,	
W. Smith, Esq., M. P.	Mr. Rutt
Mr. Collins	Mr. R. Taylor
Mr. Favell	Mr. Waymouth
Mr. Hale	Mr. Wilks
Mr. Hanbury	Mr. Wood
Mr. Jackson	Mr. Yallowley
Mr. Medley	Mr. Yockney.

From the General Body of Ministers,	
Rev. Mr. Asplaud	Rev. Dr. Cox
Dr. Rees	Mr. Coates,
Dr. Winter	

From the Congregational Board,	
Rev. Mr. Blackburne	Rev. Mr. Yockney
Mr. Orme	Mr. Harper.

From the Protestant Society,	
Mr. Steven	Mr. Walker
Mr. Wilks, their Secretary (attending also as a Deputy).	

From the Unitarian Association,

Mr. Christie	Mr. Bowring
Mr. Richmond	Mr. Edgar Taylor.

Mr. W. SMITH, being called to the Chair, addressed the Meeting at considerable length, on the difficulties which he, and many zealous friends of their cause, felt as to the expediency of agitating the question. This Meeting, he stated, was not called at the instance of the Deputies, but from the applications of other bodies, which would probably communicate their feeling on the subject. For his own part, he was inclined to believe that the present *was* a favourable moment for preferring their claims.

Mr. FAVELL, at some length, expressed his opinion that they could no longer delay their application.

The Resolutions of the Congregational Board of Ministers were then read. They strongly urged that no further delay should take place.

Mr. BOWRING, as a Delegate of the Unitarian Association, communicated the earnest feeling of that body on the subject, as expressed in the three resolutions which he read. The first is the same as was afterwards adopted by the Meeting. The second declared the opinion of the Association, that it was expedient to convene a public meeting, requesting the presence at it of distinguished friends of Liberty. The third expressed the strong feeling of the Association that their claims should be urged only on the broad ground of denying the right or policy of the magistrate's making religious opinion or profession the ground or pretence of civil preference or exclusion.

Mr. ASPLAND stated, on behalf of the body of Ministers, *their* decided and unanimous feeling, that longer delay was alike injurious to their cause, and inconsistent with their character and professions.

Mr. WILKS, on the part of himself and his co-delegates, stated, that the Protestant Society also felt the necessity of taking active measures, and were convinced that they could no longer be delayed.

The Rev. Mr. YOCKNEY (as a Congregational Minister) expressed, in energetic language, the feeling of his brethren on the subject, and their earnest desire to come forward on the broadest grounds.

There was, no doubt, some difference of opinion among Dissenters, but he believed it to have been much magnified, and he was desirous of putting the matter to the proof.

Dr. COX expressed the same feeling on the part of the Baptist Ministers. He believed the laity of his denomination did not go quite so far as the majority of the Ministers, but that this was only the consequence of the want of discussion and information.

Mr. BOWRING, to bring the business to some point, moved the first resolution, being the same as that communicated by the Unitarian Association.

Mr. WILKS proposed, but afterwards withdrew, an amendment, confining the application to the relief of Protestant Dissenters from the operation of the Test and Corporation Acts, instead of seeking the total abolition of the test imposed by them.

Mr. BOWRING'S resolution was then carried unanimously.

Mr. CHRISTIE, in pursuance of the feeling of his constituents, moved the expediency of a public meeting, for which, after some discussion, the second resolution, proposed by Mr. Wilks, was substituted.

The third resolution was then proposed and agreed to, and the Deputations were appointed as follows :

Resolved, That in the opinion of this Meeting no time should be lost in bringing the subject of the Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts before Parliament; and that for this purpose every measure should be adopted for securing the support and co-operation of the Members of the Legislature.

Resolved, That to promote such object, and to arrange the best mode in which it may be conducted, it is desirable to obtain an early interview between several distinguished Members of both Houses of Parliament and a Deputation from this Meeting; and that the Chairman be requested to invite and arrange that interview on the earliest convenient day.

Resolved, That the Deputation be composed of the following gentlemen, taken from each Body represented at this Conference; and that as soon as the proposed interview has occurred, another Conference be appointed, at which some practical determination may be adopted; and that, in the mean time, each of the Bodies here represented be recommended to take all the measures they may deem prudent, to prepare those Bodies for active co-operation in the application proposed :

Wm. Smith, Esq., M. P.	}	Presbyterian.
Mr. Busk		
Mr. Richard Taylor		
Mr. Favell	}	Independent.
Dr. Brown		
Mr. Waymouth	}	Baptist.
Mr. Medley		
Rev. Mr. Aspland	}	Presbyterian.
Rev. Dr. Rees		
Dr. Winter	}	Independent.
Dr. Smith		
Mr. Orme	}	Congregation- al Board.
Mr. Yockney		
Dr. Cox	}	Baptist.
Dr. Newman		
Mr. Christie	}	Unitarian As- sociation.
Mr. Edgar Taylor		
Mr. Bowring		
Mr. Steven	}	Protestant So- ciety.
Mr. Walker		
Mr. Wilks		

April 6th.

The Deputations assembled at Henderson's Hotel, Palace Yard, to confer with Members of Parliament, in pursuance of the above proceedings. Owing to an important political meeting on the same day, several Members were prevented attending. The Deputations met previously to the hour at which the Members of Parliament were expected.

Mr. SMITH, being called to the Chair, entered into an explanation of the reasons which had induced him to direct a postscript to be added to the circular convening the Meeting, the effect of which was to solicit, that "as considerable doubts were entertained on the point of the expediency of proceeding at the present moment, it was recommended that no further steps should be taken before that Meeting, which might tend to preclude a free discussion on that head." He had, on more mature consideration, and consultation with several of their warmest friends, felt great doubts whether any good could result from an agitation of the question at this time. He thought, too, that it was not a proper course to solicit the attendance and advice of the Members of Parliament who were expected, and to come with an announcement to them, that whatever their opinions might be, it was determined to act on our own.

Mr. BOWRING protested against this meeting proceeding to any such discussion. They had already fully considered the question, and had determined to go on, and they were only a delegation, with

instructions to consult as to the best mode of doing what it was determined should be done.

At this period of the discussion Lord HOLLAND and several Members of the House of Commons entered. There were present

Lord Holland	Mr. John Smith
Lord Nugent	Hon. R. Smith
Mr. Spring Rice	Alderman Wood
Lord John Russell	Mr. Easthope
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Warburton.

A letter was read from the Marquis of LANSDOWNE, expressing his best wishes and desires in the cause of Civil and Religious Liberty.

Mr. FAVELL rose to express his concurrence in opinion with Mr. Bowring, that they were not there to discuss over again what had already been unanimously determined upon. He added his conviction, that it was expedient immediately to prosecute their claims, not so much in the expectation of immediate success, (though this was a very fair one,) as to bring the matter forward, to discuss it over and over again, and, he trusted, finally to prevail.

Mr. WILKS concurred entirely with Mr. Favell and Mr. Bowring as to the object of their meeting. He stated his perfect conviction, that it was absolutely impossible not to prosecute their claims at once. He had received letters from all quarters urgently pressing them to go forward, and it was quite clear that, if they did not choose to press on, others would. They came there to communicate these feelings, and to request the co-operation of their friends in Parliament.

Mr. ASPLAND, on the part of the body of Ministers, expressed their earnest desire and determination to prosecute their claims with vigour. When they reflected on the delay which had taken place, they felt shame and sorrow at what they considered as an absolute neglect of duty, and they wished not to lose a day or an hour in endeavouring to make up for lost time. He was glad of the opportunity of disavowing, on their part, any concurrence in those petitions against the Catholics, which had brought unmerited obloquy upon them. That there was some difference of opinion among such a widely-spread body as the Dissenters, was very likely, and could not be denied; but he spoke in the hearing of his brother ministers, and was confident that it was their wish and desire to seek relief for themselves upon the assertion of the most extended principles of religious liberty. It should be recollected, too, that

though there were some who doubted as to conceding the Catholic Claims, it was not from a refusal to assert the broadest principles (as they thought) of religious liberty, but from a conviction (a mistaken one, of course, he considered it) that the matter in difference with the Catholics was a political one.

Dr. WINTER expressed the same feelings, as did Mr. ORME and Dr. REES. The latter stated, that he had himself been the bearer to Lord Holland and Mr. Smith of petitions from the body of Ministers, praying the repeal of every penal statute restraining religious freedom, and he was quite sure they were still actuated by the same liberal feeling. The Dissenters conceived that the best mode of bringing forward their claims was to petition against the statutes which oppressed them; but they did it on the broad and general ground, leaving it to others to determine to what other bodies, besides their own, those principles would apply.

Mr. YOCKNEY stated the strong conviction of himself and his brethren, that it was become their imperative duty to press forward, and to rest their claims for relief on the only true and broad principle of denying the magistrate's right to interfere with any man on the ground of religious profession. He was anxious for proceeding, not so much from an expectation of immediate success, as to understand their position. If those gentlemen who were so zealous in support of the Catholic cause, deserted the Dissenters, we should then know how to rate the professions of such pretended friends of religious liberty.

Mr. STEVEN concurred with all the other speakers, and was satisfied that they must go forward.

Dr. Cox also was of the same opinion.

Lord HOLLAND expressed his gratification at meeting the Deputations, and at learning that they were determined to bring their grievances before Parliament. It was unnecessary to make professions of his opinions. His exertions were at any and every time at their service. It was for them to determine their time, and it was, he considered, the duty of every member of the Legislature to assist when called, at any moment, in redressing a grievance. He should only claim a discretion as to the mode of agitating the question.

Mr. SPRING RICE very eloquently and energetically expressed his gratification at the course now intended to be pursued by the Dissenters. For himself he had never advocated, and never would

advocate, the cause of Catholic or Protestant, on any other than the broad ground of denying the right of any government to interfere between man and his Creator. If he had applied only for the removal of the Catholic penal laws, it was because they were *all* that oppressed Ireland. But the principle was what he contended for. He could pledge all his friends from Ireland who vote in favour of the Catholics, to do exactly as much for the Dissenters; and from the most frequent and intimate intercourse with the Catholics themselves, he could assure the meeting, that the constant and unvaried expression of their opinion, clergy as well as laity, was for asserting the absolute and broadest principles of freedom in the expression and enjoyment of religious opinion. He might add, further, that it was only by the prevailing advice and persuasion of their friends in Parliament (how wisely he would not say), that their petitions had not of late always gone for the repeal of *every* penal law and disability in matters of religion. They were most ready and desirous to place their applications on the broadest possible basis. He was rejoiced to hear the determination of the Meeting, and his most cordial and zealous exertions were at their service.

Mr. MARSHALL stated, that from his friends and connexions in Yorkshire, and indeed from all quarters, he was convinced that it was highly desirable immediately to proceed.

Mr. JOHN SMITH strongly urged the same views.

Lord NUGENT also fully concurred. On the subject of the Catholics he might be allowed to add, that he was authorized to say that they were willing and anxious not to confine their application to relief for themselves, but to stand upon the widest principles of religious liberty, and concur with any who were desirous to effect the repeal of every penal statute or disability.

Mr. W. SMITH suggested, that as the meeting was so unanimous in its feeling, they might request Lord J. Russell to undertake their cause; and he perhaps would give them *his* opinion as to the expediency of the present time for agitating the question.

Lord J. RUSSELL had no hesitation in expressing his decided opinion that the present time was a favourable and suitable one. His exertions were at the service of the Dissenters, and, whenever called on, he would cheerfully do his utmost.

The Members of Parliament having retired, it was unanimously resolved, that Lord J. Russell be requested to move the question in Parliament and to give notice accordingly, and that the general Deputations do meet again on Monday the 9th of April.

On the same evening,

Lord JOHN RUSSELL gave notice to the House of Commons, that he should on the 31st of May (afterwards altered to the 7th of June) make his motion on the subject of the Test and Corporation Acts.

Previous to this Meeting, the Committee of the Protestant Society printed and circulated resolutions to which it had agreed on the 26th of March, (before the first meeting of the Associated Deputations,) detailing historically and argumentatively the history of the laws affecting the Dissenters and their present claims, resolving on immediately prosecuting an application for the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts, and offering to concur with the other societies in any measures they might suggest that could lead to success.

April 9th.

The Associated Deputations met at the King's Head in the Poultry, when the Secretary, Mr. Winter, stated that he had just received an intimation from the Secretary of the Protestant Society, that its Committee had met on the evening of the 6th of April, after the Meeting in Palace Yard, and had determined to prepare their petitions and prosecute their exertions distinctly, and not in association with the united Committees of Deputations as one body. Mr. Wilks and Mr. Steven afterwards personally stated and explained their views of the eligibility of this determination. Considerable discussion took place, but we had rather forbear to enter upon it. We are sorry that the Protestant Society should have thought it advisable or prudent to withdraw from an united prosecution of a common object, where so much unanimity had prevailed; but it is not for us to dictate to its members either as to the substance or manner of its proceedings; and we can only express our ardent hope that they will feel the separation as imposing on them a still more powerful reason for activity, in order to justify by the result a course which to many has appeared at any rate of doubtful policy.

It was then resolved, that Mr. John Smith be requested to second Lord J. Russell's motion. That an united Com-

mittee be formed, as in 1786, comprising the Committee of the Deputies and six members from each London body or Society desirous of co-operating, with power to add to its numbers; such Committee to be called "The Committee appointed for conducting the Application to Parliament for the Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts." That such Committee should conduct all proceedings proper to be taken for promoting the object in view. That the different Societies be requested to name their six Deputies, and that then the aggregate Committee be summoned. And, that these resolutions should be sent to the Body of Ministers, the Protestant Society, the Unitarian Association, the Wesleyan Methodists, the Quakers, the Presbytery of the Scotch Churches in London, and the Associate Presbytery of Seceders.

The united Committee will proceed with all activity on the duties entrusted to them, and will probably communicate to congregations the form of a petition which they may recommend. It is desirable that as many petitions should be sent up as can be procured, previous to the motion, and the most effectual course will be to commit them to the Members of Parliament connected with the districts from which they come, with a request of their support.

April 10th.

At the Annual Meeting of the Dissenting Ministers of London and the vicinity of the Three Denominations, several resolutions were passed expressive of their opinion on the Corporation and Test Acts, and declaratory of their determination to petition for their repeal. The following ministers were appointed as a deputation to unite with the Committee of Deputies, &c., in the formation of a General Committee:—Mr. Aspland, Dr. Rees, Dr. Winter, Dr. Humphrys, Dr. Newman, Dr. Cox, and Mr. Coates, the Secretary of the body.

April 12th.

The Unitarian Association met and appointed as their delegates to the united Committee,

Mr. Christie	Mr. Edgar Taylor
Mr. Bowring	Mr. John Fisher
Mr. Hornby	Mr. John Watson.

And they agreed on the form of a petition to be submitted to the united Committee, as one which, with their approbation, would be recommended by the Association to the congregations in its connexion.

April 20th.

The United Committee met at the King's Head in the Poultry. Mr. William Smith was requested to act as its permanent Chairman. The junction of the Body of Ministers and of the Unitarian Association was officially announced, and communications were reported from the other bodies who had been invited to co-operate with them. A Sub-Committee was appointed, consisting, with the Chairman, of two members of each of the delegations, to prepare and publish a statement of the case of Protestant Dissenters as to the Corporation and Test Acts, and to draw up a circular letter with the form of a petition, to be distributed throughout the country. We rejoice that this Committee is now in motion, and we expect that by the time our number is in the hands of our readers, they will have taken some decisive steps to promote the great object for which they are associated.

Petitions.

WHERE congregations have not prepared their petitions in their own forms, the following (which has been approved by the Committee of the Unitarian Association) may serve as a guide; of course, with any variations which appear desirable.

Petitions should be in the hands of members of parliament by about the 1st of June. Where an opportunity serves of intrusting them to the members connected with the district, it should by all means be embraced. If no other means offer for presentment, they may be sent to the Association rooms, No. 3, Walbrook Buildings.—It is not thought necessary to present petitions, at present, to the House of Lords.

To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of the undersigned, being Protestant Dissenters, assembling for religious worship at the chapel (or meeting-house) in Street, in

SHEWETH,

That by the operation of certain acts, passed in the reign of King Charles the Second, and commonly called the Corporation and Test Acts, all persons are excluded, under heavy penalties, from the magistracy, from corporations, and from every place of trust or command under his Majesty, who shall not qualify themselves by professing their confor-

mity with the Church of England, so far as to receive the sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to its usages.

That, in the exercise of the same right of private judgment, and with the same spirit of reformation, on which the founders of the Church of England rested their separation from that of Rome, your petitioners openly declare their Dissent from the Doctrines, Discipline, and Ritual of the Church now established by law, and cannot, therefore, offer that conformity which is required of them, and in default of which they are by law excluded from the common rights and honours of citizenship in a free country.

That, in order to avert the evils which would result from the general enforcement of such laws, Indemnity Acts have been, from year to year, passed; but your petitioners see, in such expedients, only a confirmation of the obnoxious principle of exclusion. Those Acts treat as matter of offence what your petitioners consider as the inalienable right and undoubted duty of an accountable being. They are, moreover, in their legal operation, imperfect;—they do not profess to shelter the conscientious;—they are founded on the assumption,—in itself unauthorized and untrue,—of mere inadvertent omission, and of consequent intention to conform within the period allowed;—they leave in the hands of every individual the power of defeating the election of any Dissenter to offices which he may be called upon and is well qualified to fill;—and finally, they, year by year, admit and confirm the principle, alike oppressive and impolitic, by which one branch of the community is shut out from the general blessings of good government, and subjected to degradation which no conduct on their part has merited.

That it is, in the judgment of your petitioners, incumbent on those who seek the continuance of laws of exclusion and disability, to prove, at every moment, their necessity, and the demerits of those who are the subjects of them; and your petitioners, therefore, do not feel themselves called upon to tender any vindication of their conduct in society, still less of their religious principles, for which they hold themselves responsible to no earthly judge.

Claiming, as their right and duty, to exercise, in common with all their fellow-men, their free and unfettered judgment in matters of religion, your petitioners deem the assumption of authority, whether to punish or to tolerate

another in the performance of his religious duties, as an encouragement to insincerity, an unwarrantable pretence to infallibility, a cruel injustice to individuals, a source of weakness and division in the state, and, finally, a grievous insult and injury to religion itself; and more especially they deem the connexion of a solemn religious ordinance with the qualification for secular office a profanation, against which, as Christians, they are bound, on all occasions, to protest.

Your petitioners, therefore, humbly and earnestly pray your honourable House to take these laws into your early consideration, and to remove the grievances which result from them;—to relieve this country from the reproach, which belongs to her alone, of profaning the holy ordinances of Christianity for secular ends;—and to declare and act, in all things, upon those great principles of Religious Liberty which have been recognized in so many other countries, and which, as your petitioners believe, are essential to the peace, and virtue, and happiness of mankind.

And your petitioners shall ever pray,
&c.

Change of Ministry.

It is not a little singular that the apparent triumph of bigotry and intolerance, recorded in our last number, should be so soon followed by the total discomfiture of the whole party which directed it, and an avowal of the incompetence of their principles to be the foundation of any government in this country. The extent to which the result of this reaction will be favourable to more liberal views is necessarily, while we write, uncertain; but one thing at least is plain, that the change must be productive of great good.

In France, at the same moment, public opinion has achieved a noble triumph; of the more importance to her, because it is the first in which principle and justice have fairly fought and won a battle through regular and constitutional means. The law enslaving the Press has, after a long and obstinate attempt to carry it through the Chambers, been precipitately withdrawn by those who sent it; and it is difficult to conceive either that such an attempt can be renewed, or that the triumph of the principle of resistance to oppression can end there. It will be a happy day for France when she is satisfied that her constitutional checks upon power sympathize

with the interests of the people, and can be safely relied on as the guardians of well regulated and defined liberty.

Somerset, Gloucester and Wilts Unitarian Association Anniversary.

THE Fifth Half-yearly General Meeting of the Somerset, Gloucester and Wilts Unitarian Missionary Association, was held at Marshfield, on Friday, April 13, when the Rev. Robert Cree, of Preston, delivered two admirable discourses to numerous and attentive audiences; in the morning, *On the Connexion of Unitarian Christianity with the Improvement and Happiness of Man* (from Eph. iv. 5, 6); and in the evening, *On the Proper Use of our Talents* (from 1 Tim. vi. 17—19, and Luke xii. last part of ver. 48). Mr. Martin, the Minister of the Congregation, read the hymns; and the devotional part of the services was conducted, in the morning, by the Rev. Theophilus Brown; and in the evening, by the Rev. Richard Wright.

Friends were present from Calne, Ashwick, Trowbridge, Bath, and Nailsworth, who afterwards, to the number of forty-two, including females, partook of an economical dinner at the Codrington Arms. The Rev. R. Wright was in the Chair, and to him the company were much indebted for his able and eloquent addresses. On the removal of the cloth the accustomed hymn of thanks was sung. In the course of the afternoon the Secretary read an interesting report of the proceedings of the Committee since the last meeting, and several appropriate toasts were given. It was unanimously resolved to omit the word "Missionary" in the title, and henceforth to call it the "Somerset, Gloucester and Wilts Unitarian Association." S. M.

Somerset and Dorset Unitarian Association.

THE Sixteenth Half-yearly Meeting of this Society was held at Bridgewater, on Good Friday, April 13, 1827. The devotional services were performed by the Rev. Dr. Davies, and the Rev. Mr. Walker delivered a discourse from Gal. iv. 18: "*It is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing.*" By a comparison of the distinguishing truths of Unitarianism with the opinions of our Christian brethren, it was fully shewn that our principles deserve and imperatively demand, from those who hold

them, a warm and active zeal in their diffusion. The preacher then proceeded beautifully, and in the very spirit of Christian benevolence, to shew the manner in which zeal should express itself,—mildly, though earnestly, striving, not to minister to vanity by a display of intellectual superiority, or by increasing the number of a sect, but to diffuse truth and its sacred influences for the sake of the virtue and happiness of our brethren.

The meeting for business was held at the close of the morning service, when it was resolved,

That a *cheap* edition of Dr. Channing's sermon, reviewed in the last Repository, be printed.

That Mr. Aspland be solicited to allow the Society to reprint his valuable remarks on the support which Unitarian principles afford at the hour of death, contained in an Appendix to his Sermon on the Death of Mr. Drover.

That the next Half-yearly meeting of this Society be held at Dorchester, on Wednesday, 19th of September, and that the Rev. W. Steil Brown be requested to preach.

The members and friends of the Society dined together; James Pyke, Esq., in the chair. The Society had to lament the absence of one of its most active and useful members, the Rev. G. B. Wawne, of Bridport; and on the expression of its sympathy with that gentleman in his present dangerous illness, Dr. Davies pronounced a well-merited eulogium upon his enlightened zeal, exalted piety, Christian meekness, and persuasive gentleness of manner; — "the rare and beautiful union of Christian virtues which adorn his character." The truth of the description was felt by all present.* Among the subjects introduced at the meeting, was the motion of Lord J. Russell on the Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts, and it was strongly urged upon the gentlemen present, to send petitions to Parliament upon the subject from their respective congregations.

In the evening the devotional services were conducted by W. S. Brown; and an eloquent and impressive sermon was preached by the Rev. Edward Whitfield, of Ilminster, from 1 Peter ii. 21.

W. S. BROWN.

* This excellent man, we regret to say, died on the 18th of April. Further particulars in our next. Ed.

*Unitarian District Association,
Battle.*

THE Fourth Anniversary of this Society was held on Good Friday. Tea was provided in the Chapel by the young people of the congregation, when between two and three hundred persons of different persuasions sat down to a social entertainment. The Rev. B. Mardon, A. M., was called to the Chair. The Chairman feelingly alluded to the late serious illness which it had pleased Divine Providence to inflict upon their respected pastor, and congratulated the congregation on his restoration to health and renewed efforts in the cause of pure and rational religion. Mr. Taplin then addressed the Meeting, adverting, in the language of respect and gratitude, to the time of his predecessor, the Rev. W. Vidler, by whom the foundation of the cause in that place was laid. Mr. T. then called upon the young to emulate the spirit of their fathers, and to venerate as sacred the inheritance which they had received; he expatiated at considerable length on the necessity of union and co-operation in the diffusion of Unitarian Christianity, which he contended was allied to knowledge and freedom. Mr. T. was followed by Messrs. Harding, Hughes, Badcock, Edwards and others. The meeting was attended by two French gentlemen of distinction. The Count de Nezas begged to express for himself and his friend the pleasure they had derived from the Unitarian Society, where they had seen a true specimen of old English hospitality, and a happy proof of the rational and liberal views of Unitarian principles.

The Committee of the congregation think this a favourable opportunity of stating, that since their case appeared in Vol XXI. p. 634 of the Old Series of the Monthly Repository, they have received but three subscriptions towards the liquidation of the Chapel debt, viz. the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, £25; Finsbury Fellowship Fund, £10; Hackney Fellowship Fund, £5. They again earnestly solicit the assistance of the Unitarian public, and hope that their appeal will not be in vain. Battle is an important situation for the diffusion of Unitarian Christianity, and it is to be hoped that our brethren in different parts of the country will not allow its success to be impeded by a debt of £160.

Subscriptions will be thankfully received by the Rev. W. J. Fox, Dalston;

Mr. G. Smallfield, Homerton; Mr. D. Eaton, 187, High Holborn; and by the Rev. James Taplin, Battle.

Battle, April 16, 1827.

NOTICES.

The next Annual Meeting of the Association of the adjacent Unitarian Congregations, in the Counties of Salop, Cheshire, and Stafford, will be held at *Whitchurch*, on the Wednesday in the Whitsun-week. The Rev. H. Hutton, of Birmingham, is expected to preach on the occasion.

THE Annual Assembly of the General Baptists will be held at the Worship Street Meeting-house, London, on Whittuesday, June 5th. The Rev. W. CHINNOCK, of Billingshurst, is expected to preach. Service will commence at 11 o'clock.

The Rev. Samuel Martin, of Marshfield, has accepted an unanimous invitation from the General Baptist Congregation at Trowbridge, to become their minister; to which place he will remove at Michaelmas next.

Another minister is, therefore, wanted for Marshfield.

THE Rev. B. MARDON, M. A., has accepted the invitation of the Unitarian Congregation at Maidstone to be their Minister, in the room of the Rev. G. Kenrick, who has resigned.

SCOTLAND.

Meeting of the Edinburgh Continental Society, held in the Assembly Room in that City on the 20th of March.

THE CHAIRMAN stated that the object of the Society was to convert the Continental Catholics, Socinians, Arians, Mologists and Rationalists, to the doctrines of the gospel. One portion of the Continent was involved in worse than heathen darkness and superstition, and the other in scepticism and irreligion. He had heard one of the most eminent of the Socinian preachers in London state, that as the heroes of antiquity were venerated for their virtues, so Christ was glorified in consequence of his excellent character.

Dr. GORDON read the report, which characterized Arians and Socinians as merely nominal Christians, who were in the region of the shadow of death, in deplorable ignorance of divine things, in-

volved in all the darkness of Paganism, nay, were in a still more lamentable, as they were in a more hopeless, condition, being led by the pride of a false philosophy to imagine that they were in a state of peace and safety, whilst they rejected all the truths which were essential to ensure salvation. The state of Geneva was particularly deplorable. The Genevese Pastors were the determined opponents of the gospel, and their people were destitute of all religion and godliness. The Sabbath was shockingly desecrated. A small remnant, however, was left, and they had good hopes of imparting the divine light which Scotland had received from Geneva, once the Zion of truth and holiness. Scotland owed a debt of gratitude which she should endeavour to repay.

Rev. Mr. MEJANEL, from Paris, lamented the defections from the true faith, and represented the eminent success which had attended his ministerial labours in the South of France. Hundreds implored him with tears in their eyes to preach longer to them, and he preached to large assemblies in the open air and in drenching rain. The fields were white to harvest, and labourers only were wanted. The *Edinburgh Continental Society* had been chiefly instrumental in turning many to righteousness.

Dr. JAMIESON denounced in strong terms the Roman Catholics, and was sure that religion never would flourish till their debasing system was annihilated.

Mr. HALDANE in bitter terms condemned the Catholics, and, amongst other railing accusations, stated that they had excluded from the Decalogue the second commandment. He severely condemned Socinians and Arians, and represented them as the children of hell, the allies of Satan. The pastors and people of Geneva were the objects of the most violent invective. They trampled the gospel under their feet, desecrated the Sabbath, and practised iniquity with greediness. At Strasburgh, Haffner had in his Professor's Chair openly ridiculed Christianity.

The Rev. W. J. BAKEWELL said, that he had no intention of speaking when he entered the room, and did not rise for the sake of disturbing the harmony of the meeting. Statements, however, had been made which he knew to be erroneous, and some of which a sense of duty urged him to refute. The Continent of Europe had been represented to be in the most deplorable state of ignorance and error on subjects of religion, and of moral depravity, the consequence of a deadly faith. Catholics and Protes-

tants had been equally anathematized. The latter had been denominated nominal Christians, as ignorant as Heathens, requiring as complete a change of heart and life, and denounced as the children of hell. It had been said that they pay no respect to the Bible, that Professors in their Chairs had ridiculed the doctrines of the gospel, and that the religious pastors were the determined opponents of the doctrines of Christianity. These were hard expressions, scarcely consistent with the professions of charity which we had heard from lips denouncing the claims of the Catholic Church to infallibility. But, in fact, those who had been preaching liberality had this day virtually assumed exemption from error, and dogmatically insisted on their own opinions as the only true and saving faith. He had never attended a meeting characterized by more charitable professions, and more illiberal denunciations and greater misstatements. The Continent was not so deplorably ignorant and depraved as it had been represented to be. Many of the statements carried their own refutation. That a Professor of Divinity should from his Chair ridicule the doctrines of the gospel, was too palpable a misstatement to be credited. Had he no other means of detecting the misrepresentations respecting the religious state of the Continent, a knowledge of the gross misstatements of the religious and moral condition of Geneva would induce suspicion as to their correctness. Of the state of Geneva he spoke from accurate information, and he could say, that there were few, if any, cities in Great Britain more distinguished for genuine piety and virtue. The pastors were exemplary in the discharge of their duties, and paid particular attention to the religious instruction of the young. They were not, indeed, Calvinists, but they were in his opinion sincere Christians, and he believed that their faith contained all the essential doctrines of Christianity. They believed in God, in the divine mission of Jesus. They received him as their Master and exemplar, and the Scriptures as their only rule of faith and life. Much holy indignation had been expressed "at their desecration of the Sabbath." They were not, indeed, Sabbatarians. They did not believe that the Lord's-day should be observed with all the strictness of the Jewish Sabbath. In this opinion they agreed with Calvin, whose peculiar notions of dogmatic theology they rejected. Indeed, all the Continental nations disapproved of a Jewish manner of observing the day on which

Jesus rose from the tomb. The Genevese had been grossly calumniated. In this they shared the fate of all religious Reformers. The primitive Christians were as groundlessly libelled. Let the Continental nations manage their own religious affairs; and let us attend to our own opinions and our own hearts, and we should have enough to do. Consider our starving poor in some of our manufacturing districts, and let them have your superfluities. Feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and you will have the satisfaction to know that your means are not abused.

Mr. HALDANE wondered that the last speaker should have been suffered to mount that sacred platform, dedicated to religious purposes, and pollute the meeting with his blasphemies. He had always questioned the propriety of allowing strangers to speak on such occasions. He could assure the meeting that all his own statements were correct, that the religious and moral condition of Geneva was most deplorable. A debasing system of religion had depraved the manners of the inhabitants. He and his friends had investigated and found that there were 20,000 abandoned women in that city, a greater number than in the whole city of London. The world was the devil's world.

The CHAIRMAN complimented the speaker on the satisfactory answer he had made to the stranger's statements.

B.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, APRIL 3rd.

Repair of Protestant Churches in Ireland.

SIR JOHN NEWPORT brought forward a resolution respecting the state of the law regarding the building and repairing Protestant churches in Ireland. He said, the Protestants had allowed the churches to fall into decay and ruin, and the cost of building and repairing them fell upon the Roman Catholics, who were shut out of the vestries, and derived no benefit from them, instead of upon the Established Church of Ireland, which had immense revenues at its disposal! Since the Union, not less than half a million of money had been raised, principally upon the Catholic population, for such Protestant purposes, many of whom had been distrained upon for church rates. Persons who did not profess the Established religion ought not to be taxed for the support of it. This country was cried up as the paragon of liberality,

while Roman Catholic countries were at the same time denounced as illiberal and prejudiced. Let the House, however, judge. In 1791, the Diet of Hungary, which was composed of persons of different orders, to the number of 500 or 600, came to a resolution in the following words:—"The Protestants of this state shall not be called upon to contribute to the Catholics either in money or labour, nor shall the Catholics, on the other hand, contribute to the Protestants, or to the establishment of their churches or schools." This resolution was passed by a majority of more than three to one. In the same Diet, Protestants were declared equally eligible with Catholics to fill every office and to hold every rank in State. This was the conduct of a Roman Catholic State, and yet it was said that England surpassed every other country in the world!

Mr JOHN SMITH thought the system perfectly monstrous which compelled the Catholics of Ireland to build Protestant churches; but our whole system in that country was an absurdity of the grossest description. A day must, however, come, when common sense and common justice would triumph.

Mr. PLUNKETT observed, that the Protestant churches *must* be kept up, although there might be but few Protestants in the parishes.

Mr. PEEL said, he could not concur in the proposition, that the Roman Catholic peasant ought not to be burdened with any share of the expense for repairs of Protestant churches. If that principle were good for Ireland, why not equally so for England? If one class of Dissenters were to be so far relieved, what reason could be assigned for not releasing all other classes who were not within the pale of the Established Church? The inevitable consequence would be, that all who were indifferent to the reformed system would declare themselves Dissenters, for the purpose of escaping this tax. Undoubtedly, if one class of Dissenters more than another deserved to be looked upon in a more favourable light, it certainly was the Roman Catholic occupiers of land in Ireland, for they had to provide their own churches as well as to assist in making the same provision for the other church by law. But while he entertained these feelings towards the Roman Catholic occupier of land, he felt them not for his landlord. And more particularly for his Protestant landlord, and still more so where he happened to be an absentee. Of all men, for him he had no consideration. With reference

to the Right Hon. Baronet's second proposition, for the insertion of a future clause into leases, to save the Roman Catholic tenant, and throw the weight upon his landlord, he was rather favourable to such a regulation. He did feel for the poor tenant who had taken his lease without any expectation that a church would be built near his land, and who had afterwards to meet the expense of such a building. With the utmost desire to go hand in hand with the Hon. Baronet, in giving a full consideration to parts of his plan, if brought forward in a specific bill, he hoped he would withdraw his resolution.

Sir J. NEWPORT said, he should withdraw the resolution, and move for leave to bring in a bill for amending the laws relative to the rebuilding and repairing of churches in Ireland, and for relieving occupying tenants from church rates on certain occasions.—Leave was given.

FOREIGN.

MADRAS.

Unitarian Association.

THE Foreign Committee have received a letter from William Roberts, dated Sept. 22, 1826, from which are taken the following very interesting extracts. This excellent man was then recovering from a severe attack of asthma followed by the measles.

“ In hopes of our friends increasing their remittances, I, with greatest economy possible, endeavoured to keep up both my schools and the catechist, but I am now not able to pay them any longer, without much inconvenience and injury to myself and family. * * * Several of my brethren are very willing to do every thing to serve and promote the truth they have embraced, but the increase of their families and their poverty are great impediments.

“ When a man becomes a Christian in India, he is entirely alienated from his caste and from all his other friends, and forfeits their favour for ever; but he has the consolation, favour and support of his European teachers, and the friendship of the party he joins. As to a Unitarian, it is extremely hard: he is not only forsaken by all his former friends and well-wishers, but he is defamed and looked upon almost by all other denominations of Christians, and their learned teachers, as a monster and enemy of their right faith. His own brethren being too few to afford him

much help, he is almost single in all his turns and against all his opponents. These discouraging inconveniences deter many from professing Unitarianism openly. Many seem to think that to become a Unitarian is not only consenting to bear all the reproaches of their former friends and bitter ill-will of those good, though mistaken, Christians, from whom better things might have been expected, but it is also voluntarily purchasing poverty. I want ability in English to describe all the inconveniences we labour under.

“ But myself in particular, though I am unworthy, yet my heavenly Father has one after another granted many of my earnest requests. One particular petition remains; that is a Unitarian teacher, to keep up our present light burning, and inspire my brethren and others about us with fresh courage. I have already, considering my weak and sickly constitution, beyond all reasonable expectation, been blessed with a long life, and had time and means to inquire, read, examine, think, and separate the wheat from the chaff, and hold up to the view of others the pure truths of the gospel, against all discouragement for thirty years; and also lately, by the kindness of my English Unitarian friends, I have been enabled to print and circulate some of my writings. Though my labour has not been crowned by many conversions, yet when I reflect on my own insufficiency and humble circumstances of life, I am astonished how the Lord has so kindly, so wonderfully conducted me step by step, without suffering any worldly consideration or difficulty ever to draw me away from my duty. All these his goodness I am afraid will eclipse, if I should die without a second person to take up my place; it being a common interrogation, Who will carry on the Unitarian cause when William Roberts dies? May God's Supreme will be done!

“ Present month will complete the 58th year of my age. Bodily weakness now creeps on fast. Whatever difficulties may yet lay before me, the same good Being, who has conducted me hitherto, will, I trust, guide me safely through it. * * * I beg through this, to present my heartfelt thanks to the friends and supporters of the Unitarian cause at Pursewankum. May the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ bless them richly for all their good endeavours and continued kindness!”

FRANCE.

The Press.

THERE are few sciences more essentially serviceable to mankind than statistics. Facts speak for themselves, and every body will allow that their effects are more really powerful than the most brilliant theories. M. Daru, by the publication of his "*Notions Statistiques sur la Librairie*," has demonstrated unanswerably all the importance of the various species of industry to which the press gives birth; and the result which every impartial man will draw from his calculations must be, that a well-advised government will ever most scrupulously beware of diminishing the products of a source so admirably calculated to increase the public wealth. M. Daru has arranged his *Statistical Tables of the products of the French press*, from the *Bibliographie* published since the year 1811, by M. Beuchot. It will be seen that from the 1st Nov. 1811, to the 31st December, 1825, the French press has produced the enormous number of 1,152,295,229 sheets, the daily papers not being included, nor the impressions from the royal press. If we afterwards follow, year by year, the number of printed sheets, we shall perceive that the demand for literary matter has doubled in 10 or 12 years. But we prefer giving some remarks on the particular labours which belong to the press.

The first material requisite for printing is the paper, or rather the rags with which it is fabricated. We perceive, then, that for the yearly fabrication of paper, (the quantity of which is 2,800,000 reams,) the necessary quantity of rags is 80,600,000 pounds. At Paris, a considerable portion of these rags is collected from the streets by individuals, the number of whom is calculated at about 4000, and whose average gains are computed at 36 sous per diem. But as this article makes scarcely one-sixth of the gain of these pickers, the rest consisting of bones, old iron, broken glass, &c., it appears that the quantity of rags daily collected in the streets of Paris, is of the value of about 1200 francs. This sum doubles when the rags have passed through the hands of the rag merchant and of those who superintend the selecting and washing; operations which occupy about 500 persons. On the whole, the city of Paris supplies the paper manufactories with rags to the value of 4800 francs, comprising the contributions of hospitals and private persons, &c., which makes annually 1,752,000 francs; and the whole

of France produces in the same space of time a sum of 7,480,000 francs on the single article of rags, which, at the rate of 500 francs per head, furnishes means of existence to 14,960 individuals. The number of paper-mills in 1825 was 200, and the number of workmen employed in them amounted to at least 18,000, not reckoning those engaged in the preparation of acids, pastes, the machinery, &c., which would form a total of more than 30,000 persons. There are 35 type-founderies employing 1000 workmen, and the produce of this branch of manufacture may amount to 650,000 francs per annum. Lastly, the expense of printing ink may amount to 12,000 francs.

We now come to printing itself, having briefly glanced over its accessories. The general number of printing establishments in France is 665, of which 82 are at Paris. In 1825, 1550 presses were calculated to be in full activity, viz. in Paris, 850, including those of the royal establishment to the number of about 80, and about 700 in the various departments. These presses produced, in the same year, 1825, between 13 and 14,000,000 volumes, of which more than 400,000 issued from the presses of M. Firmin Didot. We cannot follow the calculations of M. Daru through all their details, and must content ourselves with observing, that the gains of the compositors, pressmen, correctors, &c, amount annually to about 15,262,500 francs.

There are reckoned, at Paris, 132 master binders, but to these must be added a great number of private workmen, and binders in the departments, which will increase the number to 1200, occasioning an annual circulation of 2,440,000 francs. There are, in Paris, 480 booksellers, and 84 second-hand booksellers, and in the departments 922, forming a total of 1586.

The general summary of these statistical statements shews, that 13,500,000 volumes, the average annual produce, create in commerce a real sum of 33,750,000 francs. This comprehends the gains of the rag-picker, the income of the bookseller, and the profits of literary men. It is true that these last have but a small division of this enormous amount, and M. Daru considers himself as very close to truth in estimating the receipts of literary men for their labours, at no more than 500,000 francs. It must, indeed, be remembered, that many desire no remuneration for their manuscripts, and that others can obtain none; that those who bargain with publishers obtain a very moderate price, most frequently paid by

a certain number of copies of the work, or upon the profits of sale; and again, that the reprinting of works, which have become public property, afford their authors no further advantage. M. Daru concludes these curious researches with the following observations:—"To conclude: the industry of the press creates annually a sum of nearly 34 millions, and this creation is more peculiarly real and profitable, inasmuch as the original matter is composed of objects almost without any value whatever: rags, lamp black, a little oil, some lead and a few skins, are the only appreciable materials which the paper mill, the printing press, and the binder, derive from other exertions. In the language of political economy, labour is the estimate of all value; but it may be said, with equal justice, that the most noble of all powers—intellectual power—converts sterile matter into precious objects. It is the privilege of the mind, that to it alone belongs creation."—*Revue Encyclopédique*.

Increase of Literature.

THE following statistical account of the literature of France in 1811 and 1825 is taken from *The Courier Français*; it does not include either official papers or daily journals. In 1811 there were printed—

	Sheets.
On Legislation	2,831,662
On the Sciences	2,214,303
Philosophy	410,298
Political Economy	131,133
Military Affairs	1,147,400
The Fine Arts	161,525
Literature.....	3,781,826
History.....	3,375,891
Divers subjects, Almanacks, &c.	1,885,869
Theology	2,509,752
Total.....	18,451,713

In 1825, the number had risen to—

Legislation	15,929,839
Sciences	10,928,277
Philosophy.....	2,804,182
Political Economy.....	2,915,826
The Military Art	1,457,913
The Fine Arts	2,937,301
Literature	30,205,158
History	39,457,957
Different subjects	3,886,973
Theology	17,487,037
Total.....	128,010,483

Twenty sheets may be reckoned as a volume, which would give an increase of above 5,500,000 volumes in 1825 over

1811, which has been further increased one-fifth in the year just ended.

GERMANY.

Catholic Reformation.

In the *Allgemeine Kirchen-Zeitung* for last January, is inserted a copy of a recent petition from a part of the Catholic clergy in Silesia to the Archbishop of Breslaw, praying for a reform of the Catholic worship. A short account of this eloquent, forcible, and manly document, for which we are indebted to a friend now in Germany, from whom we hope for further valuable communications, may perhaps be interesting to our readers.

After speaking of the evils which arise respectively from the opposite inclinations of the over-zealous and the indifferent, and after professing their warm attachment to the Catholic Church, the petitioners proceed as follows:—"But we cannot deny, that in the course of centuries abuses have crept in, and troubled the pure stream of the Gospel; that weeds have luxuriated among the good seed of Christianity, hindered its flourishing growth, and embittered its blessed fruits." They go on to say, "No one can wonder that it should be so. A church which has had to contend with the storms of eighteen centuries, could not remain exempt from the influences of time. Christ, though he has promised his continual presence with it, forwards his work by the instrumentality of men, whom he employs as the teachers of his divine truths, and as the shepherds of his flock. What might have been concluded *a priori*, is confirmed both by history and by the present state of things. The doctrines and the saving morality which Christ preached, have been delivered to us through the apostles, fathers, and inspired men, true and pure. But in unessential things, ecclesiastical ordinances and customs, which have been adopted from time to time, to promote the instruction, edification, and salvation of believers, manifold abuses have insinuated themselves. The more these abuses obstruct the efficacy of our religion, the more is it incumbent on us to labour actively for their gradual removal."

The petitioners proceed to consider these abuses specifically. They say, "The Catholic worship in the first centuries was a great, holy, awful whole, a communication between clergy and people, an immediate intercourse between God and man; but the brightness

of this system began very early to be obscured. In order to bring in Jews and Heathens, many rites and usages were adopted with reference to ancient or established customs; and hence the Liturgy of the Catholic church became greatly corrupted. Many prelates and learned men in Germany, active and distinguished friends of the Catholic church, have often declared their opinion to this effect. Who does not know and esteem the labours of Werkmeister, Winter, Pracher, Huber, Selmar, Busch, Brunner, &c?"

The proposed reforms they describe under three heads.

1. They intreat that the bishop would cause a Psalm-book to be prepared and generally circulated, to be used by Catholics in all their religious services. According to the tenor of their remarks, this Psalm-book would be similar in its objects to those commonly employed by Protestants. In some parts of Germany the Catholics already use such books.

2. They most earnestly argue in favour of having the Liturgy read in the vernacular tongue.

3. They petition for a general revision of the Mass-book, for the omission of many things which are useless, unmeaning, or unsuitable, and for the allowance of more time for preaching.

Dr. Scholz.

DR. SCHOLZ, the professor of theology in the University of Bonn, has been pursuing a novel mode of cultivating his biblical studies, in which he is deservedly eminent throughout Germany.

Having determined to pursue a course of travels, having for their principal object an inquiry for all materials necessary to the most extensive collation of MSS., he has made a journey from Trieste to Alexandria, and thence through Egypt, Palestine, and Syria.

The results of his observations, of a sort secondary to his *main* pursuit, but highly interesting on every topic of ancient literature, customs, arts, and languages, have been published by him in the form of a volume of travels.

Well skilled, not only in the Greek, but in the different Eastern tongues adapted to his favourite pursuits, Dr. Scholz every where prosecuted his Biblical studies with the greatest industry, and was peculiarly active in his examination and collation of MSS.

This book of travels then gives the clue to one branch of his resources for his grand design of a new edition of

the Greek text, founded on the most extensive comparison which it is possible for any individual to make, without pursuing a still more energetic system of personal investigation. A second series of illustrations of his design appears in another work, which comprises a *Biblical Tour* made over Europe with the same view.

The grand result is his New Testament itself, for which 600 MSS, not known to Griesbach, have been made tributary, and which is now in the course of publication. It is understood that very important results are to be looked for from this highly praiseworthy and laborious undertaking; and we shall certainly lose no time in making our readers acquainted with it as soon as it reaches our hands.

PRUSSIA.

THE CATHOLICS.—Germany supplies a striking refutation of what has been so often advanced of late, that the character of the Catholic religion never changes. Silesia, the richest and most industrious province in the Prussian dominions, contains about two millions of inhabitants, of whom about one half are Catholics. The proportion of Catholics was somewhat greater when Frederick wrested that fine province from Austria. It may naturally be supposed that the Priests were by no means pleased with the change which placed over them a Protestant Sovereign; and those who have acquired their notions of policy in the English school, will naturally suppose that he succeeded in retaining possession of Silesia by a system of rigour towards the Catholics, and by securing the devoted attachment of the Protestants by vesting them with an ascendancy over the Catholics. This, however, was not the policy of Frederick. He made no distinction between Protestants and Catholics. By providing for the instruction of the people, by freeing them from numerous abuses, by improving the administration of justice, by restraining an insolent Aristocracy within due bounds, he soon gained the affections of the Silesians, who have long been among the most devoted of all the Prussians to their Government, and during the war of liberation, particularly distinguished themselves by their enthusiasm and their bravery. This system of kindness and impartiality has been completely successful in extinguishing all jealousy between Catholics and Protestants. They live on the best terms with each other. The Catholics have made no scru-

ple of accepting Bibles from the Protestants, and reading them. The Prince Bishop of Breslaw, having lately interfered to prevent the reading of these Bibles, was disobeyed. The Catholic clergy of Silesia, so far from sharing the views of their Bishop, have united in demanding a reformation of the whole Ritual, more especially of the Missal, by substituting German for Latin, &c., so as to suit it to the wants of the present age; and threats are held out, that if their demands are refused, they will all go over to the Protestants.

Oaths by the Menonites.

Berlin, March 28.—In order that the Menonites dwelling in the Prussian dominions may be freed from making Oaths at variance with their religious principles, his Majesty the King has ordered as follows:

“If a Menonite is called on to swear an oath as a party, or to be heard as a witness, or is nominated to an office in which the taking an oath is necessary, he must by a certificate from the Elders, Teachers or Presidents of his congregation, shew that he was born in the Menonite sect, or that at least a year before the commencement of the process or the nomination to office, he has belonged to that religious society, and that he has hitherto led an irreproachable life.—To this attestation the common formula of the Menonites must at the same time be added. The affirmation by means of a shake of the hand, which is the form followed by them, has equal force with the actual swearing of an oath; and whoever abuses this form in confirmation of an untruth, shall receive the punishment of perjury.”

LITERARY NOTICES.

Mr. Scaum, of Beverly, is writing a History of that place, to be published under the title of *Bevariaë*.

Dr. T. F. Dibdin is engaged on a translation of Thomas à Kempis's Imitation of Jesus Christ.

Mr. J. Graves has announced, as in the press, the History and Antiquities of the Town and Honour of Woodstock, including Biographical Anecdotes, &c.

Mr. J. F. Stephens has issued proposals for publishing, in monthly parts, embellished with coloured figures of the rare and interesting species, British Entomology, or a Synopsis of Indigenous Insects, containing their generic and

specific distinctions, with an account of their metamorphoses, times of appearance, localities, food, and economy.

Miss Edgeworth has in the press a volume of Dramatic Tales for Children, intended as an additional volume of Parents' Assistant.

Mr. Isaac Taylor, Jun., is printing a concise History of the Transmission of Ancient Books to Modern Times; or, an Account of the Means by which the Genuineness and Authenticity of Historical Works especially, and Ancient Literature in general, are ascertained.

Memoirs, including correspondence and other remains, of Mr. John Urquhart, late of the University of St. Andrew's, are preparing by the Rev. Wm. Orme.

Sir Isaac Newton's Two Letters to Le Clerc; the former containing a Dissertation upon the Reading of the Greek Text, 1 John v. 7; the latter on 1 Tim. ch. iii. ver. 16, are announced as about to be published from authentic MSS. in the Library of the Remonstrants in Holland.

Mr. William Carpenter will shortly publish a Natural History of the Bible; or, a descriptive Account of the Zoology, Botany, and Mineralogy of the Holy Scriptures: compiled from the most authentic sources, British and Foreign, and adapted to the use of English readers, illustrated with numerous engravings.

Mr. Sweet is preparing a work on the most ornamental and curious Plants which are natives of New Holland and the South-Sea Islands.

The Bishop of Strasbourg, late Bishop of Aire, lately published a Reply to Faber's Difficulties of Romanism, which was an answer to a former work of the Bishop's, entitled Discussion Amicale. A translation of both these works is announced.

Mr. Samuel W. Burgess will shortly publish Sacred Hours; consisting of select Pieces in prose and verse.

The Author of the "Cigar" has nearly ready for publication, The Every Night Book, or Life after Dark.

A Life of Morris Birkbeck, written by his Daughter, is in the press, and will appear in a few days.

In the press, The Desolation of Eyam, the Emigrant, a Tale of the American Woods; and other Poems. By William and Mary Howitt, Authors of the Forest Minstrel.

The Rev. John East, A.M., has in the press, The Sea-Side; a series of short Essays and Poems, suggested by a temporary residence at a Watering-Place.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Academic Unity, being the Substance of a General Dissertation contained in the Privileges of the University of Cambridge, as translated from the original Latin, with various Additions. By G. Dyer. 8vo. 7s. boards.

An Essay on the Limits of Human Knowledge, designed, from a Consideration of the Powers of the Understanding, to promote their most legitimate and advantageous Exercise. By W. H. Bathurst, M. A., Rector of Barwick in Elmet, &c., &c. 8vo. 1s. 6d. sewed.

Morell's Elements of the History of Philosophy and Science, from the earliest Records to the Commencement of the Eighteenth Century. 12s. boards.

Allbat's Elements of Useful Knowledge in Geography, Botany, Astronomy, &c.: with Eight Engravings. 12mo. 4s. 6d. half-bound.

Memoir of the Geology of Central France; including the Volcanic Formations of Auvergne, the Velay, and the Vivirais. By G. Poulett Scrope, F. R. S. F. G. S., &c. 4to. Boards. 3l. 3s.

Illustrations of Ornithology. By Sir William Jardine, Bart, F. R. S. E. F. L. S. M. W. S., &c., and Prideaux John Selby, Esq., F. L. S. M. W. S., &c. Part I. Royal 4to. 1l. 11s. 6d. boards; large paper, 2l. 12s. 6d.

A Chronicle of London, from 1089 to 1483; written in the Fifteenth Century,

and for the first time printed from MSS. in the British Museum. To which are added, numerous Contemporary Illustrations, consisting of Royal Letters, Poems, and other Articles descriptive of Public Events, or of the Manners and Customs of the Metropolis. 4to. 2l. 2s. boards.

Ancient Scottish Ballads, recovered from Tradition, and never before published; with Notes, historical and explanatory: and an Appendix, containing the Airs of several of the Ballads. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d. boards.

On Idolatry, a Poem. By the Rev. William Swan. 12mo. 5s. 6d. boards.

A Widow's Tale, and other Poems. By Bernard Barton. 12mo. 5s. 6d. bds.

Old English Sayings, newly expounded, in Prose and Verse. By Jefferys Taylor. 12mo. 4s. boards.

Memoirs of the Life of Mr. Robert Spence, late Bookseller, of York. By Richard Burdekin. 12mo. 3s.

Whittemore's Historical and Topographical Picture of Brighton and its Environs, and Visitor's Guide; embellished with Eighteen beautiful Engravings on Steel and Copper. 3s.

Harry and Lucy's Trip to Brighton; a pleasing Description of the Amusements and Scenery of this popular Watering-place, for Children; with Fourteen Engravings. 1s. 6d.

CORRESPONDENCE.

The Conductors have again been obliged, by the influx of interesting matter, to exceed their prescribed limits. They have to acknowledge the receipt of numerous Communications, for which they hope to find room hereafter. The recommendation, of sending Unitarian Missionaries to Ireland, would, they think, be more suitably addressed to the Committee of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association.

The Conductors would rather court than repel Communications to the Poetical, or, as one Correspondent is pleased to call it, the "Rhyming," department of their work: but they would, once for all, observe, for the information of some who are disposed to favour them with papers of this class, that correct grammar and an intelligible meaning are as essential requisites to good poetry as to good prose.

ERRATA.

Page 233, line 5, for *Emerg*, read "Emery."

234, line 35, for *Theodocie*, read "Theodocée."

241, line 4, of the quotation from Juvenal, for *tibicini*, read "tibicine."

264, for *J. T. Clarke*, read "T. T. Clarke."

282, line 7 from the bottom, for *it is*, read "this."

297, col. 2, line 23 from the bottom, for *resort*, read "revert."