

THE MONTHLY REPOSITORY

AND

REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, No. VIII.

AUGUST, 1827.

ON MR. ELTON'S "SECOND THOUGHTS."

To the Editor.

SIR,

APPRIZED by a notice in one of your recent numbers that a gentleman and scholar who but lately advocated the Unitarian doctrine with much zeal and ability, was about to publish his reasons for abandoning that system, I was induced shortly after to furnish myself with the work alluded to, in order that I might make myself acquainted with those reasons, and give them an attentive and impartial consideration. I have done so; and if some few remarks which I am disposed to make on Mr. Elton's little volume should appear to you deserving a place in your Repository, they are much at your service.

It was not without pain, I must confess, that I was convinced almost by the first pages of the *Second Thoughts*, that the spirit of the work is decidedly polemical. When circumstances oblige a man to say farewell to his former friends and companions, some kind words at parting are naturally expected, to soothe the pain of separation, and leave behind the impression of good-will. At the close of a religious intercourse, something of this kind seems especially becoming. From two revolutions in his own creed, it was to be hoped that the author would at least have learned the lesson of candour towards others; one of the few good fruits which the thorns and briars of controversy sometimes yield. It might have been thought that some feelings of tenderness towards his late self would have disposed him to judge and speak with less severity of those of whom he was so recently one. Did he duly consider what an unfavourable inference would arise against himself from those charges of mental and moral perversion with which he loads his late friends? Or does he reckon so largely on the forgetfulness of the public, as to suppose that they will not call to mind that such as Unitarians are represented to be now, such Mr. Elton also was but twelve months ago? Truly, in this instance we may say to him, "Wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself:" and if he should reply, that he has now forsaken his error, still, let me ask, ought not some feelings of humility and sympathy to teach him forbearance towards those who still remain entangled in it? When the Israelites came out of Egypt they were enjoined ever to be kind towards strangers; because, said their lawgiver, "ye yourselves

were strangers, and ye know the heart of a stranger." And ought not one who was so lately a zealous Unitarian to know the heart of a Unitarian, and the peculiar difficulties which constrain him to bear the reproach of a despised and hated sect, too well to allow him to turn round immediately and taunt him with all the caustic asperity of which his pen is master? From those opponents who have known us only from afar, from the misrepresentations of ignorant bigots and crafty polemics, we might naturally expect such treatment: but from one who cannot but have perceived the sincere love of truth and laborious discharge of duty which distinguish many Unitarians, it comes with an ill grace indeed. *Et tu, Brute!*

I have no intention, Sir, of following Mr. Elton into the controversial detail of his book. That is, indeed, a *crambe repetita*; but the fault of this is not in him, but the subject. Orthodox readers, whose faith rests more in impression than in rational conviction, find it very desirable to have the old material worked up for them from time to time in a new form, and these will peruse this fresh *philippic* with great relish. Ever best pleased with those misrepresentations of Unitarianism which bring them most speedily to the desired conviction of its falsehood and impiety, they will find the account of it here given very much to their satisfaction. The work proceeds entirely on the old plan. Instead of distinguishing carefully the essence of Unitarianism, i. e. the doctrine of *ONE God the Father*, from the heterogeneous mass of opinions which have in different individuals been combined with it, the author blends all these promiscuously together, and by that means, and with the help of his own colouring, contrives to exhibit a picture sufficiently repulsive. All strong, unguarded, injudicious *ultra* things that have been said by any professed Unitarian, or even by such semi-deists as Evanson, are brought forward by him as illustrative specimens of Unitarian doctrine, and allowed to be silently imputed by the reader to every individual who bears that name. With respect to the doctrine which he now defends, he adopts a diametrically opposite course. He takes his stands on so qualified and moderate a statement of orthodoxy, (if, indeed, it can be considered as such at all,) that many Unitarians would scarcely know how to distinguish it from their own sentiments, except by the domineering and intolerant tone which they find it assuming. I shall illustrate this assertion in a few particulars.

The very first sentence of the "Second Thoughts," shews how humble that fancied orthodox eminence really is, from which its author now looks down on the heretical Unitarians; the dignified temple,

Despicere unde queat alios, passimque videre
Errantes.

That sentence is as follows: "The three characters or aspects of deity, under which God has revealed himself to his creatures, (expressed by an unhappiness of metaphrase *persons*,) are imputed by the Unitarians as three distinct objects of worship." Two things are here observable; first, that Mr. Elton's orthodoxy is, after all, only about that of Sabellius; and, secondly, that he makes a false accusation against the Unitarians, who are not accustomed to charge this *modal* Trinity with tritheism, but only with insignificance; never deeming it any difficulty to admit that the Deity has revealed himself to his creatures either under three aspects or characters, or under twice three, if that number should be preferred. For certainly God is revealed to us as the self-existent Jehovah, and then as the Creator and Preserver of the world; then, as our Redeemer and Sanctifier in the gospel.

All these, to which more might be added, are so many characters or aspects of Deity towards his creatures: but to insist on his having precisely *three*, neither more nor less, as a great and formal doctrine, is really trifling with a sacred subject. It is true that the Father, the Son or Word, and the Spirit, are three names under which we recognize very especially the Divine agency towards us in the New Testament; and that the vigour of Christian doctrine hinges very much upon our so doing. But really there is in this no matter of controversy: Unitarians make no serious objection to this kind of Trinity, and it is ungenerous and unjust to represent them as aiming at the shadowy, and therefore invulnerable, doctrine, those serious and earnest remonstrances which they direct against the truly tri-personal Deity of the popular faith, and against those forms of doctrine and worship which are calculated to convey a real tri-personal idea to the people. There is a want of fair and open dealing in this matter. Trinitarians keep two forms of their doctrine on hand, like two sets of weights in a shop: in practical and devotional religion they prefer the use of the solid and substantial one, but when controversy begins, this is popped under the counter, and assailants are allowed no object of attack but a baseless shadow which wears its resemblance. Those that find edification in this kind of religious tactics do well to avail themselves of them. I make these remarks because Mr. Elton, in taking his stand on the merely *modal or nominal Trinity*, ought in fairness to have observed, both that it was different from the popular creed, and also that it was not that to which Unitarians object.

But although this nominal Trinity may be allowed to pass as a thing of little moment when considered only as an abstract distinction in the Divine Nature, what are we to make of it when taken, as we must take it, in connexion with the doctrine of *the Deity of Christ*? The Divine "Word which from the beginning was with God, and was God," may, indeed, be represented as an aspect or power of the Deity; and so may the Holy Spirit. But can we say the same of Jesus Christ? It is impossible. No sophistry nor subtilty can prevent the reader of the New Testament, nor the Christian world at large, from thinking of Jesus Christ as truly a distinct person, a distinct intelligent agent, from the Father that sent him, and to whom he prayed, saying, "Father, not my will, but thine be done;" and of whom he said, "Of that day and hour knoweth not the Son, but the Father only." Not all the half-meaning and no-meaning terms that have been devised, neither substance nor essence, nor mode nor aspect, will ever help common sense out of this dilemma. Jesus Christ is most prominently and unequivocally a distinct being, and person, and agent, or whatever other term may be preferred, from God his Father; and, therefore, those who contend for his proper deity, that he is in himself, without reserve, truly God, can have no fair refuge from the charge of polytheism in the Sabellian scheme of the Trinity; and if they could, would only lapse into the Patripassian heresy. I must insist on it, then, that it is not the doctrine of the Trinity so much as that of the Deity of Christ, (in a strict and proper sense,) that is the main question between Unitarians and their adversaries. The doctrine of the Trinity is an abstract, scholastic subtlety, which it is scarce worth disputing about; but that of the Deity of Jesus Christ, roundly and popularly taught, is a very different thing; it is a broad and palpable conception, and, notwithstanding what Mr. Elton says, does inevitably introduce a *second object of worship*, clothed in all the attributes and honours of the Supreme, and commonly drawing to itself by much the larger share of the affections of the worshipers. Here it is that the Unitarian finds the occasion of his uncon-

querable scruples ; scruples which I do not see that these "*Second Thoughts*" do any thing towards removing.

I cannot, however, but observe in this place, that I am unable, from the perusal of Mr. Elton's book, to state what his sentiments on this subject really are. I doubt whether he is fairly out of our port after all. If the following passage, which is the most to the point that I can find, be descriptive of his present opinions, I can perceive nothing in them but what is strictly Unitarian, even to the proper humanity of Christ : " Let it be doubted whether the filiation of Christ were before the worlds, or the passages seemingly bearing that import be reducible to the same sense of pre-science in God as is expressed in 1 Pet. i. 10, and the sonship imply a state of glorified humanity, commencing in time and with the birth of Jesus, as may be to consist with Psalm ii. 7, Isaiah xlix. 1, and Luke i. 35 ; whether again the instrumentality of Christ, in the visible and invisible creation, may not bear, as Locke supposes, a mystic and spiritual sense, referrible to the regeneration of man's fallen nature, and his assumption into a new state of immortality, as may be thought to be implied by Isaiah lxv. 17, and 2 Cor. v. 17 ; or, finally, whether 'the word' that 'was with God,' John i. 1, relate to Christ primarily, or to the attribute of the Father with which Christ is after spoken of as personally identified ; let all this be doubted, or the latter alternative throughout be even decided upon, and yet the scripture testimony will remain in express avouchment of the fact, that Christ was at least 'the word made flesh :' this complex relation of deity indwelling in humanity, constituting Jesus what he was, the Christ, 'the only-begotten of the Father.' " The whole of this passage, not excepting the latter clauses, is, in my opinion, good and true Unitarianism, and contains views of truth of which I for one cordially approve. I am indeed of opinion that it is not on these points that Mr. Elton's secession has mainly turned, but on those connected with the doctrine of atonement. I wish, for my own part, that instead of abandoning the Unitarian communion, with whom I apprehend that he still agrees in the most essential points, he had remained in his place, and done his best towards reforming those things in which he esteemed us defective. I think there is still room for Τριταιι Φροντιδες. If, Mr. Editor, these remarks should suit your purpose, I may probably continue them another day.

T. F. B.

HUNGARIAN LITERATURE.

SIR,

Hackney, June 25, 1827.

As communications have been at length established with our Transylvanian brethren, I trust some of our young inquiring students will direct their attention to the language and literature of that country. The former (Hungarian, or, as they call it, *Magyar*) is one of the most remarkable of the European dialects, being undoubtedly of Oriental origin, and having a very slight affinity with any of the idioms of the surrounding country, whether Teutonic, Slavonian, or Romaic. It was cultivated at an early period, and a Grammar, entitled *Magyar Régiségek és Rickasagok*, was published as early as 1539. There is no want of books, both in Latin and German, by which a tolerable acquaintance with the Hungarian tongue may be acquired. Of Albert Molnár's *Grammatica Hungarica* (first printed in 1610) there are many editions, and there is a Latin and Hungarian Dictionary by the same author. Hungarian Grammars in German have been published by Jos.

Farkas: *Gründliche und neu verbesserte Ungarische Sprachlehre*, of which several editions existed, printed at Vienna and Presburg; a Philosophical Grammar, by Jos. S. Nagy, Vienna, 1793; and a more popular work by Verseggy, *Neu Verfasste Ungarische Sprachlehre*. The best Dictionary is that of Jos. Von Marton, of which the second edition was printed in Vienna, in 1804. Its title is *Magyar-Nemet es Nemet Magyar Lexicon, Deutsch-Ungarisches und Ungarisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*. As a specimen of the language, and of the popular poetry of the country, I annex two of the songs of the people, which I have extracted from a mass of literary communications lately received from this *Terra incognita*.

FAJDALOM.

Fáj, Fáj!
 Fáj a' szívem fáj!
 Reped szivem
 Oda hivem
 Fáj a' szívem, fáj!
 Életem mái
 Komor orái,
 Hány ezer bú's átok
 Jóve rátok!
 Fussátok ezekkel
 A' sok keservekkel
 Mellyekkel, az ég
 Ostoroz még.
 Iaj szabaditsatok
 Öldöklő bánatok!
 Mert a' kín engemet
 Torba temet.

AZ IDŐ.

Az idő szárnyon jár
 Soha semmit nem vár
 Es' foly, mint erős folyás,
 Viszsa soha sem tér,
 Mindent a' földre vér,
 Mindeneken hatalmas:
 "O qazdaqot, szeqenyet
 Öszveront egyszerént
 Nincs neki ellent-állás.
 Csak egy van időtől
 'Saz ó erejétől
 A' ki békével marad;
 Nem fél kaszájától,
 Nem sebes szárnyától;
 Idő rajta elolvad:
 A' tündöklő hir név
 Melly dicsőégre rév
 Az nundenkor megmarad.

DIRGE.

Woe! woe!
 Woe! my soul's woe!
 She is departed,
 I—broken hearted.
 Woe! my soul's woe!
 O'er my dark hours
 Wretchedness pours
 Thousands of curses and pains;
 Nothing remains,
 Nothing for sorrow
 To smite with to-morrow;
 Sorrow hath emptied its quiver,
 Emptied for ever.
 And my sad soul
 Stands at the goal,
 Where suffering's exhausted; to crave
 Nought but—a grave.

TIME.

ON hurrying wings time flies away,
 It will not for a moment stay,
 But like a stream glides on—glides
 on:
 It never turns its footsteps back,
 But sinks all ages in its track,
 And reigns and rules alone:
 The poor, the rich, alike pursues,
 The poor, the rich, alike subdues:
 Who can withstand it? None!
 There's only one whose mightier
 strength
 The strength of time o'erpowers at
 length,
 And sits in quiet victory;
 Time's sickle mows it not; time's
 flight
 Brings nor decay, nor death, nor
 blight,
 But passes harmless by;
 There's only one—'tis virtuous fame,
 Through shifting ages still the same—
 It lives immortally.

I earnestly wish to see some zealous labourers in this almost untrodden field.
 I am sure they would gather a rich and interesting harvest. J. B.

ON THE DANGERS OF ADVERSITY.

No subject of exhortation is oftener chosen by the divine and the moralist than the dangers of prosperity and the blessings of adversity. It is a good subject, and deserves all that can be said upon it; but should not the reverse of the picture be sometimes held up to view? There is little need, perhaps, to dwell much on the moral advantages of prosperity in order to make it desired, as such a state needs no new attractions to render it beautiful in the eyes and welcome to the heart of man; but it seems desirable to point out to the child of immortality the dangers which beset the path of sorrow; a path which, though thorny to the feet and obstructed to the view, is generally represented as enlightened by the day-spring from on high, and infallibly tending to heights of holiness and peace. Do we sufficiently reflect that such is not its universal tendency? Are we aware that adversity has slain its thousands, though prosperity may have destroyed its ten thousands? It behoves us to be careful that, while we desire and aim at advancement in holiness, we are not lost through want of circumspection. While we guard against the snares of wealth, ease, and worldly privileges, let us not flatter ourselves that, as soon as sorrow overtakes us, we must necessarily become more worthy of the love of the Father who chasteneth us, that our hearts must necessarily be purified, and our affections elevated.

We shall be in great danger of falling into this fatal error if we take any other guide than the sound words of the gospel of Christ. Human guides may lead us astray; we may follow them as far as, on comparison, we may find their warnings to agree with the voice of divine truth, but no further. When the poor man attains wealth, when he who was unknown or despised, stands on the eminence of fame, when the bereaved mourner collects around him the elements of domestic peace, and is once more "safe bosomed in his loved and happy home," every voice is raised to warn him against the sins of ingratitude, pride, and avarice; these voices tell him the truth, and we shall do right to awaken a powerful echo in the bosom of others, or in our own, if we wish to preserve our innocence and security. But when the mourner's friends gather round him to speak to him of his peculiar safety, when they raise his sinking spirit by asserting that his sorrows are marks of God's especial favour; when they tell him that he will become holy by his discipline, that his sufferings entitle him to an inheritance in the future world, and that the clouds which encompass him are but the veil behind which a benignant Deity descends to commune with his chosen servant in his sanctuary, we must examine the enticing words of man's wisdom, and bring them to the test of Scripture. We must remember that adversity is sent to humble us; that it is a sign that we need correction; that it rather becomes the sufferer to cry, "Lord! be merciful to me, a sinner," than "Lord! I thank thee that I am not as other men are." We must remember that though sorrow may soften the heart, it may also harden it; that it may expand or contract the affections; that it may bring us to God or alienate us from him, according to our previous habits of mind, or to our course of action under the pressure of new circumstances. Instead of believing that the bitter draught of sorrow will assuredly confer immortality, we must bear in mind that it will act according to our preparation for its operation; it may renovate our powers; it may restore our vigour, and infuse new life into our spiritual frame; but it may also exert a relaxing and benumbing influence, and unawares lay us prostrate in eternal death. If we

do not endeavour to discern what influence the operations of Providence ought to have on our character, and strive to subject ourselves duly to them, we may expect in vain the precious results for which we look with confidence. Some results will be produced, perhaps valuable, perhaps noxious, but our expectations will be disappointed unless we anxiously observe, and, as far as possible, carefully direct the process. It is not every lump of earth which will yield gold in the crucible, and it is not every mind which will come forth from its fiery trial adorned with solid and shining virtues.

But though adversity may benefit some minds more than others, it has its dangers for all. That which is oftenest pointed out is distrust of the goodness of God. This is, however, in our opinion, by no means the greatest. In a Christian country like this, where every sabbath renews the praises of the Father of mercies, where preachers abound to display instances of his goodness, where through the whole range of its literature, from the volume which invites little children to "bless God, for he is very good," to that which appeals to his "glorious works" to shew that he is the "Parent of good," express acknowledgments of the benignity of Providence are found in every page,—a belief in this benignity is so early formed and so strongly maintained, that it usually stands the shock of adverse events, and dwells, actively or passively, in the mind through life. It is almost as uncommon, in this age and country, to meet with a denial of the unalterable goodness of God, as a doubt of his existence. Those who are practically resigned to his will and those who are not, equally acknowledge the justice and mercy of that will.

A much greater danger appears to us to be a tendency in the sufferer to imagine that he is an object of God's peculiar favour; that he is exalted in the sight of God and man by his mere suffering, independently of the effect which it may have on his character. Where this fatal notion once obtains entrance, presumption usurps the place of humility; the spirit *condescends* to receive the inflictions of its parent, and congratulates itself on its submission. It looks round to see what the world thinks of its resignation, and from that moment it becomes the slave of the world.

The world takes upon itself to prescribe rules for the demeanour of those who are under the pressure of sorrow; and hence is another snare for the weak and the worldly. The same events produce such different effects on different minds, that the innocent pleasures in which one mourner finds a welcome solace, may call up associations too powerful for the fortitude of another. But the world has one rule for all, and he who does not obey it must expect to meet its censure and its scorn. The humble sufferer who believes not that his feelings are of consequence enough to interfere with the comfort of others, who suppresses his sighs that the smiles of those around him may not be checked, who goes every where, and sees every one, and leaves no accustomed duty unperformed, is too often censured as wanting feeling; while he who shuts himself up, or is never seen but in gloom and tears, and who requires peculiar consideration for his situation from every one he sees and every company he enters, is held up to admiration as an example of refined sensibility, and is honoured with the praise of being "a true mourner." The world *will* judge; but he who submits his feelings and conduct to its judgment, takes upon him a yoke which will grow heavier with each day of his life in this world, and which may deliver him over to a still worse destiny in another. Any one who has studied the structure of the human mind is aware that there is no such thing as permanent, utter misery. Our associations are so complex, the pleasant are so mixed with the painful, the power of external objects over them is so great, and the ten-

dency of the mind to call up pleasurable and consolatory thoughts is so strong, that no efforts of our own, from a regard to the opinion of the world, or any other motive, can long depress the elasticity of the soul. If such be the happy bent of our nature, why should it be counteracted? If we possess the power of enjoying innocent pleasures, our true wisdom is to seek them, whatever our circumstances may be, and whatever the world may think of our sensibilities.—It need scarcely be suggested how careful we should be not to censure our fellow-sufferers for shrinking from efforts which are beneficial to ourselves, or to judge of their conduct by our own, be the apparent similarity of the circumstances ever so striking. While we feel that the world may as well attempt to fathom the ocean, or reach the uttermost parts of the earth, as to compass our griefs or estimate our consolations, we must guard ourselves against a similar presumption, though our own discipline may have enlightened our eyes and instructed our judgments.

Two other dangers next present themselves to our notice, opposite in their character, but equally formidable. There is much fear that the soul which has suffered much should become callous, and this peril may be enhanced by the very tendency of the mind, (to turn to pleasant thoughts wherever they can be found,) which has been mentioned as one of the happiest circumstances of our nature. It is a privilege which the Father of mercies has conferred on his rational offspring; and while it serves as an alleviation of our griefs and a means of refreshment and invigoration to the soul, it can be subservient only to good: but when we make use of it to turn our minds from serious reflection, to escape from Him who would purify us by salutary discipline, we convert our privilege into a curse. If, when we find our hopes disappointed and our blessings withdrawn, we can find a refuge from regret in the trifling interests of the world, if we play the truant to avoid our punishment, we must not congratulate ourselves on bearing it well; but should rather mourn that what ought to be the most efficacious means of grace does but harden our hearts, accumulate new perils upon our heads, and augment the heavy reckoning which futurity has in store against us. To this danger the strong and high spirit is most exposed: to its opposite, timidity, the gentle and humble soul is peculiarly liable.

But few words are necessary here. Those who have known what real sorrow is, know also what it is to tremble at every breath, to dread every change, to strain the aching sight to discern what new evils lie in the clouded future, to have a superstitious, unacknowledged feeling that every effort will end in disappointment, every blessing prove a snare, every acquisition give place to bereavement. They scarcely dare approach the streams of God's bounty lest they should be defiled with blood, and are ready to refuse to taste the fruits which he showers into their lap, lest they should find them dust and bitter ashes. This timidity may, for a while, consist with a desire to acquiesce in the appointments of Providence; but if not timely checked, it will lead through the gradations of despondency, ingratitude, and insensibility, to Atheism, speculative and practical.

Many more are the snares into which the unwary may fall in a state which is too often thought to be one of peculiar safety. But those which remain will suggest themselves to the mind of the reader under some of the preceding heads. The principal of those on which we cannot now enlarge are dreaminess,—living in a world of imagination and sentiment—and listlessness in the performance of necessary but irksome duties. The first arises from the before-mentioned error of fancying that the subjects of discipline are the objects of God's peculiar favour, in a strictly literal sense; the last,

from the selfishness against which, in various forms, we have been warning the reader. It is so evidently hostile to all improvement, so fatal to the hopes which ought to be the Christian's chief treasure, and all arguments against it are so obvious and so common, that the mere mention of it is sufficient here.

Of all these perils, those are the most formidable which endanger the sincerity and ingenuousness of the heart. But the soul may be lost where sincerity and resignation both exist; want of circumspection alone may be fatal. How important is this truth to us!

A man may mourn most deeply and most truly; he may earnestly desire to exercise resignation; he may, with the utmost sincerity, declare to himself that he does not wish one circumstance of his lot to be altered, and yet fall into snares as dangerous as any which can be found in the flowery paths of prosperity. He may arise in the morning, and pray with real devotion for resignation to bear, and strength to support, and then go forth, satisfied that the blessing of God is on him, and that he must necessarily be benefited by his trial. But when he enters the bustling scenes of the world, he fears to surrender himself to his accustomed impulses of activity, and to his long-formed habits of employment. He is ashamed if he find that the objects before him have beguiled him of his grief for a while; he asks himself if the innocent enjoyment into which he was beginning to enter is not inconsistent with the regret which he owes to the memory of the friend he has lost, or the sympathy which is due to those with whom he is suffering. He remembers that he is in affliction, and has a vague idea that a peculiar frame of thought and manners must be maintained for some time after the blow has fallen. The consciousness of peculiar circumstances hangs upon him, and makes him look in every face for condolence, in every occurrence for consideration to his feelings, in every word for sympathy. He has heard and read so much of the experience of persons under trial, and knows so well how their demeanour is made a subject of speculation, that he believes it necessary to relate his own feelings, and to watch that his own behaviour accords with his circumstances. If he writes a letter to a friend, he fills his sheet with his thoughts of resignation; he tells of his consolations, his hopes, and the blessings which remain to him; and if he finds himself stopping his pen to choose his expressions, if he detects himself *painting* with words, if a suspicion flits across his mind that he is exciting his feelings in order to write, rather than writing to give a natural relief to his feelings, he recurs to the old impression that some record of his present state should remain, and that it is for the glory of religion that he should shew how great and how various are her consolations. Thus he passes the day, desiring that the will of God should be his will, and believing that it is so; but, in reality, thinking only of himself, and living only to himself. If, in the silent watches of the night, sad thoughts arise, and the tender remembrance of lost blessings comes to awaken the deepest emotions of his soul, he waters his pillow with tears, and indulges the anguish of a wounded spirit; still assuring himself that he does not and will not repine, and that this grief is only the fitting tribute of faithful affection. Again he rises, with an aching head and a heavy heart, wearied and enervated, and more engrossed with himself than ever, though he may again pray, and pray with sincerity, "Thy will be done." What are the consequences of such a course of feeling and action as this? What but daily increasing selfishness; morbid feelings which, instead of retaining or deepening their intensity, must induce insensibility; a gradual forgetfulness of God and disregard of duty; a growing craving for the sympathy, the

approbation, the applause of others; a paramount desire of being interesting, and the sacrifice of one thing after another, of *all*, for the sake of being so! Can any one say that this is an exaggerated picture? Happy is he who has never known such a victim to the dangers of adversity; but happier is he who has resisted and overcome similar perils, who has properly estimated his blessings while he possessed them, and become better by resigning them!

The means of such improvement are natural to some minds, easy to others, and attainable by all. The grand rule is to look to *principles*, and to leave *feelings* to take care of themselves. This rule includes every thing. Principle will lead the mourner to refer all to God; principle will oblige him to forget himself, and will suggest to him continual occasions of doing good to others. Principle will teach him that affliction is not intended to set him apart from others, but to enlighten his views of his relation to them, to exalt his affections towards them, to animate his efforts in their behalf. He must, sometimes, notwithstanding his endeavours to forget himself, feel what an aching void sorrow has left in his heart; but, instead of turning his view inwards to behold the desolation there, he will look abroad with a searching eye on the varied aspects which life presents to him: he will gather together all the images of peace, hope, and joy, which he can lay hold on, to supply the cravings of his affections. He will go forth into the world from the house of mourning, calm and erect, prepared to abide its storms, and ready to welcome its sunshine. He will have smiles for the infant, and a heart open to its little joys: he will have cheerfulness for the aged, and a ready hand to help their infirmities; he will have words of encouragement and of warning for the young, and a watchful eye to protect their interests; he will rejoice in their brilliant hopes as if they were his own, and will grieve for their destruction as if the loss were his. While he can "rejoice with those who rejoice," he will bury his peculiar griefs in his own bosom: when called on to "weep with those that weep," he will speak of himself only so far as to tell where he found the supports and comforts which, by the blessing of God, have been his. He does not desire to shroud his mind in mystery; it is there, clear and transparent, for all to look into who choose: he only wishes that the gusts of passion should not ruffle, or the clouds of despondency overshadow it. His regard to duty imposes on him the care of his health and of his tranquillity. The works of God are his study abroad; the word of God employs him at home. He keeps his powers in full exercise all day, and at night he seeks and obtains rest; or, if darkness and silence exert on him their peculiar influence of calling up the shadows of departed joys, he endeavours to be grateful that these joys *were* his; he estimates the privileges they have afforded him, and numbers the blessings he has left: he listens to the assurances of faith, that all these and many more are laid up for him as a treasure in heaven; and his soul glows with the resolution, that where his treasure is, there his heart shall be also. It requires no great discernment to trace the further progress of his discipline. We need only look at some who have thus trodden their thorny path, and then we may see how he will daily advance in the love of God and man, and in fitness for his heavenly destiny. He will attain the heights of holiness, and will encourage many to follow him thither; for he will say, by example, though not in words, "Be of good cheer; I have overcome the world."

Where one such sufferer is seen, we may rejoice in the power of religion, tended and cherished by adversity: when we see several, a whole family, submitting to the will of God, and working out their own and each other's

salvation, in patience and self-oblivion, we may glory that such a sanctuary abides on earth for the spirit of holiness to dwell in. Such a family are God's peculiar people, and if their obedience to his commands will not avail to exclude the angel of chastisement from their abode, a milder presence will soon follow to repair the devastation, and to whisper the gracious benediction, "Peace be to this house." Peace will remain with them, will rest upon them when they go out and when they come in; when they lie down and when they rise up; in the dwelling and in the field; in the house of God, and in the intercourses of the world.

But to the single-hearted and the confiding only does God send his messengers of peace. They who hope to purchase the applause of the world by their resignation, they who govern themselves by the world's rule, they who regard not God while they speak of his dispensations, who harden themselves under his discipline and defy his visitations, they who cower before him in an abject spirit, and "tremble wrongly or too much," till fear spreads an impenetrable veil before their eyes, may at length sigh in vain for inflictions as mild as those they have already sustained, and may with anguish remember the warning, that "not all who cry Lord! Lord! shall enter the kingdom of heaven," or the awful inquiry, "Without faith, how can a man be saved?" Their heavenly Parent would have gathered them unto him, as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings; and they would not. Shall they then wonder that the refuge which they refused is at length denied them, and that they are left in sorrow to mourn their just and inevitable exclusion?

V.

JOURNAL OF A RESIDENCE OF TEN WEEKS AMONG THE WALDENSES,
IN THE MONTHS OF OCTOBER, NOVEMBER, AND DECEMBER, BY G.
KENRICK.

(Continued from page 418.)

First Visit to the Valley of Lucerna, continued.

THIS narrative is in substance a journal kept during my residence at La Tour, in the Valley of Lucerna. In transcribing it for the Monthly Repository some additional facts and illustrations have been inserted in their proper places. In cases where exact accuracy seemed to be of importance, I have preferred giving the names, and, as far as I could recollect, the words of my informant. Should this narrative chance to meet the eye of the excellent Moderator of the Vaudois Church, or of any others of my friends among the Pastors, they will not, I am persuaded, think I have taken too great a liberty in publishing information communicated in conversations. In so doing I have only imitated the example of their warm friend and admirer Mr. Gilly, and of several other travellers who have visited them and published their accounts of late years, and I could in no other way have so satisfactorily shewn that the Protestants of the Valleys of Piedmont have not barely a claim to relief under their present difficulties and privations, on the narrow ground of their supposed accordance in doctrine and discipline with a particular sect, but that, as the zealous advocates of Christian liberty in its full extent, and as firm maintainers and patient sufferers in behalf of those grand fundamental principles on which the church of Christ was originally founded, and which ought to raise the Christian above all the littleness of party, they are deserving of the sympathy, the approbation, and the imitation of Protestant Europe.

On Sunday, October 22, I again attended M. Bért, at La Tour, who gave us a discourse of greater length and considerably more force and energy than the former. His text was Eccles. viii. 11: "Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil." He began with saying, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt die." But Adam ate of the forbidden fruit, and did *not* die for a considerable time. God had important designs to answer by the prolongation of Adam's life, and was graciously pleased to grant him a respite from the execution of his sentence, which gave him time to repent and bitterly lament his transgression, and to acquaint his descendants with the dealings of the Lord towards him.

In our days, also, when men transgress the commandments of God, the penalty is often long in following the offence. And it is on this account that the heart of the sons of men triumphs in security, and, abusing the forbearance of the Almighty, is fully set in them to do evil.

"I purpose shewing you at present, first, that if the whole sentence against crime were executed in the instant of transgression, there would cease to be any such thing as VIRTUE in the world. Second,—That the offender does really *begin* to feel the effect of his crime as soon as it is committed. And third,—That unless he repent and avert the Divine displeasure from his head, the *full* punishment of sin, although deferred, will certainly overtake him in the end. May our Heavenly Father, who giveth every good gift to them who ask him in sincerity, grant that the words of his servant may be effectual to the improvement of the hearer, and the vindication of his ways before men, which we humbly ask in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen." Under the first head the preacher observed, that were the thunderbolt of the Divine displeasure instantly and invariably hurled at the head of the criminal, the terror with which this would inspire our minds must necessarily destroy the nature of virtue, which consists in a filial obedience proceeding from a principle of love. Besides, the immediate death of the sinner would preclude the possibility of his repentance and reformation, and deprive his brethren of the good effects arising from the sight of a sinner turning from the errors of his way. The *occasional* occurrence of this instantaneous punishment answers all the purposes of a salutary warning; while, on the other hand, the example of those who live and reform their conduct is of the greatest service to the world, as well as a theme of joy and exultation to the inhabitants of heaven, as we learn from the words of our Saviour in the fifteenth chapter of Matthew's gospel. Under the second he remarked, that although the sentence against the wicked be not fully executed here below, yet that conscience anticipates the sentence of the Judge, and begins to punish the offender almost in the instant of commission. His ruined health, loss of reputation, and dissipated property, were likewise to be considered in the same light. Under the third head he remarked, that death would soon seal the fate of the transgressor, "and after death is the judgment;" "and after the judgment—but here," said the preacher, "I content myself with saying, *he is in the hands of God!*"

I have done but little justice to this discourse, many passages of which were very striking. I could not help remarking that the conclusion shewed the mildness and forbearance of the preacher's own disposition. "Many an orthodox preacher in my own country," I thought, "would have dwelt *principally* on the eternity of *hell torments* as the only means of vindicating God's justice in permitting sinners to live in this world. But the pastor of La Tour delights to represent the gospel as a message of peace and joy, and

when he touches upon the more awful parts of the Divine dealings to men, does it with pain and from a consciousness of duty, and with feelings full of pity for the offender." M. Bert professes the usual doctrines of orthodoxy, but I soon found that he was no bigoted sectarian or dogmatist upon any subject.

On Sunday, October 29th, I went to Bobio, six miles up the Valley of Lucerna, to hear M. Muston, who is secretary to the "Table," or Committee of the Synod. His discourse was on a Future Judgment,—a good practical sermon. As there was here, as at La Tour, not the slightest trace of the peculiarities of orthodoxy in the prayers, hymns, or sermon, I took the liberty of remarking to M. Muston, with whom I dined, that from all I had heard of the Vaudois in England, I was greatly astonished to hear nothing in their services in which all sects, even an Unitarian Christian like myself, could not cordially join. I had expected, for example, that more prayers would be addressed to Christ than in the Common Prayer of the Church of England, the occurrence of which formed the principal ground of our separation. Whereas, I had not heard any prayers addressed to any other Being than the Father. "Do you never address any part of your worship to the Son?" "In my opinion," replied M. Muston, "it would be idolatry. We know him only in the gospel dispensation as a man, sent by God for the salvation of our souls; although it be true, that by reasoning from the extraordinary nature of his miracles and the sublimity of his doctrine, we discover something of the Divinity (or of his divinity), '*nous decouvrons quelque chose de la divinité.*' He appears to us in the gospel uniformly as a man, and he himself gave us a model for our prayers in which the Father alone is addressed, and declared, that "this is life eternal to know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." Can we do better than follow his instructions and example? There are mysteries we cannot comprehend, but our concern is to worship God and imitate Jesus Christ, and obey his precepts." "Do the Vaudois then," I inquired, "consider nothing more to be necessary to constitute a Christian than a belief in one God, and in Jesus Christ as the Messiah?" "Certainly not," replied Muston M. "Are not those the terms laid down in the gospel? And I cannot conceive," he added, "why Protestants should be divided into so many sects. I speak my sentiments freely on this subject to the members of M. Malan's church, and I put the matter lately in such a light to one of them, who came to see me, that he was unable to reply to me. I think spiritual pride and a want of forbearance must be at the bottom of it." I observed, that in England the church established by law, and most of the other sects, represented their own peculiar views essential to the character of a Christian, and to acceptance with God. "There they are wrong," said he: "that is what I should not like. I should agree more nearly with you than with any other sect. We are in accordance upon all that is essential."

On Sunday, November 5th, I again heard M. Bert. The subject was the Duty of Parents to their Children. It was the day on which was announced the re-opening of the central or "*grande école*," and of the other ten elementary schools in M. Bert's parish, after the long vacation which is given during the vintage season. In the first of these schools, supported at the expense of the whole parish, with the aid of foreign Protestants, a somewhat *superior* kind of instruction is given (to a limited number of scholars), but so as not to interfere with the classical school, for the Valleys at large, kept at La Tour. In the other ten schools, kept at the expense of each of the ten sections, or "*quartiers*," into which the pa-

ish is divided, all the children are gratuitously instructed in reading and writing alone. Every parish is similarly divided, and has similar schools, proportioned in number to the size of the parish. But, through the poverty of the inhabitants, they are, in many instances, only able to keep their school open for a few weeks in the year. When Providence moves the heart of any of their "*English benefactors*" to send a few francs more than usual, there is great rejoicing, that the school of such or such a "*quartier*" can be kept open a fortnight longer, this winter! Several of M. Bert's parishioners informed me that their pastor was remarked for adapting his discourses to whatever happened to be going on in the parish, or around them. He had lately preached on the vintage season; his present discourse had a particular view to the re-opening of the schools. He very affectionately enforced on parents the duty of providing for the instruction and improvement of their children by sending them to their several schools, and, at the same time, seconding the exertions of the schoolmaster by reading the Scriptures with them at home, praying to God with them and on their behalf, and teaching them to sing psalms to his praise. This last, he observed, the singing of psalms in a family, had a great effect in cultivating a pious spirit in young minds. And how much preferable was this to the singing of idle songs they might otherwise learn, which might exhilarate the spirits for a moment, but left no useful impression on the mind. He observed, that notwithstanding the great facilities for elementary instruction they now enjoyed in the Valleys, owing to the kindness of their *foreign* benefactors, it was a lamentable fact, that *every* Vaudois could not yet read and study the Scriptures for himself. "Those of you, my friends," he said, "whose misfortune this is, ought to be particularly careful always to enter the church in good time, to hear the Scriptures read by the schoolmaster, a custom adopted amongst us specially for your use. But it is a disgraceful thing to observe that the schoolmaster remains reading the Bible for a considerable time to a very few persons, while the majority of you prefer to stand talking at the gate. Placed as you are, my dear brethren, in these Valleys, in the midst of persons of *another* communion, differing from you, I stop not to remark in forms, for forms are nothing, but materially differing from you in religious belief, is it not peculiarly your duty to be ready to give to every one who may ask it some good reason for your faith? That faith which, through the blessing of God, our fathers preserved for so many centuries, and which they so often bled to maintain uncorrupted! Your brethren of the *other* communion are always on the watch and full of zeal for the making of converts; and is there not the greatest probability of their success, if they find you unarmed with the knowledge of the Scriptures?"

Between Michaelmas and Christmas, every year, M. Bert, like the rest of his brethren, makes a *visit* to each of the "*quartiers*" of his parish. These visits are called *examinations*, because it was anciently the custom to examine each individual separately respecting his knowledge of religion. This is still the practice in some of the parishes; but in others, that of La Tour in particular, the population is too numerous to admit of this, and the pastor only delivers an address to each assembled quarter in turn. If there happen to be any differences, or other grounds of complaint, they are then likewise submitted to the pastor's decision. These meetings have the effect of bringing every member of a widely scattered flock into a closer intimacy and friendship with their shepherd. He dines and spends the rest of the day in social converse with one or other of the families of the quarter.

M. Bert, who was exceedingly attentive to me, was particularly desirous I should accompany him in some of these visits, as he said the practice was

peculiar to the Valleys. He invited me to accompany him to one of the quarters, where, he said, they assembled *in a stable*, for want of an apartment of sufficient size, and that from the crowd and warmth he was obliged to *take off his coat*. The Moderator of the Vaudois Church, or, as Mr. Gilly takes pleasure in calling him, their "*Archbishop*," preaching in a stable in *sleeves*, but not of *fine lawn*!

My health not permitting me to accept of this invitation, I was glad to avail myself of another opportunity of hearing him, where I did not expect the place would be so confined, in the village of La Tour itself. Here I found him addressing the quarter, not in a stable, but in a large wood-house, or cellar. He was explaining the nature and design of our redemption through Christ. He observed, that mankind had a general belief of the necessity of some kind of sacrifice for sin: hence all those bloody expiations by which the Heathen sought to appease the wrath of their gods. Sacrifices abounded in the Jewish ritual; but they were misunderstood and abused; and God was continually complaining by the mouth of his ancient prophets of the mistaken confidence which the people placed in the virtue of sacrifices for sin; and that, while they multiplied sacrifices, they neglected to obey commands, which was better than any sacrifice they could offer him. Under the Christian dispensation, our High Priest once offered up himself, that there might be no more need of sacrifice for sin; "thus shewing, as an English writer observes," said M. Bert, "how dear his children were to our heavenly Father; for even the angels were never the objects of redemption; 'but we are redeemed,' as the apostle says, 'by the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without spot and without blemish.' We are redeemed from sin and iniquity to do good works, to lead us to perform which is the grand design of the death of Christ, without which he died for us in vain. He offered himself a sacrifice, leaving us an example that we should follow his steps—that we should sacrifice our hearts to God, and be ready to sacrifice our lives too, in imitation of his example, whenever it should be necessary to preserve our faith and keep a good conscience. We are called upon still to offer the sacrifice of ourselves to God by obedience to his commands, following the steps of our divine Master, who became obedient unto death." The latter part of M. Bert's address explained the meaning of a favourite phrase which I heard several times in his prayers and discourses in speaking of the death of Christ, that he died, leaving us an example that we should follow his steps. He said nothing which implied that he regarded the death of our Saviour as being, strictly speaking, an *equivalent* paid to the Father for the debt of moral obedience due to him from his creatures; nor did he describe and distinguish the offices of the three persons of the Trinity in the work of redemption; nor did he paint in glowing colours the wrath of an angry Deity, which nothing but blood could appease; nor, in short, did he employ any language in which all Christians could not agree, inasmuch as it adhered closely to the sentiments and language of those Scriptures which all receive as divine.

A few days afterwards, I attended another of these pleasing unions of the pastor with a portion of his flock separated from the rest, that he might apply himself to their peculiar wants, and adapt his exhortations to their peculiar circumstances. In this instance the quarter was a hamlet, a short distance from the village, and a part of which is mountainous. Most of the persons present were engaged in agricultural or pastoral labour, and, with his usual judgment, the pastor's address was specially adapted to their employments. The main topic of the address was the duty and means of cultivating a pious

spirit. "And here, I suppose, I shall meet with an objection in the outset," said he. "We have no time, particularly at this season of the year, when we have so much business to do that we can scarcely get to church. The chesnuts must be gathered in, or they will spoil or be lost. The cattle must be provided for against winter, or they will die. Business! What is man's business here but to please his Maker? But your worldly business may be going on, and the great business of religion be promoted by it. Your occupations are of a nature to lead you constantly to think of God. The lands of some of you who live in the lower ground produce great abundance of maize, (or Turkish wheat,) and nothing can be more wonderful than the increase of this plant. You sow the seed *in hope*, and such is the bounty of Divine Providence, that your hope of a vast increase is rarely disappointed. When you see those lofty, sturdy plants rising up almost into trees from so small a seed, and observe how strongly the grain is fortified against the effects of weather and other injuries by its thick outward covering, which you cannot break asunder but with violence, can you help thinking of *Him* whose wisdom has thus given effect to his kind intentions towards you? Others of you are situated higher up the mountains, amidst the extensive woods of chesnuts with which nature has surrounded us. And perhaps you may sometimes be disposed to complain, 'My land produces me nothing but chesnuts.' But have you never considered that these chesnuts are the free gift of Divine Providence, which the sweat of your brows has never watered? You sowed no seed; no labour of yours reared and defended them; but there the trees stand, laden with fruit in their season. You have not even the trouble and danger of climbing them to secure your harvest. The fruit drops to the ground by its own weight as soon as it is ripe, without your interference, and in so great a quantity that it must perish, consumed by insects or devoured by other animals, were it not for another wise provision of Providence, who has marked it for the sustenance of man, by inclosing it with great nicety in a *case*, armed on the outside with prickles, which prevent any of the beasts of the earth from getting at it. It is found in such profuse abundance, and keeps so well, (owing to its being still protected by a second covering when the first is removed,) that it affords you a considerable part of your sustenance through the whole winter. These are reflections connected with the occupations of the mere mountaineer. By such thoughts as these his soul is led to the Great Eternal Source of good. But none of you need be so busy as to leave no time for the reading of the Scriptures. By the liberality of our English benefactors and others, every Vaudois family may soon be provided with a copy of the Bible, as a fresh stock is now on the road. Some already possess several, but henceforth no family need be without *one* copy of the word of God. And let me exhort you, my dear brethren, not to put this precious light of divine truth under a bushel; for example, to put it carefully by in a closet along with the garments which you have not in constant use; but to place it on a candlestick, that the whole house may be enlightened; that is to say, let one read aloud, that the whole family may have the benefit of it.

"I have likewise to exhort the parents of this quarter to do their duty to their children by sending them to the school, but more particularly, by an early and careful attention, to correct what is amiss in their tempers and behaviour. The term *original sin*, is one which we scarcely employ (*le péché original est un mot que nous n'employons guères*); nevertheless, every one must have observed a propensity in children, from their earliest infancy, to catch at what they see other children have, and as soon as they

have received a blow to return it. This disposition God has enabled us to correct, by watchfulness, prayer, and the aid of his grace, which he never refuses to them who ask it in sincerity. But unless parents will conscientiously perform their duty by correcting the first indications of this disposition in their children, there is little hope that the man will ever get rid of it.

And let me exhort all, young and old, to a steadfast perseverance in the faith and practice of our fathers, and a thankful improvement of the peace and means of religious instruction we enjoy in the present day. For these we are mainly indebted to our distant friends, whom Providence has raised up to visit us and support our schools. But what is it, my friends, which brings strangers from the other end of Europe to visit us? Nothing curious that we have here to shew them; but they come amongst us to see *genuine Vaudois*, who are deserving of the name, who still maintain with zeal and constancy that religion which they received at the first from the apostles or their companions, and which their ancestors so often bled to defend.

“Last of all, I exhort you to love one another. I bless the Lord on your behalf, my dear brethren, that you all of the quarter of St. Marguerite, who met me here this time twelvemonth, are alive this day, and enabled to join your voices together in singing the praises of your heavenly Father; and I call upon you to shew your gratitude to him, by living in peace in this neighbourhood, and loving one another. I might say, consider *me, your pastor*, as your *father*, or the elder of your quarter, now present. But I forbear: God is your Father, and is pleased when he sees his children loving, aiding, consoling one another, which may he grant, through Jesus Christ our Lord.”

THE MOTHER.

“OF Prince William Henry, who was for a long time resident at Hanover, I heard a trait which does honour to his heart. One day he met a woman leading in her hand a half-naked boy. ‘Will you sell me your child?’ asked the Prince. ‘You may be a very rich gentleman,’ she answered, ‘but I would not take all your money in exchange for my child.’ ‘Why not?’ said the Prince. ‘Do you know then who I am? But come to-morrow to the castle, and if, indeed, I am not in circumstances to purchase your son, at least I can provide for him.’ The woman appeared the next morning, as he had desired, and the Prince not only had the boy creditably educated, but promised to take him into his service, if he should prove honest and diligent.”—*Letters from the Continent, by Frederic Matthieson, translated by Anne Plumptre, p. 36.*

“Thy babe is naked, hungry, cold,
And thou art poor and famish'd too;
Exchange thy baby for this gold,
’Twill buy thee bread and clothing new.”

“Sore press'd by poverty we roam,—
My babe and I have scarce to eat,—
No friend we have, nor shelt'ring home—
Expos'd to all the storms that beat;

“ And thou dost dwell in lordly hall,
 Where cold and want can ne'er intrude,
 Where riches furnish at thy call
 Both costly dress and dainty food :

“ Yet all thy gold is worthless ore ;
 More dear my boy, though nurs'd in woe,
 Than all thy state, than all thy store—
 A *Mother's* heart thou ill dost know !”

“ Thy tears rebuke my folly's aim !
 My wealth thy treasure cannot buy ;
 Yet shall it answer mis'ry's claim,
 And light up pleasure in thine eye.

“ Beneath my care thy boy shall grow,
 While thou his rising worth shalt tend ;
 Your wand'rings o'er, ye yet shall know
 A home, and comfort, and a friend.”

Birmingham.

H. H.

MEMOIRS OF THE SOCINI.

ALEXANDER SOCINUS.

ALEXANDER was the eldest of the numerous offspring of Marianus Socinus.* He was destined from infancy for his father's profession, and gave early indications of superior genius and talents. After prosecuting his legal studies under the ablest masters at Siena and Padua, he took his doctor's degree in both laws at Siena in 1530, previously to which he had maintained with great applause three hundred theses, first for five days at Padua, and afterwards for two days at the university of his native city. Here he held for some time the office of one of the professors of Civil Law : he then removed to Padua, with the appointment of Professor in Ordinary, and acquitted himself with distinguished reputation. Owing to some dissensions, which arose between him and the other professors, he quitted this university for that of Siena, where he again occupied one of the law-chairs. In the year 1541, an academy was established at Macerata, to which he was appointed Law professor with a very liberal salary. The year after his settlement at this place, he caught a severe cold in consequence of overheating himself in the amusement of playing ball, from the effects of which he died at the age of thirty-one. The high esteem in which he was held was evinced by the respect paid to his remains. The government of Macerata caused his body to be conveyed to Siena, accompanied by a guard of honour. Here he was buried in the family cemetery.

Alexander was married to Agnes Petrucci, daughter of Burgesius Petrucci and Victoria Piccoluomine. Burgesius had succeeded his father Pandulphus Petrucci as the head of the Republic of Siena, but was soon compelled to relinquish his station by an opposing faction. His death followed shortly after. His widow Victoria, who was related to many of the principal fami-

* See above, p. 423.

ties of the country, bore her loss with exemplary fortitude. For fifty years that she survived her husband she commanded universal respect and esteem by her amiable manners and excellent character. She is said to have bestowed peculiar care on the education of her daughter Agnes, to bring her up in a manner suitable to her rank, and to form her mind in habits of serious piety. When she bestowed her hand on Alexander Socinus he was considered a young man of high promise as to his acquirements and talents, and in every respect a suitable match. From this union was born Faustus Socinus, whom Pancirolus, writing when Faustus was very young, and little dreaming of his future heresy, styles *Preclari ingenii juvenis, parentum vestigia secuturus esse speratur*, a youth of excellent parts, who would, it was hoped, follow the footsteps of his parents. Alexander is described as a man of great acuteness of mind, of prodigious memory, and admirable eloquence. From the superiority of his genius he obtained the title of *Pater Subtilitatum*, the Father of Subtleties; because he pursued with brilliant success the studies for which his townsmen, and in an especial manner his own family, were pre-eminently distinguished.*

CELSUS SOCINUS.

Celsus was another son of Marianus Socinus. He was educated for the legal profession, and for some time taught the Civil and Canon Laws in the university of Siena, from whence he removed to Bologna, to undertake the office of professor of the Canon Law. On the death of his father he was appointed his successor at Macerata, where, however, he remained only for a short period. Little is known of his subsequent history. It has been stated, but apparently without sufficient evidence, that he was appointed to a professor's chair at the university of Jena. There is reason to believe that a change in his religious sentiments rendered it expedient or necessary for him to relinquish his profession. He subsequently quitted his native country and retired to Switzerland.†

CAMILLUS SOCINUS

was another member of the same family, who resided at Siena. Having embraced the reformed doctrines, and gone beyond many of his contemporaries in his opinions upon some subjects, he was compelled to seek an asylum in Switzerland. The family had at this time incurred the suspicion of heresy, and could no longer remain in safety in their native city. On his retirement to Switzerland he joined the other Italian refugees, and his name frequently occurs in the ecclesiastical annals of this country. His avowal of Anti-trinitarian sentiments exposed him to much odium and persecution, and ultimately caused his expulsion from the Swiss States. He was classed with the Anabaptists of that period, and his proceedings gave occasion to a noted debate in a synod held at Coire in the Grisons in 1571, on the subject of the punishment of heretics. Though many advocated the more liberal side of the question, the majority were for rendering religious opinions the subject of penal inflictions, and decided against him. By Da Porta, the historian, who probably speaks the language of his adversaries and calumniators, he is styled a crafty and absurd man; but by others, who were more favourably inclined to his sentiments, he is represented as an

* Pancirolus in *Vita Alexandri Socini; Vita Fausti Socini Senensis descripta ab equite Polono*, pp. 3; &c.; Bock, *Hist. Antitrim.* Tom. II. p. 575.

† Pancirolus in *Vita Celsi Socini; Vita Fausti Socini, ut supra*, Bock, II. p. 576.

upright and pious person, zealous in the vindication of the truth against the new pharisees.*

CORNELIUS SOCINUS.

Cornelius is mentioned by Przypcovius as residing with his brother Camillus at Siena. The suspicion of heresy, which now attached to the family, caused him to be arrested by the emissaries of the church, and thrown into prison. He was fortunate enough, however, to elude their vigilance, and succeeded in escaping to Switzerland, where he joined his brothers.†

In the account of the dispersion of the college or society of Vincenza in 1546,‡ occur the names of Darius and Lælius Socinus. Darius Socinus was not the brother, but probably a near relation of the persons just enumerated. He fled to Switzerland, and resided for some time in the Grisons, whence he removed to Poland, and finally to Moravia.§

Lælius was the youngest son of Marianus Socinus; his history will be next considered.

R. S.

CARDINAL XIMENES' MANUSCRIPTS.

To the Editor.

SIR,

Hackney, July 2, 1827.

ALLOW me to refer Mr. Rowe to a letter in Vol. XVI., p. 203, of the Monthly Repository, O. S., which I think sets the matter at rest respecting the manuscripts employed by Ximenes for his Polyglot. The story of their destruction is a very idle fable, and credulity has been rather daringly practised on by the statement that Professor Moldenhawer saw in 1784 the receipt given by the rocket-maker in 1749 to the ignorant librarian who had sold the manuscripts! These manuscripts must have been strangely resuscitated after their "blowing up," since it is only four or five years since that the fingers holding this disbelieving pen turned over the seven which Gomez, who wrote in the sixteenth century, refers to as the seven Hebrew manuscripts used by the "unlimitedly munificent cardinal." A catalogue of the Alcala manuscripts was made there in 1745, which contains no other than those now existing. That the manuscripts referred to are modern and valueless, there can be no longer any question. "Error," "inadvertence," "precipitation," seem to me rather erroneously, inadvertently and precipitately charged on this occasion to the learned commentator on Michaelis. "Unwarranted inference," "extraordinary observation," "curious critique," "marvellous deduction," "absolutely inexplicable mistake," are terms of scorn and levity which might have been better spared by your very zealous correspondent. Of the competent sagacity of Ximenes himself to estimate the antiquity of the manuscripts he used, I have some doubt; and a little more inquiry into the character of the cardinal will satisfy Mr. Rowe, that his munificence "was limited" by no small portion of meanness and avarice.

JOHN BOWRING.

* *Vita Faustii Socini, ut sup.*; Da Porta, *Hist. Reform. Eccles. Ræticarum*, Tom. I. Lib. ii. p. 544; Bock, 576.

† Bock, II. 576, 624.

‡ Lubieniecus, p. 39; Sandius, B. A., p. 19.

§ Bock, II. 577; Lubieniecus, p. 40.

ON MR. BELLAMY'S TRANSLATION OF THE COMMAND OF JOSHUA.

To the Editor.

SIR,

THE intention of the present paper is to point out to your readers Mr. Bellamy's elucidation of that singular passage in Joshua x. 12 and 13, respecting the sun and moon standing still, a passage which has at once called forth the sneers of the infidel and the sighs of the devout Christian, which has baffled the ingenuity of a Michaelis, and only served to confirm the daring conjectures of an Eichhorn, and to which, in short, no fair or legitimate sense has (to my knowledge at least) been given by any other commentator, although Maimonides and other learned Rabbis inform us that no such miracle as that which is here alluded to was ever understood by the ancients to have been performed.

Before I proceed to give the new translation proposed by Mr. Bellamy, and which the reader will find in the last number of his Bible, it may not be amiss briefly to allude to the situation in which Joshua was, when he is described as performing the singular miracle of causing, *at his own command*, "the sun to stand still in the midst of heaven, and the moon to stay." "The writer," observes an author no ways favourable to the sacred Scriptures, but whose remarks in this case are sufficiently correct, "describes the battle between the Israelites and the Amorites, in the 8th, 9th, 10th and 11th verses, and concludes the paragraph with the total overthrow of the idolatrous enemies of the Hebrews under Joshua, whom they pursued, and drove them into their fenced cities. It is absurd, therefore, to suppose that after the battle and conquest are described, and the remaining part of the Amorites had fled, the writer should return to give a fresh account of the same transactions, or that there was a necessity for a miracle to be wrought to conquer the Amorites, when the account states that it was already done before the sun and moon are said to have stood still." Independently of the absurdity here noticed, it may be fairly asked, with Mr. Bellamy, of what occasion the light of the moon might be—or even of what effect—when the sun was shining "in the midst of heaven"? And we may further inquire with him, what influence the miracle may have had on all the hills and all the valleys of half the world, besides Mount Gibeon and the Valley of Ajalon, and also what was doing during the corresponding hours of darkness in the other half of the world, in the absence of the sun?

Besides the objections here made to the miracle of the sun and moon standing still, or rather to the rendering of this passage in the authorized versions, there is one circumstance in the narrative which has rendered it extremely suspicious in the minds of many who do not otherwise trouble themselves with critical niceties, although frequently unwilling to think for themselves, and trusting too much to the authority of others. The circumstance to which I allude, and which I know has puzzled many devout Christians, who for the sake of peace would rather continue in uncertainty, as far as they are personally concerned, than unsettle the minds of their neighbours by causing them to doubt, is, that in the performance of a miracle of no less magnitude than that of arresting the course of the sun and the moon, (the reader will always pardon me for adhering to an expression as unphilosophical as it is repugnant to the whole tenour of the Scriptures,*) a Jewish

* As I take my stand on the immutability of God, and the consequent immutability of those laws by which he governs the universe, and am, therefore, imperi-

chieftain should dare to act, *proprio Marte*, by his own sole power, and independent of the authority of the Almighty Jehovah! Contrary to the mode of announcing every other miracle in the preceding books of Scripture—and the reader will here give me credit for not wishing to do away with miracles in the sacred Scriptures indiscriminately—the important words *וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה* are not to be met with in the passage before us; a deficiency which, as it is sufficient to awaken the fears of the devout but less erudite Christian, cannot fail to put the more learned on his guard, and apprize him of an error which it becomes his duty to endeavour to rectify.

Mr. Bellamy's translation of the passage more immediately referring to the sun and moon in Joshua, is contained in the twelfth and the first clause of the thirteenth verses of the tenth chapter, and is to the following effect:

Ver. 12. Therefore Joshua will (shall) declare before Jehovah concerning the day when Jehovah delivered up the Amorites in the presence of the children of Israel, when he commanded, in the sight of Israel, the sun setting in Gibeon, and the moon being in the valley of Ajalon.

Ver. 13. Then the sun set and the moon arose, when the people avenged themselves of their enemies, &c., &c.

The first verse under consideration, as translated by Mr. Bellamy, contains sundry variations from the authorized version; but as the significations which he has in every case attached to the original Hebrew are shewn by him in other parts of his Bible to be used for the same Hebrew words even in our authorized translation, and as, moreover, this can easily be confirmed by referring to the common Dictionaries, it would be a mere waste of time to dwell further on them here. It is, however, a singular circumstance, that in this very verse, two verbs which Mr. Bellamy has rendered differently in point of meaning, from the King's Bible, stand in the original Hebrew also, in tenses which are not preserved in the common version. Thus *וַיֹּאמֶר* *he will (shall) declare*, the 3rd pers. sing. fut. pih., (without the prefix *ו*), is rendered in our Bible by the 3rd pers. sing. pret., *he spake*; and, again, the verb *וַיָּשֶׁבֶט*, which, strictly speaking, is in the infinitive mood, is translated as if it were the imperative in our Authorized Version. The first case, I apprehend, requires no explanation; for a simple future in Hebrew without the *ו* prefixed, can never be rendered otherwise than in the future tense; but it may not be amiss to say a few words respecting the second verb *וַיָּשֶׁבֶט*. A writer in the Cassical Journal, signing himself T. W., who gravely brings forward various passages from Herodotus, Plato, the Chinese History, and Josephus, to prove that traces of the miracle recorded in our English version are to be found in profane history, although by some singular mistake not a word is said of the sun and moon standing still in any of the original passages quoted by him, makes Mr. Bellamy assert that this verb is in the participle active, and pretends that he has cited a variety of examples of verbs

ously led to consider any assertion by which this primary principle is either wholly or in part impugned, as an open insult to the Majesty of the Divine Being, I feel the more inclined to give the present Bishop of Salisbury and Professor Lee credit for their backwardness in accepting Mr. Bellamy's challenge to give a satisfactory interpretation of the passage respecting "the sun returning ten degrees, by which it was gone down on the sun-dial of Ahaz." There can certainly be nothing either "dignified or entertaining," as Colman has it, for a Bishop and a Professor to sit beneath "their laurels and their bays," and to proclaim to all the world, by their defence of the Authorized Version of 2 Kings xx. 8—11, and Isa. xxxviii. 7, 8, that blasphemy is consistent with orthodoxy. How far their silence may seem to warrant such a supposition, is a very different question.

in the same form as if they were participles active, whereas they are infinitives. Now, all that Mr. Bellamy has said on the subject is, that לָבוֹא is formed the same as בָּוֹא , מָוֹל , צֹם , &c., which are properly translated in the common version, as the participle active, by *coming*, *circumcising*, *fasting*, &c. The truth is, Mr. Bellamy knew well enough that לָבוֹא is in the infinitive mood, and, as a proof of it, has brought forth a host of examples in the infinitive likewise, although, according to the idiom of our language, they are very properly translated in the authorized Bible as participles active. What appears equally certain, is, that T. W., when objecting to Mr. Bellamy, that לָבוֹא is in the infinitive mood, and not in the participle active, is himself wholly ignorant of that peculiarity of Hebrew construction, according to which the infinitive is occasionally used to denote the *time being*, and which is then very suitably rendered into English by the participle active. As a proof of this I need only quote, in addition to the passages referred to by Mr. Bellamy, Isa. xxii. 13, $\text{וְהָיָה שִׂשׁוֹן וְשִׂמְחָהּ חֶרֶג בְּקֶר וְשַׁחַט צֹאן אֲכַל בֶּשֶׂר וְיֵין וְשִׂתוֹת יֵין}$ which is thus translated in the authorized version: "And behold joy and gladness, *slaying* oxen, and *killing* sheep, *eating* flesh, and *drinking* wine."

In the first clause of the thirteenth verse, Mr. Bellamy defends his variations on the same grounds as before; and as there appears no fair reason to question his right of following the received version whenever he thinks proper so to do, we are not, I presume, warranted in condemning the translation which he proposes, particularly as it must be allowed to yield good sense.

Thus much might be said to shew that on the strength of verbal criticism and correct grammatical construction alone, Mr. Bellamy's new version is consonant with the original. A consideration, however, of the time and place when and where the event, as narrated by Mr. Bellamy, is stated by the sacred writer to have occurred, will throw no small light on the whole transaction. The Israelites under Joshua were engaged in warfare with the idolatrous kings of the Amorites, whom they sought to vanquish in order to establish themselves in the land of Canaan. In the whole of the district where this contest took place, the inhabitants worshiped as their primary idols the symbols of (שֶׁמֶשׁ) the *sunlight* and of (יָרֵחַ) the *moonlight* in their temples, which, when dedicated to the former, were built on the tops of mountains or high places, but when dedicated to the latter, in valleys. It would also appear that Gibeon and Ajalon were noted places for the worship of these idols, the former of which lay eastward in the tribe of Benjamin, and the latter at a considerable distance directly to the west, on the extreme part of the land bounded by the Mediterranean sea. Now it was at the time that the Amorites were completely overthrown, that, agreeably to the Hebrew text and to Mr. Bellamy's version, one of those occurrences took place which are frequently termed by some "strange coincidences," whilst others designate them as "the special leadings of Providence," but which (however they may be called) are neither more nor less than divine miracles, inasmuch as they can in no wise be effected or controuled by human powers. In short, the victory was decided in favour of the Israelites, and to the destruction of the idolatry of the Amorites, precisely at the time of the full moon, when, in the words of the text, the sun was setting on Gibeon and the moon rising over Ajalon. But it would be unpardonable here not to let Mr. Bellamy speak for himself in his concluding note on this subject: "One thing is more singular," says he, "in the order of Divine Providence respecting the idolaters of Canaan. While their lights

were burning in their temples as symbols of the *sunlight* and the *moonlight*, and while the worship of the light of the two orbs, the sun and the moon, was celebrating, that Pagan abomination was totally destroyed about the full moon, when the sun was setting in *בִּתְּוֵי*, in the *division* (i. e. the horizon) of the heaven to the people of Gibeon, and when the moon was rising over the valley of Ajalon, both the luminaries being above the earth; evidently shewing to those bigoted nations that even the presence of their idols had no effect in restraining the power of the army of the Hebrews."

Let the reader now decide for himself, and either adopt or reject the proposed alterations of Mr. Bellamy in Joshua x. 12, 13. I wish to bias the judgment of no one: but, if the foregoing observations are true, I cannot pretend to conceal that in abandoning the authorized version we get rid of gross inaccuracies of translation, as well as of "a miracle for which there was no necessity," and which, when considered, according to the narrative, as the performance of a mere mortal, "outstrips in point of possibility all that has ever been told in the tales of the Talmud or the legends of the Koran."

JARCHI.

WITHERED BLOSSOMS.

THE blossoms are wither'd! we tread o'er their form
 On the plain, as we pass, without care for them now;
 In their frailty they met the rude shock of the storm,
 And they dropp'd, unprotected, unwept, from the bough.
 But lately we gazed on their beauties, and pray'd
 That the sunbeam would cherish and ripen their bloom,
 And we hop'd, ah how vainly, for see where they fade!
 'Twould be long ere the garden would lose their perfume.
 Thus often young Genius is prais'd and caress'd,
 While his morning of promise is splendid and gay;
 And bright seem his prospects of fame and of rest,
 Till the blast of detraction sweeps over his way.
 Oh, then, how the world views the fallen with scorn!
 How it heedlessly tramples the withering mind!
 Forgotten the charms which attracted at morn,
 All his worth, all his hopes, are to darkness consign'd.
 As dull and unfeeling the hearts of the crowd,
 To the pinings of Virtue in misery's hour;
 In the reign of her sunshine they greet her aloud,
 But leave her neglected when storms overpow'r.
 The many will tread on the best of their race,
 When ruin's sharp blight o'er their prospects has blown;
 Or coldly will gaze on the sufferer's face,
 Then pass on their way without pity or moan.
 Then court not the smiles of the world; they are vain!
 Nor trust in its promises,—fear not its strife:
 But cherish thy conscience through sorrow and pain,
 And confide in that Being, whose favour is life.
 For He, who decrees a new spring to appear,
 To adorn the sear bough with its splendours once more,
 Will cause joy to arise from each struggle and tear,
 And thy leaf to be green, when life's winter is o'er.

Birmingham,

H. H.

(1877)

MORAL QUERIES.

No. 1.

Law of Libel.

CAN that with propriety be called a law which will not admit of a definition, and which leaves so much to uncertainty in the minds of our juries, that one shall give a verdict of £400 damages, and another, in the same case, only a single farthing? Or suppose we admit the wretched attempt at definition by our judicial *ipse dixit*, "the greater the truth the greater the libel," then comes the unavoidable corollary, "the greater the lie the less the offence;" and the premises and the inference are well worthy of each other's support. They are solecisms in language, an insult to common sense, and an outrage upon every moral sentiment and feeling. In short, they are "morally wrong, and therefore cannot be politically right." If villany is to be screened from responsibility and merited reproach — if we are never to open our mouths to expose the most wanton and barefaced violation of public justice, then farewell to all distinctions between virtue and vice, for we shall never be able to profit by the one or guard against the other. A church is a church, a cabbage a cabbage, and a scoundrel a scoundrel, and it is not by changing or mincing their names that we can alter their qualities. Suppose my best friend is about to be inveigled into a partnership with one whom I know to be a consummate villain, am I to stand by a silent spectator because an exposure might tend to injure the rascal? Insinuations will not do, and I am obliged to mention facts; and then, according to modern explanation, the more correct I am in my information the greater the crime I commit against the peace and welfare of society; and if the offender is allowed to riot with impunity, my friend is ruined; while honour, fidelity, virtue, and religion, upbraid me with my neglect. Or suppose the case of master and servant: every principle of rectitude, and even the law itself, requires, that a faithful and just character should be given on inquiry, "nothing extenuated nor ought set down in malice;" but how will this rule apply in the case of libel? The varlet may have debauched my damsels, bored and drained my barrels, and pilfered my plate pantry; but he says, "You have no right to injure me, or to make a football of my reputation; if I have done wrong let the law punish me; but if you dare to expose me I will sue you for damages on the law of libel." Or there may be numberless defects in the character of a female domestic, which the laws would not punish, and which, nevertheless, ought not to be disguised on application for character. She may be dirty, idle, insolent, wasteful, and a liar; she may have corrupted her fellow-servants and my children, but it is at my peril that I declare these failings. She defies me to substantiate the charges; I shall not be allowed to prove them in a court of justice, and if I attempt it elsewhere so as to injure her character, I shall be made to suffer for my presumption. Such are a part of the vile inconsistencies of this absurd law. What then remains to be done in order that it may be consigned to that oblivion or infamy to which it is so justly entitled, but that a few honest juries should prove by their verdicts, that as long as the public are true to themselves it will not be in the power of interested, designing, or ignorant judges to enslave them, or to suffer the plainest rules of equity or justice to be violated to the public injury!

No. 2.

Mental Quibbling, or Specimen of Casuistry.

“Epimenides has said, that all the Cretans are liars. Now he himself was a Cretan; therefore he has lied, and the Cretans are not liars; and if they are not liars, then he has not lied—ergo; the Cretans are liars.”

No. 3.

Some months ago, Graham, the aeronaut, announced his intention of gratifying the people of Birmingham by ascending from thence with his balloon. The spot, the day, and the hour being appointed, an immense multitude assembled, and a considerable sum of money was contributed by those who were admitted within his inclosure. As soon, however, as the balloon was inflated and ready for its ascent, it was attacked by a sheriff's officer at the suit of a creditor of Graham's; the money collected from the public was also seized for the same purpose; and the officer would not suffer the balloon to go up, because it would have been giving up possession of the property for which he was responsible. Now, then, in all similar transactions it is universally understood that till the adventurer has fulfilled his share of the contract, the money collected for the exhibition does not belong to him, and if he fails in his engagement, he must either return the money, or be branded as an infamous cheat. How then can the sheriff or his officer be justified in seizing the property? Was it legal; and, if it was, was it not a gross violation of justice? Or supposing, as some of the public papers asserted, that the balloon did not go up in consequence of its being damaged by the populace, will this alter the bearing of the question as to the right in the property?

No. 4.

There are three sovereigns in Europe, and it is said only three, from whose high offices of state all persons are excluded who do not profess the established religion of the respective countries; and these three are Ferdinand of Spain, Selim of Turkey, and George of England! What a humiliating reflection for Englishmen, that their beloved Ruler should be found in such degrading, imbecile and bigoted company! Gifted by nature, accomplished by education, and aided by the “soi pensant” most enlightened council in the world,—that such should be the combined result of circumstances, must surely call for a national and sober inquiry. If expedience is to be our only apology, at least let us grant the same amnesty to the other two personages, and not pretend to censure them for what we allow ourselves to practise; or if they are wrong in such narrow and illiberal opinions, is it not possible we may be so too? In the common intercourses of life, do we find Catholics and Dissenters to be incorrigible knaves or fools, devoid of honour and every principle of social morality? And if not, would it not be well before we accuse them as a body, to ascertain how many virtuous individuals it would require to make up a community of monsters? All mankind are composed of the same materials, from the hands of the same Creator, guided by the same impulses, and liable to the same prejudices—can it then be allowable in the face of Heaven to persecute opinions, or even to withhold protection and good-will from those we imagine to be most erroneous? Is it not high time we began to profit by our own improvements and experience, and not perpetually sound the tocsin of alarm, because in the dark ages of the world mankind were bigoted and superstitious and cruel? Shall we never learn that the best way to ensure a

friend is to prove that we deserve his confidence; and that religion (the religion which consists in opinions only) will ever be found to thrive best under persecution? It is one of the first principles of action in the human breast to resist oppression; and our prejudices are much more likely to be riveted than removed when authority attempts to expel them by force or by obloquy and misrepresentation. The northern blasts induce the traveller to wrap himself more closely under his cloak; it is the warm and cheering influence of the summer's sun that causes him to throw aside the mantle and enjoy the full luxuriance of his invigorating beams. Would it not be well to make the experiment, while we possess those means of controul which may not always be our protection?

No. 5.

Sound Argument, or Cabinet Logic.

That war engenders famine, we deny;
Opinions so disloyal thwart our wishes;
To our insatiate need a kind supply,
It much improves our stock of "loaves and fishes."

No. 6.

Some of the public journals, a short time since, mentioned a decision in one of our courts of justice, that a grandfather is bound, if able, to maintain his grandchildren, provided that their parents have not the means of doing it. What are we to think of such an opinion? How few grandfathers are there whose property would not be totally swallowed by such a claim! And what a powerful incentive for idleness in a father who knows that his children or the parish may make the demand!—Is this statute or common law, or the *ipse dixit* only of temporary and mistaken authority? Is it possible such a law should exist in the same code as the law of primogeniture—or, if it should, by which of them should the practice of society be regulated? The one burdening a man in moderate circumstances with a load of which no human foresight can calculate the extent—the other releasing the man of enormous wealth from even the maintenance of his own children! The family estate goes entirely to the first-born, though there may not be a farthing left besides for a numerous family, who are thus necessarily thrust upon the public purse for their subsistence. What then becomes of our boasted privilege of equal laws for the protection of persons and property; and is not such a glaring solecism and falsehood enough to lead to the conclusion, that those who have no share in making such laws have no tie upon them but force and fraud for their observance? The Revolution abolished in France the law of primogeniture, and that abolition is still continued. When two or three generations shall have passed away, and all personal recollections are entirely forgotten, will not this single good be considered as making ample amends for all the evils attending the arduous struggle?

JAMES LUCKCOCK.

DR. CARPENTER ON HIS REPORTED CONVERSION.

To the Editor.

SIR,

Isle of Wight, July 17, 1827.

HAVING observed, on my return from the Continent, a paragraph in the English Papers, intimating that I had seceded from the Unitarian faith, I think well to state, that my belief remains unchanged that Unitarianism is the Doctrine of the Gospel.

L. CARPENTER.

ON THE USE OF THE TERM UNITARIAN.

To the Editor.

SIR,

I READ with some little regret the letter of T. F. B. in your last Number, *on the Use of the Term Unitarian*. It is scarcely probable that the writer will find many supporters; but, as a *Unitarian*, I hope I may be allowed a short space to express my disapprobation of a proposition which, did no other objection attach to it, appears to me to strike at the root of fair and honest dealing, at the same time that it tends to renew, at the eleventh hour, an unprofitable controversy.

The foundation on which your correspondent rests his argument is twofold. In the first place, it would appear that his opinion on the doctrine of the Divine Unity is not yet made up. It is still with him an "obscure dogma," "a great dispute," a question "involved in much real obscurity." Secondly, on the ground of the truth of the Unitarian doctrine, it is more politic to resort to the "honest art" of inducing "the inquiring, the wavering, the timid, the careless, and the irresolute," to enter our chapels by assuming a name which is to lull suspicion of their real character. Into this trap T. F. B. expects many would fall "who were not prepared either to deny or defend the Trinity, but who were so minded as to be best pleased when they heard least about it." And how are these persons to be brought to the study and knowledge of the truth? Precisely, on T. F. B.'s plan, by keeping all allusion to it, even in name, studiously out of sight. How any cause can be so advanced, I am quite at a loss to perceive. On the contrary, as a question of experience and of mere policy, it can scarcely be contradicted that the Unitarian doctrine has made most progress, and our societies have best flourished, where the opposite course has been pursued of judiciously advocating it, openly and honestly, on all seasonable occasions.

Your correspondent speaks of the term Unitarian as implying "a contentious and controversial sound," and as "shewing a domineering jealousy about the faith of others." But why, I would ask, are not those who think alike and worship the same object, to assemble under the denomination which correctly marks them, without being subjected to imputations, unsupported either by fact or argument? T. F. B. can assuredly found a sect under any new designation he thinks proper, but it is too much to expect that those whose opinions are fixed, after mature deliberation, are to retrace

their steps, and return amidst the mists and fogs of doubt and difficulty, for the edification of emerging at some indefinite period, with "the wavering, the timid, the careless, and the indifferent."

After all, your correspondent does but propose to renew an old experiment, under a different and less intelligible name. Societies have long existed, and still exist, where the great question which, according to T. F. B., brings with it so much perplexity, is never alluded to. Many of our old Presbyterian chapels are cases in point. Let their empty pews testify as to the result. I will merely add one word more. The suggestion of your correspondent (more than once brought forward) is singularly ill-timed at the period when the name of Unitarian has been recognized by the Legislature of our country, and is beginning to be known and respected in almost every quarter of the globe. Any attempt, therefore, at a change of designation would be as fruitless as it would be inconvenient, impolitic, and unpopular with the vast majority of the Unitarian body, who associate with the term the recollection of many difficulties happily overcome, and who see no reason whatever for its abandonment in the day of triumph.

A UNITARIAN.

THE COLLEGIANTS OF HOLLAND.

To the Editor.

SIR,

DR. MOSHEIM, in his Ecclesiastical History, (Century 17, Sect. ii. Part ii. Chap. 7,) mentions a sect which arose in Holland about the year 1619, and were denominated Collegiants, from their giving the name of Colleges to their religious assemblies.

He informs us that all were admitted into this sect, who *believed in and lived according to the Scriptures*, whatever might be their opinion of the nature of God, the person of Christ, &c. They met for worship on Sundays and Wednesdays; sung, prayed and expounded the Scriptures: this last part of their service being open to all their members, (females excepted,) who might advance their own sentiments, or controvert (with charity and moderation) the sentiments of others.

They held a half-yearly meeting at Rhinsberg, near Leyden, which occupied four days. During this time they listened to edifying discourses and exhortations to brotherly love, partook of the Lord's Supper, and administered *baptism by immersion* to those *adults* who desired it. They had at Rhinsberg "ample and convenient houses for the education of orphans and the reception of strangers."

Dr. Mosheim speaks of them as numerous in his time, (his Ecclesiastical History appeared, I believe, between seventy and eighty years ago,) in the provinces of Holland, Utrecht, East and West Friesland; the Frieslanders holding their half-yearly meeting at Leewarden.

The object of this communication is, Sir, to solicit from any of your Correspondents, who may be acquainted with the state of religious parties in Holland, some information respecting this interesting sect, a sect distinguished by its liberality at a time when Holland was torn with religious discord.

Yours truly,
J. C. M.

TALIESIN'S POEMS.

To the Editor.

SIR,

I HAVE just heard that Mr. Edward Williams, well known by the name of the Welsh Bard, died a few months since, in his native village, near Cowbridge, Glamorganshire. He was a man of much worth, and, considering the disadvantages under which he had laboured, of considerable literary attainments: and, as he manifested peculiar zeal in propagating the Unitarian doctrine in Wales, having been instrumental in forming Unitarian societies there, in the distribution of Unitarian books, and in publishing a hymn-book in Welsh for the use of Unitarian congregations, it may be expected that some one well acquainted with his character, principles, and attainments, will pay in due time a proper tribute of respect to his memory. All I have to offer will be found in what follows.

I have by me a letter received from Mr. Williams, dated Flimston, Cowbridge, Glamorganshire, Sept. 6, 1812, out of which I shall make the following extract. After various matters of a private nature, Mr. Williams thus adds; "Now let me mention a curiosity to you. In the manuscript works of our venerable bard, Taliesin, printed lately, who lived in the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century, we find fragments of poems in an unknown language, one of them as follows:

"Oranant oriant
O brithi Brithoi
Nuoos nuedi
Brithi brithanai
Sychedi edi euroi, &c."*

Mr. Williams adds, "there is not a word of Welsh in these verses: there is nothing like Welsh in them. A learned gentleman of Bristol, who has been in India, and has acquired a knowledge of several Indian languages, in a letter which I lately received from him, assures me that the above fragment and others are pure Sanscrit. I am astonished at this," continues Mr. Williams; "I know not how to believe it. I am equally unable to believe that this gentleman intends to impose upon me, or upon any one else, in what he says."

Thus far Mr. E. Williams.—I shewed this letter at the time I received it to a gentleman well acquainted with the Sanscrit, and I was given to understand from him also, that the above lines are really in the Sanscrit language.

Now, Sir, whether Mr. Williams has noticed these lines in any work of his, or made any remarks on them, I do not know: I do not recollect that he has in the only work of his which I possess, (his two volumes of poems, published in 1794, though he has given there some of the Welsh Bardic Triades, with numerous extracts,) nor is it of much consequence, in the view which I have in sending this extract, whether he has or not; as in either case the words will be equally susceptible of critical examination, and may be safely left for the consideration of any of your learned readers who may have made Welsh and Oriental antiquities the objects of their research. I shall make no observations of my own. If, therefore, you approve the above communication, I may, perhaps, at some future opportunity submit to you a few thoughts which, how imperfect soever they may be, may, perhaps, lead some of your readers, better acquainted with Welsh antiquities, to make the matter alluded to above the subject of their more serious consideration.

GEORGE DYER.

* These lines are printed in the Welsh Archaeology, Vol. I. p. 74.

REVIEW.

ART. I.—Δευτεραι Φροντιδες. *Second Thoughts on the Person of Christ, on Human Sin, and on the Atonement; containing Reasons for the Author's Secession from the Unitarian Communion, and his Adherence to that of the Established Church.* By Charles A. Elton, &c. Bristol, 1827.

Unitarianism Abandoned; or Reasons assigned for ceasing to be connected with that description of Religious Professors who designate themselves Unitarians. By James Gilchrist. London, 1827.

AT the head of this article are placed the titles of two works of recent publication, which are calculated, from the nature of the subjects and the names of the authors, to interest in no common measure the curiosity of the religious public. To some they may seem to indicate the weakness and the hopelessness of the Unitarian cause;—to augur its present decline and its approaching overthrow from the secession, and the subsequent assaults, of its former advocates. The declension, at nearly the same period, of two professors of the Unitarian doctrine, whose names had for some years been connected with its defence and propagation from the pulpit or the press, may, indeed, on the first announcement of the singular fact, appear an alarming presage of ill. But we must implore our Unitarian readers not to yield too readily to their fears, if perchance fears have, on this occasion, invaded their minds; for we can thus early assure them, that all the substantial danger of these portentous writings is comprised in their respective titles,—the imposing front with which they are ushered into the arena of controversy. That the considerations which are here alleged effected a change in the convictions of the authors, and compelled them, from a regard to conscience, to “abandon Unitarianism,” and to “secede from the Unitarian communion,” we are bound in charity to believe. We must, however, be permitted to state our own persuasion, that the “reasons” to which these gentlemen attribute their reconversion, will not, in the slightest degree, shake the faith of a single Unitarian who has a thorough understanding of his principles, and knows the scriptural foundation on which they rest.

Mr. Elton, to whose work we shall first advert, is well known in the classical walks of literature, as an elegant scholar, a faithful translator, and a pleasing poet. His English version of Hesiod is a standard work of its class; and his later selections and translations from the classical writers of antiquity display to great advantage his learning and his taste. In the fields of theological literature he has shewn himself a respectable biblical critic and skilful controversialist. The character which he had maintained in his former publications led us to expect, that in the avowal of the change which his mind had undergone, he would not forget the *moral* qualities of the understanding and the heart which had acquired for him the esteem of his readers; that the statement of his “reasons” would be no less distinguished by its candour than by its perspicuity; and that in “seceding” from persons with whom he had so long lived on terms of cordial intimacy, he would have quitted their society with at least a courteous and friendly salutation. In this expectation, however, we have been lamentably disappointed. The tone and the language he employs throughout his work evince a state of

mind and feeling, he must permit us to say, and to say "more in sorrow than in anger," wholly unworthy of his former reputation, and of the cause which he has undertaken to advocate.

It has been the common artifice of controversial writers to endeavour to depreciate their opponents by applying to them epithets of reproach and contempt, arraigning their integrity, and insinuating unjust suspicions of the purity of their motives. Such preludes have been thought useful expedients to screw up their own courage for the attack; or, by raising a prejudice against their adversaries, to enlist the passions of the spectators in their own favour, and thus secure for themselves, in appearance at least, a more easy and complete victory. There are few literary contests on theological subjects that will not furnish samples of these petty tactics. Mr. Elton, it grieves us to observe, has, in his attack upon Unitarians, stooped to follow in the train of more vulgar combatants. He has thickly strewed his book with specimens of these *elegantia controversiarum*, if we may be permitted so to designate them, which he seems to consider indispensable requisites for an accomplished theologian and polemic. His reading and his observation might have taught him, that such unworthy weapons can seldom be employed without danger or disgrace to the assailant. They are missiles which have a peculiar aptitude to recoil upon himself with accumulated velocity and force. He who descends, besides, to the sinks and the drains of the arena to ply his adversary with filth, may expect to retire from the combat soiled, polluted, and dishonoured, by his own ammunition.

We shall, in the course of this article, lay before our readers a few of the railing accusations which Mr. Elton has so unsparingly heaped upon Unitarians. But we shall first state the nature of the change that has taken place in his religious views, as far, at least, as we have been able to discover it in the mystical phraseology in which he has generally enveloped his meaning.

We are at a loss to understand why the author has chosen to designate his present thoughts *Δευτεραι Φροντιδες*. The reader who is ignorant of his former history, would, from this title, infer, that he had been from education an Unitarian, and had now, for the first time, deserted to the ranks of orthodoxy. His "first thoughts" must, we presume, have been the principles of the Established Church, of which his father is known to be a zealous minister and a distinguished ornament. Unitarianism must have been his "second thoughts." The correct title therefore of his book, he must allow us to suggest, ought to be, if not *πρωται φροντιδες*, as repeating the opinions of his youth, certainly *τριται φροντιδες*, as delineating the system which has superseded both his former creeds. But, to a mind like that of the author, teeming with classical recollections, the temptation was perhaps irresistible to send his work into the world under a classical sanction, which would intimate that his present sentiments, whatever might be their numerical order in the series of his mental revolutions, were *σοφωτεραι*, the wisest and the best. He might intend the *Δευτερων αμεινονων* of the Greeks to be equivalent to the *Posterioribus melioribus* of Erasmus. Whilst quoting Euripides, Mr. Elton might have recollected, with advantage to his book, a passage preceding by a few lines only that from which he has taken his title:

Τὸ σῶφρον ὡς ἀπανταχοῦ καλὸν
καὶ δόξαν ἰσθλὴν ἐν βροταῖς κομίζεται.

Eurip. Hippol. 431, 432.

How lovely is modesty in every situation! What distinguished glory does it bear among mankind!

Mr. Elton thus states the process of his conversions :

"The writer of these sheets had adopted Unitarian sentiments from the difficulty which he found in reconciling a Trinity, as scholastically defined, with the unity of Jehovah, as declared in the Scriptures; and the atonement with their declarations of his mercy."

"While following the course of study which a new theological literature naturally threw in his way, the writer's attention became deeply interested in certain works, professing to remove the objections to God's benevolence, grounded on the existence of evil. These works, assuming chiefly as their basis philosophical necessity, the government of the world by general laws, and the tendency of evil, including, of course, moral evil or sin, to the production of good, affected his mind inversely to their direct design. They induced a doubt of the benevolence of God. The burden of it was insupportable: and in this disquiet state of his thoughts, he chanced to call to his recollection a remark of Mr. Soame Jenyns, in his work on the Christian religion, to the effect, that 'repentance could not undo sin.' This led him carefully to review the testimonies of Scripture in respect to moral evil. The liberty of the human will, the lapse of our nature from original righteousness, the incapacity of this lapsed nature to fulfil such righteousness, were the gradual discoveries, for such they were, that unfolded themselves to the writer's mind. A way was opened to his understanding for the reception of the necessity and the reality of an atonement. Of this he had been newly schooled to think, as incompatible with God's merciful attributes: yet the result of his changed convictions was, that, from the moment of his yielding to these apparent evidences of Scripture his full assent, all doubt of the benevolence of God was instantaneously removed, like a veil withdrawn from the eyes."—Preface, pp. iii. iv.

After this avowal, upon the divinity and the metaphysics of which we shall make no observation, he offers the following apology for publishing his recantation :

"If the writer before felt it as a Christian duty to 'give a reason for the hope which was in him,' he feels that duty more imperative now: if he has been the unconscious agent in the dissemination of error, let him be forgiven the zeal which would bring to the altar of truth an offering of reparation."—Preface, p. iv.

To this passage we have nothing to object. The author had a full right, and it was perhaps his duty, to denounce what he deemed his error, and to neutralize its effects by the publication of what his farther studies had led him to believe to be the truth. Such open and manly conduct commands our praise rather than provokes our censure. When, however, the writer so feelingly appeals to the candour of his readers, he ought, in consistency, to have fortified his claims to their kind allowances, by evincing a disposition to be himself equally candid in his judgment of others.

Mr. Elton next proceeds to assign his "reasons" for departing "from the principles of nonconformity," as well as from the "principles of Unitarianism." "Dissent," he admits, "has been harshly termed 'the sin of schism,' by those who have asserted their own liberty of conscience and judgment in renouncing Catholicism." Still, however, "he does not conceive that dissent is a gospel duty;" "he does not conceive religion to be a thing of spite. Although divisions were foretold by Christ, they were not therefore approved by him." "In the primitive church, the Christians, who even then had their scruples and their points of difference, met under one roof, and bore with one another." Such are the intangible reasons which, in the judgment of the author, must annihilate "the principles of

nonconformity," and cover with shame and confusion all classes of dissenters in standing aloof from the communion of the Established Church! It might have strengthened his argument if Mr. Elton had condescended to explain the essential difference, in point of principle, between the case of the English Protestants in "renouncing Catholicism," and that of the Dissenters in withdrawing from the Church of England, which should obtain for the one the complimentary phrase of an "assertion of liberty of conscience and judgment," and draw upon the other the reproachful stigma of "a thing of spite." Has it never occurred to his reflection, how very convenient and appropriate would have been such language as he here employs to some zealous advocate of the Church of Rome, when remonstrating with the Reformers, who were weak and silly enough to deem it "a gospel duty" to dissent from a communion in whose creeds and worship they could not conscientiously join? And does he not think that such language might be still used with equal propriety and force by some mufti at Constantinople, to persuade those who have "their scruples and their points of difference," to "meet under one roof," the temple of Mahomet, and worship with the creed and the forms of the Islamitic faith?

To the Dissenter's objection, that he cannot yield his "assent and consent" to the *doctrines* of the Established Church, Mr. Elton has a ready answer:—

"The sixth article of the Church of England, which affirms that 'Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite as necessary to salvation,' repels," he says, "the imputation of infallibility, and consecrates the right of private judgment."—Preface, pp. v. vi.

According to our author, then, we have here a church declaring with great minuteness the tenets which its members are to believe, prescribing the exact form of words which, in their religious exercises, they are to employ, and "hemming itself round with guards," both "political" and "theological," with human penalties on the one hand, and denunciations of eternal perdition on the other, which yet effectually demolishes its own work by candidly admitting that it may be in error; and liberally conceding to all the right of private judgment in forming their opinion of its doctrines and ceremonies, and adopting or rejecting them at their pleasure, when entering its pale and joining its communion! These, however, are Mr. Elton's "Second Thoughts" on this subject. There was a time when he had other, and, we will say, juster, views of the spirit and intention of the document to which he refers. "One of the articles," such was his language in one of the ablest of his works, "provides, that the dogmas and definitions of the Church divinity are no farther binding than they are proved to be warranted by holy writ; *but it is assumed that they are warranted by holy writ, and to doubt them is heresy.*"*

If any thing farther were needed to confirm our author's adherence to the communion of the Established Church, he finds it in the excellence of her Liturgy.

"An obsolete creed, a few remnants of scholastic phraseology, and the tautology of some repetitions *accidentally* retained, cannot," he thinks, "deprive the liturgy of the merit of its copious infusion of Scripture; of its

* *An Appeal to Scripture and Tradition in Defence of the Unitarian Faith*, 1818, p. 207, *nam*

sententious, yet eloquent, collects, handed down from the purest ages, and of the comprehensiveness and fervour of its general supplications. The superiority," he continues, "of the 'Book of Common Prayer,' of which the Essex-street compendium exhibits only a *withered anatomy*, is no where more strikingly exemplified than in the order for the Lord's Supper. Let this be compared, in its influence on the mind, with the dry historical lecture on the evidences of the resurrection usually substituted in the Unitarian chapels."—Preface, pp. vi. vii.

We shall not stop to inquire which creed Mr. Elton would represent as "obsolete," or with what correctness he can describe either of the creeds by this term, when he must know that there is not one which is not commanded to be used in the public service of the Church several times in the course of every year. Neither are we called upon to defend the Essex-street Liturgy, so elegantly designated a "withered anatomy:" nor yet shall we pronounce any opinion on the comparative merits of the service of the Liturgy at the Lord's Supper, and that of Unitarian ministers; though Mr. Elton must allow us to say that his experience and our own have been very different both as to the subjects and the religious influence of the sacramental services at Unitarian chapels. We are free to admit that in the Liturgy of the Church of England, in its prayers and collects, there is much that is truly excellent; and we are as much disposed as Mr. Elton to condemn the vulgar imputation that all who adhere to the Established Church must be swayed by motives of interest, of fashion, or of habit. No evidence beyond what we already possess is necessary to convince us that many, we would say thousands, conform to it from the purest motives, and with the most honourable feelings. Nevertheless, there is enough in its Liturgy, in its dogmas and its ritual, to render it impossible for many to join its communion without a violation of their conscience; and on this ground they are willing to rest the justification of their dissent. To them the worship prescribed by the Liturgy, were they publicly to unite in it, would be gross hypocrisy; for their outward acts would have no corresponding sentiment in their hearts.

Mr. Elton has himself, in his former publications, so well stated some principal objections to the religious services of the Church of England, that we shall transcribe them in preference to the insertion of any observations of our own. Speaking of the Creeds he remarks,—“The three creeds are assumed to be infallible, and to have equal authority with Scripture; and this is Popery. Yet these infallible creeds are each contradictory to the other. The *first* and most ancient, which the Spanish Jesuits reprobated as a Unitarian symbol, acknowledges God, the FATHER ALMIGHTY, as the maker of heaven and earth, and Jesus Christ as his only son. The *second*, makes Jesus Christ God of God, and himself the maker of all the worlds. The *third*, makes Jesus Christ God *with* God, and equal in power and eternity to his own Father. These three creeds, in fact, mark the progress of Trinity; but the writer, who congratulates himself on belonging to a church that possesses these *three* creeds, congratulates himself that he *holds three faiths*.

“It is better that variations of doctrinal belief should arise, and that the agitation and collision of opinions should keep inquiry alive, than that error, if there be error, should be locked up in antiquated formularies, which usurp the sanction of holy writ, and impose a barbarous scholastic jargon for the simple and authorized language of the Scriptures. He who finds his *religion* in systems of theology, examines the Scriptures for the purpose of reconciling their contents with his own pre-established formularies. He de-

spiseth prophesyings.' The creeds and articles of his church, to him, 'are spirit, and they are life.' *Defendantur Symbola, ruat Evangelion.*"*

In another work he observes, "A claim to dominion over the consciences of men, and the right of condemning opinions and punishing them, as well as the revival of the abrogated institution of tithes in support of a priesthood, are equally palpable innovations on the temper and discipline of the Church of Christ; but these are retained by a church calling itself *protesting and reformed*, together with some of the most prominent doctrines, particularly those embodied in the forged creed of Saint Athanasius, and enforced on the consciences of Christians under pain of damnation." "With respect to doctrine, that the reformed Churches still retain much that is in common with the church 'believing a lie,' and 'upon whose forehead was written MYSTERY,' is sufficiently notorious. It is matter of historical and scriptural investigation, whether that which they retain be not equally foreign to 'the simplicity of Christ,' with that which they abandon."†

As to the Lord's Supper in particular, Mr. Elton writes,—“A strict Churchman retains a certain undefined sense of the *real presence*, though he disbelieves the actual translation of the elements. This is the *consubstantiation* of Luther. On this point the Lord Cobham was arraigned for heresy, as an unbeliever in the sacrament of the Mass.”

“This is the doctrine of the *Church-of-England Catechism*, which affirms that 'the body and blood of Christ are *verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful* in the Lord's Supper.' The church-communicants, contrary to the known apostolic practice, receive the memorials *kneeling*. Dr. Johnson defines a communicant, 'one who is present as a worshiper at the Lord's Supper.'”‡

Such were but lately Mr. Elton's views of the Communion Service of the Liturgy, which he now thinks so peculiarly edifying. He closes this part of his "Second Thoughts" with the following curious passage, which, he appears to have forgotten, might be construed into a pointed reproof of himself: "It should seem that the Church of England cannot escape censure either when she deviates from the doctrine of the New Testament, or when she scrupulously adopts it" !§

These preliminary matters being despatched, Mr. Elton proceeds to state and to justify his "Second Thoughts" on the important questions of "the Person of Christ," "Human Sin," and "the Atonement." He begins by observing, that "God had revealed himself to his creatures" under "three characters or aspects," "expressed by an unhappiness of metaphrase *persons*, from the *personas* of the Latin Father Tertullian." The imputation "preferred by the Unitarians" is indignantly repelled, that these persons are "three distinct objects of worship." Whatever may be thought of certain interpretations of particular texts, supposed to refer to the person and offices of Jesus, "the Scripture testimony," he asserts, (p. 11,) "will remain in express avouchment of the fact, that Christ was, at least, 'the word made flesh.' This complex relation of deity, indwelling in humanity, constituting Jesus what he was, the Christ, the 'only begotten of the Father.'" He quotes with approbation (p. 11) as expressing his own sentiment, the

* Appeal, &c., as above, pp. 206, 207.

† Brief Account of the Unitarians, with Observations on the Rev. E. Manley, &c., 1823, p. 8.

‡ Appeal, &c., as above, p. 198.

§ Second Thoughts, Preface, p. vii.

opinion entertained, as he asserts, "by the Christians, by the Jews, and by those philosophers who had inspected the sacred writings of the Jews and Christians, that the Word was understood as the personified principle of reason in God, and consequently as God himself, acting by his intelligent principle; 'the word of Jehovah' being used to describe the faculty wherewith the Divine Wisdom wills and effects its operations." The term *Logos*, or the Word, he remarks, (p. 12,) imports "the presence of God's word in spiritual operation; and, as where God's attribute is and operates, there God must be, the presence therefore of God himself. 'The word that was *with* God was God.'"

We have here followed as closely as possible Mr. Elton's own representation, in order that our readers may gather his faith from his own words. For ourselves, we frankly confess, that after frequent and anxious efforts we have abandoned in despair the attempt to comprehend his meaning. The author intends this language, of course, to denote something different from what he understands by Unitarianism. We see nothing in his terms which an Unitarian may not, and which some Unitarians have not, used upon the same subject. When divested of all mysticism, and interpreted according to their plain and obvious signification, the words, in our apprehension of them, express no fact which they would not recognize as a part of their own system.

On the subject of original sin, Mr. Elton (p. 30) puts in his disclaimer against the doctrine of those who hold "that all mankind sinned in Adam as their representative, and were amenable to punishment for his individual transgression." The proper Calvinistic doctrine he designates, (p. 31,) "the overstrained if not mischievous notion of utter depravity, founded on texts of a particular application to individuals, or to some period in the history of the Jewish people." "The sin that came upon all men," or, as he is pleased to call it, "original sin," is, according to his present system, a "natural inability to fulfil all righteousness." (P. 28.)

"If it be said," he observes, (p. 30,) "that death must be derived from a mortal progenitor by a necessity of nature, where is the want of philosophy in admitting, what the every-day experience of the transmission of parental qualities of mind, as well as of body, justifies, that a moral as well as physical defect is inherited by the same natural necessity? All moral defect (which it may be as well to state at once must originally arise out of the abuse of the powers entrusted to the creature, and not out of the primary design, or absolute decree, of the Creator) must, in the eyes of a Being of perfect purity, be sinful, and thus the alleged want of equity in imputing sin, where sin has not been actually committed, is a charge raised on imaginary grounds; for if there be moral defect or insufficiency in answering the claims of a complete righteousness, that is itself a state comparatively of sin; and that state is contradistinguished from *actual* sin by the term *original* sin."—The author speaks (p. 35) of "the wrath which in the Divine equity abides on the state of moral defect which the progenitor of the human race, who had been 'created upright,' transmitted to all his posterity, together with their mortal nature."

From these and other passages of a similar import, it will be perceived that whatever ideas the writer may attach to his words and phrases, which are not always obvious, he is very far from symbolizing in his "Second Thoughts" with the commonly-received or Calvinistic faith on the subject of original sin and hereditary depravity. The keen eye of orthodoxy would espy "heresy" lurking in the midst of all his representations.

Next follows Mr. Elton's view of the remedy provided for the moral im-

potence and degeneracy of man. On this part of the subject we shall give the author's summary of original sin and the atonement in their connexion with one another.

“It is declared that as ‘by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.’ Rom. v. 19. Now, if we compare this passage with others, such as ‘God has concluded all under sin,’ Gal. iii. 22; ‘By the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified,’ Rom. iii. 20; ‘Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and redemption,’ 1 Cor. i. 30; and ‘He has made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him,’ 2 Cor. v. 21; the meaning will be sufficiently plain, that the sin which came on all men, or original sin, namely, the natural inability to fulfil perfect righteousness, was remitted through a mean chosen by God; Christ’s undergoing the sentence past upon it, and the natural righteousness regarded as the righteousness of God, or as original and perfect righteousness: in other words, that the many were justified, or beheld in the complacency of God, as just persons, in consideration, not of their own, but of Christ’s righteousness; and that they were afterwards sanctified, through the same faith in Christ’s propitiation, and enabled, through the grace given them, to ‘work out their salvation,’ Phil. ii. 12; their repentance being now rendered available, and they being enabled by faith to attain to that law of righteousness, through God’s forbearance and acceptance, which the first chosen people, by the works of the law, were not, Rom. ix. 30, 32. And thus they were ‘redeemed by Christ from the curse of the law,’ Gal. iii. 13; ‘For as many as are of the works of the law are under a curse; for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in ALL things which are written in the book of the law to do them,’ Gal. ii. 10.”—Pp. 28, 29.

Such, according to his own account, and so far as we have been able to attach an intelligible meaning to his language, are Mr. Elton’s present notions on these branches of Christian theology, to the illustration and defence of which the work before us, with the exception of the ample portions appropriated to invidious or criminal charges against Unitarians, is ostensibly devoted. We shall not trouble ourselves to submit the theological system comprised in his “Second Thoughts,” to a more minute and critical analysis. As far as he has succeeded in developing his conceptions, we are content to leave his new opinions to be answered by those which preceded them, in which the “reasons” adduced in their support will, we think, find their complete refutation. To any reply we might offer he would probably turn a deaf ear, ascribing our rejection of his sentiments to “the natural pride and self-righteousness of the human heart.”

We cannot compliment Mr. Elton on the literary execution of this part of his undertaking. We look in vain for the *lucidus ordo*, the perspicuity and the point, which had usually distinguished his style. He writes like a man who had embarked on an irksome task, who is dissatisfied with his work, distrustful of his conceptions and language, and yet deeply anxious to make the best of his case. There is so much of evident toil in searching out and displaying in full array all that was to be obtained to give an apparent sanction to the author’s views, that the book has been rendered almost unreadably heavy and tedious. In his frequent wanderings into the regions of mysticism, the reader loses all distinct traces of his meaning, and becomes bewildered in thick and impenetrable clouds. The parts of his work in which alone he speaks plainly are those devoted to vituperative attacks upon the Unitarians, to some of which we shall direct the attention of our readers in the following number.

ART. II.—*A Summary of the Laws peculiarly affecting Protestant Dissenters; with an Appendix, containing Acts of Parliament, Trust Deeds, and Legal Forms.* By Jos. Beldam, of the Middle Temple, Esq., Barrister at Law. Butterworth. 1827.

WE have at last a professed text-book on the law as it affects Protestant Dissenters. Such a book has been long much wanted, and though we looked to see the deficiency supplied ere this by an abler hand, and though the present volume is certainly but a beginning, and that of an imperfect character, we are thankful to receive it such as it is, and have no doubt but that it will be extensively useful.

That sort of exposure which is the result of a mere formal detail and classification of the bungling and heterogeneous mass of crazy materials which make up our code of law on this head, is better calculated to make a matter-of-fact impression than the most impassioned eloquence. Disposed, as Mr. Beldam appears to be, we must think very unnecessarily, (and certainly inconsistently with the apparent bias of his own opinions,) to take his principles from the narrow and contracted side of the materials before him, nothing can conceal from the view of the digester, that the whole system is a miserable compound of tricks and expedients; and, accordingly, he cautiously enough observes, in his Introduction, as follows:

“Political considerations apart, the tendency of the present work will probably be to shew the propriety of entirely new enactments; but whether such enactments ought more clearly to define and perpetuate the ancient laws, securing to Protestant Dissenters by less equivocal provisions the immunities and privileges they at present enjoy; or whether, on a broader principle of legislation, it were better to abolish the ancient system, and to enforce such modern restrictions as may be thought necessary by modern sanctions alone, must be left to the Legislature to decide.”

After a frightful catalogue of statutes quoted, occupying three pages with double columns, (what a luxury it would be to have the pruning of such legislation!) our author proceeds to the body of the work, which, so far as regards the statutes, is avowedly and obviously founded upon, though an amplification of, the summary attached to the book of proceedings published by the Deputies.

We are not, we hope, about to trespass too much on our readers' attention, or to aim at the hopeless task of inveigling them into legal discussions; but a few points are of general interest, and we shall, we trust, be excused in adverting to them.

In the first place, it cannot but be observed, that any attempt thus to single out a portion of our law on the subject of religion, by treating only of its effects on Protestant Dissenters, is a very confined view of the subject. To do any thing like justice to such a topic, and to combine any thing like a statesman's view of the condition of Nonconformists with the drier details of law, the whole code on the subject of religion, and the various ways in which persons and property are affected on account of opinion, ought to be brought together. Many points of the history and objects of these laws are unintelligible, if viewed only in connexion with one class of persons. If the general impression upon the mind, after a review of the law, as it affects the most highly-favoured class of Nonconformists, be such an one as Mr. Beldam has stated, what would be the conclusion on

a review of all the other medleys of barbarism and bigotry which a wider range would naturally bring to light?

In point of detail, Mr. Beldam's mode of stating many statutes by their general results, without placing their actual texts even in an appendix, has been very unsatisfactory to us. Looking at his volume as the only text-book on the subject, the deficiency is often most provoking, and defeats the primary object in referring to such a work. The general reader, and even the lawyer, on subjects which are of so rare professional occurrence as not to repay a laborious research, require in a book like this a compendium of reference on which they may rely; and such laws, for instance, as the Corporation and Test Acts ought certainly to be given *in verbis*. For legal purposes and conclusions this is absolutely necessary, and for the general reasoner on the scope and object of these laws, the whole text and form of both those statutes are of the greatest importance. For instance, in the Corporation Act, when we see, as we should do by having the whole before us, that what we now call "the Corporation Act" is nothing but a clause which seems to have slipped into a bill of a different purpose; and when we compare this with what even in a law-book we might perhaps be suffered to know something of, namely the history of the concoction of the Act, which will be found in Sergeant Heywood's excellent pamphlet; and when, again, the previous legal and historical object and application of a test are explained, together with the actual existence at that moment in communion with the Church of the very Dissenters against whom it is supposed to have been aimed, and whom the Act of Uniformity did not create till afterwards,—who does not see that a totally erroneous impression of that Act is conveyed by merely giving as the substance of it the purport of one clause, smuggled in by way of compromise at the end, and giving a permanent character to what was meant to be only temporary?

Again, as to the Test Act, it is one thing to state in substance the present operation of the Act, and another to give us the very words, which themselves furnish arguments as to the objects and views of the framers. Nothing, it has always struck us, can shew more forcibly the temporary character, the avowedly fleeting operation, intended by the framers of what are now called the bulwarks of our Constitution, than that in one and the same clause and line, "the King" (that being, existence, or corporation, which in the eye of the law lives for ever) is joined with a subject, the Duke of York, whose removal (and with him the removal of the fears of mischief) might take place the next day. The statute imposes,—for ever, apparently,—the obligation of qualifying on all persons received into the household of his Majesty, or of the Duke of York! Can any thing point more strongly to the conviction that the King aimed at was one Charles Stuart, not the kingly authority in ages to come?

While adverting to these two Acts, it strikes us, as a very considerable defect in Mr. Beldam's book, that he has not, even as a matter of curiosity, given us an account or opinion as to the classes of persons affected by these Acts, that we might know who they are in these realms that hold (or rather who they are that do not hold) their liberty and property by a yearly letter of license from the ministry of the day, who may choose to bring in, or may choose not to bring in, the Annual Indemnity Acts. Sergeant Heywood's pamphlet contains some information or speculation on the subject, and it really is of great practical importance, inasmuch as the Indemnity Acts do not prevent the defeat of the election of any candidate for office within the

scope of these laws, if the opponent choose to give notice of the defect of qualification. Is every candidate for office in bodies acting under charters, &c., from the Crown, such as several of our commercial and charitable foundations, liable to this annoyance? It certainly appears that for some time after the passing of the penal laws of Charles II. a very strict practical construction was put upon them. It might have been quite as well, too, to have at least mentioned the Occasional Conformity Act of Anne's reign, and its subsequent repeal. In subjects of this sort, history and general principle are necessarily mixed up with law, and no one can have a complete view of the one without the other.

We shall next notice the extreme meagreness of Mr. Beldam's acquaintance with the Indemnity Acts, "the effect" of which, he says, "has been to convert the sacramental test into a species of political portcullis, now seldom or never employed against Protestant Dissenters; to be regretted chiefly on account of the odious distinction it insinuates, and only to be feared as it perpetuates the possibility of their exclusion." Now this, however properly the reprobation is conveyed, is giving the Indemnity Acts a vast deal better character than they deserve. The Test laws do practically exclude Dissenters from a great many offices: they are in full operation where any one pleases in elective offices that they should be so; for the Indemnity laws do not remove one particle of the legal incapacity where any body avails himself of it (as has been repeatedly done and much oftener threatened); and, again, any informer who chooses to set a sharp-witted attorney to work, may easily learn even to defeat the operation of these Acts, in those particulars which they seem intended to remedy. It has indeed been held (*in re Stevenson*, 2 Barn. and Cres. 34) by a strained construction of the Act, that where the appointment and consequent obligation to conform had taken place, and begun to run before the passing of the Act, its operation should be considered prospective; but the Indemnity Act affords no protection to a person who is appointed after its passing, and who does not qualify within six months; and there is abundant time left before the passing of the next Act for an action to be commenced and judgment obtained. Mr. Beldam should also know that it is extremely doubtful whether, when these six months have expired, the consequent penalties and disabilities do not attach, without any removal or benefit from any subsequent Act, if the party persist in refusing to take the Test.

We have, however, a graver fault to find with Mr. Beldam. Why has he, in the face of the decision of the highest tribunals, chosen to continue Mr. Justice Blackstone's utterly unfounded denunciation and classification of Nonconformity as an offence, as a mere state of remission from penalty? Has Mr. Beldam ever read Dr. Furneaux's Letters on that point? We do not ask this because we expect a lawyer writing even on religious law, to be a controversialist, but because, if he had read them, he must have seen that this crotchet has not only reason, but the highest legal authorities, against it; and we should have valued Mr. Beldam's book highly, if he had transferred to it the report which Dr. Furneaux has given of Lord Mansfield's noble speech, corrected by himself, in reversing the judgment founded on Blackstone's theory. That speech, and the decision grounded upon it, we have always considered as one of the noblest and most efficient safeguards of Dissenting liberty; one of the grandest events by which bigotry and sophistry were foiled in their endeavours to cramp and fetter the principles on which the Legislature had recognized liberty of conscience.

Why, we repeat, even as a matter of taste, should Mr. Beldam gratuitously

tack himself to the tail of the Blackstone, Perrott, and Eldon school, when he had before him the judgments of Willes and Foster, and Mansfield, and half a dozen other Judges?

We have similar observations to make on the broad assertion by which Mr. Beldam has given a portentous importance indeed to the old dogma, that "Christianity is a part of the law;" Christianity, as he says, "identified with the tenets and service of the Church of England." We once heard Mr. Shadwell, in the excess of ultra-orthodoxy, maintain or suggest this exposition of Christianity, but his leader, Sir S. Romilly, was too wise to back him in it, and Lord Eldon, willing as he was, would not venture it. Let each and every Dissenter look to himself if this be law. But we hesitate not to say, that Mr. Beldam was dreaming when he made the assertion, and that in almost every one of the cases which are usually cited for the tottering principle of the partnership between Christianity and the Law, the judges have been most explicit in disavowing any such conclusion as he draws, and in expressly declaring that in so treating Christianity they meant only its essentials; and that the foundation of the whole jurisdiction is the supposed necessity of maintaining a belief in a revealed religion and a future state of retribution, with a view to the support of oaths and the moral sanctions which it secures to the community. We have more than once observed, that even this principle has been in effect widened, so as to embrace almost any form of religion, by the subsequent decisions that oaths from persons professing even Heathenism are of sufficient validity; and, in fact, the whole jurisdiction more properly rests on the *mode* of the attack, not the *matter*, being founded on the supposed tendency of such attacks to a breach of the peace; and now that men are coming (as we believe they gradually are) to the conclusion that attempts at restraint are greater breaches of the peace of society than the occasional irruptions which they endeavour to controul, we hope to see even this last hold of persecution abandoned. We might observe too, that the statute, 19 Geo. III. c. 44, which recognizes a declaration of belief that the Scriptures contain the revealed will of God, as sufficient for legal purposes, is directly opposed to the principle that the law views Christianity only through the Churchman's glass.

The very statement that Church-of-Englandism, created by statute only, comparatively, a few years ago, is part and parcel of the common law of England, and that persons whom the statute law for propping up that Church leaves at liberty, are still within the gripe of the ancient law and custom of these realms, involves an absurdity. Mr. Beldam is equally in a wood with regard to his theories about a common-law jurisdiction over heresy, especially if we are to understand heresy to be an impugment of the doctrines of the Church of England. We venture to denominate all this talk about heresy at common law, especially in modern days, mere prattle. It would do Mr. Beldam good on this subject, too, to read Lord Mansfield's judgment before referred to.

Mr. Beldam has made ample, and often very proper, use of the hints, suggestions, doubts, &c. of Lord Eldon in the Attorney-General and Pearson (the Wolverhampton) case. We are glad to see that he, after stating the grand *doubt* which was meant to amount to an assertion that Unitarians, though relieved from statutory visitation, were, on account of some supposed offence at common law, not entitled to the protection of the court, adds, "this, however, is extremely doubtful." It is of the more importance that it should be so, if Mr. Beldam's visions as to heresy and common-law Christianity have any reality, for the same principles would manifestly involve all

Dissenters and their trusts. We were glad to see that Lord Eldon did not, in the late debate in the House of Lords, venture to repeat this doubt, for which we heard him receive, on a former occasion, a severe castigation from Lord Liverpool,* and that the existence of such a crotchet was thrown on one side, and not even thought worthy of notice in the present Lord Chancellor's manly and straightforward speech.

On the subject of Registers, Mr. Beldam might have pointed out the glaring difficulties in which Dissenters are placed by the confining of these records to the Established Church, and the crying necessity for some new system of registration. What does he, as a lawyer, mean to convey by copying the form of birth register formerly adopted at Dr. Williams's library, and the instructions as to its use? Some alterations are in contemplation which will improve this register; and, in the present state of the law, it is the best the Dissenters can hope to have, and is, in some particulars, much better than the Church registers; but Mr. Beldam must know that the form as he has given it (which is not, by the bye, the one which has for many years been used) is in itself no evidence at all, as it does not purport to contain even the signature of either of the parents, so as to make it equivalent to a declaration by them, like an entry in a Family Bible.

On the Marriage rite, too, it would have been very useful to have given us some information, legally and historically, particularly when we are told that Quakers "*still retain the liberty of solemnizing matrimony in their conventicles.*" How lax all this is! Where is there in any law quoted by Mr. Beldam a word about this "*liberty of solemnizing matrimony in conventicles*"? In order that we may guess how Quaker marriages now stand, one would like to hear from Mr. Beldam what he considers was the old law of England as to marriage, which is left to the Quakers by the excepting clause in the Marriage Act. It might have been observed, too, that Quakers, by this sulky exception, are left without any facilities for proof of their marriages, their Register being, as such, no evidence.

We cannot congratulate Mr. Beldam on his good fortune in the precedents of trust deeds imparted to him. We will not pay them so bad a compliment as not to admit that they are better than the miserable form which the Deputies put forth under the sanction of Mr. Preston's name; but we hope that our Dissenting friends will equally avoid Mr. Beldam's project, which we consider as, in many points, very unworkmanlike, and marvellously ill adapted to the general views and objects for which we should hold up a precedent for popular adoption.

To conclude: how obviously does a review of this disgraceful part of our code suggest the ease with which a revisal and consolidation might take place,—sweeping away altogether many of the present bones of contention,—providing easily and in a straightforward manner for the due exercise of the religious worship of Nonconformists,—the privileges, duties, and restraints, so far as the welfare of society demanded them, of its professors, and the peculiar cases of some bodies,—and settling a simple, intelligible pledge and promise of attachment to the welfare of the community, on which all citizens should be equally entitled to its privileges, to be forfeited only by actions at variance with its well-being!

* Since this was written, we have traced the old spirit at work in a clause tacked to the Marriage Bill by amendment, and specially providing that nothing therein contained should be construed to alter or abrogate any law in force with regard to the doctrine of the Trinity. More food for doubts!

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

(Continued from p. 211.)

FROM what we have before had occasion to say of the determined *orthodoxy* of Mr. Bloomfield, it will be anticipated by our readers that we shall find more from which we must dissent in his annotations on the Gospel of John, than in those on the other evangelists; and we cannot give him the praise of being always a candid adversary—much less an impartial judge: still we meet here, as in the other parts, with a great deal which must be accounted valuable by all sober-minded interpreters; and the parts which we least approve may be instructive to the diligent inquirer, whilst they mislead those who blindly submit themselves to the guidance of a commentator of approved orthodoxy, or who are anxious to find pretences for believing what they have previously determined not to reject.

That the Gospel of John should have seemed to our author to require some preliminary remarks, we cannot wonder; but we think it would have been more *useful* to have attempted some short account of the different theories which have been proposed respecting its peculiar design, and the cause of its singularity of phraseology, giving reasons for the adoption of that which he has preferred; more rational, at least, to have given a simple explanation of his own views, instead of copying a dissertation, a large part of which is in opposition to a theory with which most of his readers are unacquainted, and which is confessedly imperfect, inasmuch as it refers for its completion to another essay,* by the same author, of which no abstract is here offered to us. Dr. Tittman's introduction is, however, recommended by the high tone of its orthodoxy. He maintains that the Gospel of John was expressly written to give instruction respecting "the *person and work of Christ;*" to teach that "he existed before the beginning of the world with God, that *he is God, and the creator of the universe.*" Of Dr. T.'s arguments for the deity of Christ, we have before had occasion (p. 60) to give one curious specimen, and we now add another, which certainly needs no remark from us to set it in its just light. John xvii. 5, (And now, O Father! glorify me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was,) is thus quoted: "*Restore to me now in heaven that majesty which I had there with thee before the creation of the world*"!!

The first passage of Mr. Bloomfield's commentary to which we shall particularly call the attention of our readers, relates to chap. i. ver. 29, "Behold the lamb of God, who taketh away, i. e. (he says) who *expiateth* the sins of the world," in defence of which gloss there is a long, and we must add, though rejecting without hesitation the author's opinion, a useful and liberal annotation. The sense is thought to be, "that Christ underwent a cruel and ignominious death *for the sins of the whole world.*" "There is an allusion either to the *paschal* lamb, or to the *lamb*s ordered to be sacrificed in the Old Testament, particularly what is called the *sacrificium jugs*, i. e. the *lamb*s every day, morning and evening, slain in the temple. At all events Christ is here considered as a *viotum* offered up for the sins of men; as in 1. Pet. i. 19. So 1. Cor. v. 7, "For Christ, our *pascha*, is sacrificed for us."

The uncertainty here about the sacrifice referred to is very remarkable, and is sufficient to show how little dependence can be placed on the interpretation.

* De vestigiis Gnosticorum in N. T. frustra quaesitis.

In what follows, we are first reminded that the paschal lambs are called in the Old Testament זֶבַח sacrifices, a fact of no importance to the argument, since this word, derived from a root signifying “to slay,” expresses the death of the victim, but has nothing to do with the purpose of the sacrifice, whether expiating, eucharistical, or, as was certainly the case with the paschal lamb, merely a commemorative sign. We are then told that in the morning and evening sacrifice “the whole of the carcass was burnt and offered up, to expiate the sins not only of the *Jews*, but of the *whole human race* ;” in justification of which, passages are cited from Josephus and Philo ; but one of the passages from Josephus is not at all to the purpose, only stating that the lambs were offered *at the public expense* ; and little importance can be attached to the other, which relates “that the Jews affirmed to Suetonius, the president, that they twice every day offered up sacrifices for Cæsar and the Roman people ;” a piece of flattery which we need not suppose connected in their minds with any religious truth, and which need not at all be explained to refer to expiation. The passage from Philo expressly states (which we wonder Mr. Bloomfield could overlook), that the morning and evening sacrifices were “*thank offerings*,” consequently *not expiatory* (*ὑπὲρ εὐχαριστίας ἐκάτερον*) ; and Mr. Bloomfield has himself recorded Gabler’s objection, on this very ground, to the interpretation he adopts. The expression “*lamb of God*” is further insisted on as meaning “the lamb *accepted of God*, or destined to death by God himself,” as, *ἔργον τοῦ Θεοῦ*, a work approved by God, *ζωὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, a life approved by God—we should rather compare it with such phrases as “*man of God*,” i. e. *devoted to the service of God*, or “*righteousness of God*” (Phil. iii. 9), i. e. *righteousness or justification given by God*, &c.

Lastly, Mr. Bloomfield relies greatly on the force of the word *αἶρειν*, though he is himself in great uncertainty whether *αἶρειν τὴν ἀμαρτίαν* is “to take away the guilt of sins,” to *expiate* them, or is to be understood of “suffering, undergoing and paying the punishment of sins ; since the victim took on himself and bore the sins.” If the first be admitted, “to take away the guilt of sin,” may be understood to announce pardon and the means of acceptance to sinners, without any reference to the death of Christ. The second supposition rests on a misapprehension of Levit. iv. 4, &c., nothing being there or elsewhere said of laying sins on the head of the sin-offering, and the intention of that sort of offering being a public acknowledgment of the sin, accompanied by a small fine, together answering as a sufficient punishment for the kind of faults for which these offerings were appointed ; and of Levit. xvi. 21, &c., the *scape-goat* not being ordered to be slain, and not being in any sense a sacrifice, but merely a symbolical representation of the purification of the people ; had our author’s view been correct, the sins would have been laid on the goat that was killed, not on that which was set at liberty.

Kuinoel thinks it cannot be proved that John the Baptist expected the death of Christ ; that our Lord is here called a *Lamb* in reference to his character as an innocent and meek person ; that his “taking away the sins of the world,” is not intended as a reason for his being called a *Lamb*, there being *no reference to sacrifice* ; and that “to take away sins,” is to be explained to *remove vice* by teaching and promoting virtue, he quotes 1 John iii. 5, οἴδατε ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ἐφανερώθη, ἵνα τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἄρῃ. His idea of the sense is thus expressed : “View this innocent, pious, meek person, wholly devoted and consecrated to God ! Great and wonderful things will be performed : he will remove the sins of men, and extirpate vice from the earth, he

will purify men by his doctrine," &c. To this interpretation Mr. Bloomfield opposes a merely declamatory passage from Doddridge against Grotius; he says it is not true that vice and sin have been removed by the Christian religion, (it may be replied that they have been diminished at least, and, that it is the object of Christianity to remove them,) and he objects to the sense given to the word αἶρεν, of which he complains that no example is given. We should consider the passage from John's Epistle as a sufficient example, nor can we see that αἶρεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν to "remove sin," is harsher than τὸ δίκαιον τῷ δικαίῳ αἶροντες, "taking away the righteousness of the just man," or is very difficult to be derived from the sense of removing or taking away any sensible object, as "remove from among you (LXX. ἀρατε) the strange gods."

On the whole we think Mr. Bloomfield's own statement will incline the impartial reader to prefer Kuinoel's interpretation of this important text, or at least, whether he refer the last clause to the reformation of the world through Christ, or to his promise of pardon to the penitent, entirely to abandon the idea of *any* reference to sacrifice, or *any specific* reference to Christ's death.

Ch. ii. 25, ("He needed not that any should testify of man: for he knew what was in man,") affords Mr. Bloomfield an opportunity of defending the omniscience, and consequently the Deity of Christ. We join with him in reprobating the interpretation which explains the words of a knowledge of the human heart derived from natural wisdom and experience. It is perfectly evident, we think, that the writer meant to be understood of supernatural knowledge; but when it is hence inferred that Jesus was possessed of omniscience, and was God himself, we must refuse our assent, because the power of knowing the thoughts of those with whom he had intercourse in the performance of his mission, must have been almost necessary for our Lord's success in his teaching, and might as well have been communicated as any other miraculous gift; because there are instances recorded of such a power having been possessed by the ancient prophets, as Samuel's knowledge of the object of Saul's search, when he went to inquire after his father's asses, and Elisha's knowledge of what Gehazi had done, when he followed Naaman to receive a present from him, and because it is evident from the history in the New Testament that the Jews understood such a power to be a proof of a divine mission, but *not* of Deity. It was thus that Nathanael was convinced that Jesus was "the Son of God, the King of Israel," because he shewed a miraculous acquaintance, not exactly with his thoughts, but with his private actions; by the same means the woman of Samaria was led to acknowledge him as a prophet. A convincing passage respecting the opinions of the Jews on this subject is found in Luke vii. 39, where Simon the Pharisee seeing that Jesus permitted his feet to be anointed by the woman who was a sinner, observes, "This man if he were a prophet would have known who and what manner of woman this is that toucheth him; for she is a sinner." It appears from this that the Jews not only allowed the possibility of a man by divine assistance knowing the thoughts and sentiments of others, but even expected as a matter of course that every prophet should to a certain extent be furnished with this power.

An instance of the want of clearness and decision of which our author often gives us cause to complain, occurs in the notes on ch. v. 2—4. He occupies eight pages in discussions respecting the true meaning of this passage, and seeming to be equally convinced by Mead and Lampe at last sanctions the opinion of Doddridge, which is a strange compound of Mead's

idea, that the pool was a medicinal bath possessing sanative power only at intervals, with the common notion of the actual descent of an angel and the miraculous character of the cures: yet in conclusion, he appears to acquiesce in the opinion, which seems to us to admit of little doubt, that the fourth verse, from which the whole difficulty arises, is an interpolation, and gives, from Kuinoel, a good abstract of the reasons against its genuineness, which make a large portion of the previous annotations useless.

In the long note on ch. viii. 1—11, Mr. Bloomfield zealously defends the genuineness of this much disputed passage. We acknowledge the justice of many of the observations he has given from Staudlin and Kuinoel, yet we cannot help still looking on the story with somewhat more than suspicion. To the internal arguments against it, we, indeed, attach little or no importance, and we are almost inclined, as Beza seems to have been to receive it as substantially true, while we feel obliged to question its genuineness as a portion of St. John's Gospel. The few remarks we shall offer will relate to the evidence of manuscripts respecting the whole passage, the variety of reading in the manuscripts which contain it, and the modes of accounting for its omission if genuine, or its insertion if spurious. Staudlin observes that the number of manuscripts which have the story is far greater than of those which omit it. This is true; for, according to Griesbach, it is contained in 203, omitted in 79; but we are not to consider all those which contain the passage as supporting its authority, for 35 which mark it with asterisks or obeli, and 18 which insert it in other places, must rather be counted against it, which would make the numbers 150 for its genuineness, 132 against—no very important majority considering how much greater the tendency is to *take in* than to *leave out*. “A judgment must, however,” Mr. B. justly remarks, “be formed, not from the *number* only, but the weight and excellence of manuscripts and the consent of different recensions.” The testimony of A and C is objected to, because these valuable manuscripts are mutilated in this part of St. John's Gospel, and it is supposed hardly possible to decide with certainty whether or not the lost leaves contained the suspected verses. With respect to A we think if the acknowledged integrity, acuteness and experience of Wetstein, the clear statement of Woide, and the actual inspection of the printed copy of the manuscript which enables every one to form a tolerably correct judgment, fail to produce conviction, there must be a very obstinate determination not to be convinced; and as the portion of C, which is here lost, is still smaller, (only one leaf,) we have no hesitation in saying, that every one who has attentively examined a fac-simile specimen of the manuscript will feel, that the confidence of Wetstein and Griesbach on the subject is not without reason. We ourselves have scarcely more doubt than if we had actually inspected the lost leaves of both manuscripts. As it is evident that the addition belongs to the Constantinopolitan recension from the general testimony of manuscripts of that class, its absence from such a manuscript as L, in which Constantinopolitan readings prevail, but which has a considerable mixture of Alexandrian or Western ones, proves it to have been absent from at least one of those recensions, (which by a comparison of other authorities is found to be the Alexandrian,) whilst the blank space, shewing it to have been known to the Scribe, and perhaps implying that he had some inclination to insert it, only agrees with the known fact that his text is partly derived from Constantinopolitan copies.

We must recollect, in these inquiries, that there is no perfect standard of any recension of the sacred text, and that many manuscripts have a very

mixed text, because, in writing them, the Scribes compared more ancient copies of different recensions, and inclined sometimes to one, sometimes to the other, according to the dictates of no very enlightened critical judgment. The general disposition being much more to add than to take away, (of course we do not refer to instances which may be explained as the effects of accident,) we judge of the testimony of any particular recension, rather from those copies which steadily omit what is found in other recensions, than from those which introduce what may be supposed to be taken from copies of a different recension. If a passage be marked in any copy with asterisks or obeli, it is clear that the Scribe was acquainted with and had a respect for manuscripts which omitted it; and if, whilst the great body of manuscripts following a certain recension, contain a passage, it is thus marked in several copies which are remarkable for a mixture of the readings of a different recension, we of course conclude that the passage was not contained in that other recension. Now, this is exactly the case with the story of the adulteress: it is found generally in the Constantinopolitan manuscripts, but it is either omitted or marked with various signs of doubt, or inserted merely as a supplement at the end of the gospel, in a considerable number of those manuscripts which are most remarkable for a sprinkling of Alexandrian readings; of course we conclude, that the story was not found in the manuscripts of the Alexandrian recension, which, *in a case of this kind*, is a strong presumption against genuineness.

Respecting the extraordinary variety of readings in the passage itself, we are told by Mr. Bloomfield, (from Staudlin,) that “those who maintain that it is spurious can no more account for this circumstance than those who defend its authenticity.” This seems to us to be a mistake. All who have remarked the variety of readings as important in the argument, must have done so on the same ground—a belief that the original of the story must have existed in some other language, and that the different modes of expressing in Greek precisely the same idea, are so many different translations; take, as an example, the first words, vii. 53:

Καὶ ἐπορεύθη ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ	
ἐπορεύθησαν	
ἀπῆλθεν	τὰ ἴδια
ἀπῆλθον	τὸν τόπον

—or the closing ones,

πορεύου καὶ μηκέτι ἀμάρτανε
τὸ λοιπὸν
ὑπαγε ἀπὸ τῶν νῦν

A passage which appears, in different copies, full of such variations as these, will hardly be believed to be in its original language; and the doubt which appears to have existed as to the proper place of inserting it, whether in its usual place, or after Luke xxi., greatly favours the idea of its being an addition from some other source.—We know of none more probable than the *Gospel of the Hebrews*.

We acknowledge that an apprehension of the possible injurious tendency of the passage might account for its suppression and lessen the authority of lectionaria against it; but if this were the cause of its omission we should hardly find it absent from some of the oldest and best manuscripts; and, certainly, on the supposition of its spuriousness, there is no difficulty in accounting for the early introduction, from some other work, of a story generally circulated and believed, and which must have been esteemed

highly interesting. We might say much on the evidence of the versions, and on the particular character of some of the manuscripts; but as the subject may be uninteresting to most readers, we will conclude, taking the absence of the passage from many of the oldest and best manuscripts, especially those which contain most of the *Alexandrian recension*, and the varieties of expression in different copies which seem to prove it a translation, to be sufficient grounds for most strongly suspecting, if not absolutely rejecting it, in which opinion we concur with a great proportion of the most eminent critics.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

ART. IV.—*Lettre du Consistoire de l'Eglise Réformée de Lyon aux divers Consistoires de l'Eglises Réformées de France.* Lyon. 1826.

Letter of the Consistory of the Reformed Church of Lyons to the different Consistories of the Reformed Churches of France.

It had been hoped that the deep interest taken by the Protestant states of Europe in the vexatious, and often fatal persecutions to which the Protestants in the south of France were subjected soon after the restoration of the Bourbon dynasty, and the measures of relief which were at that time extorted for them from the government of Louis XVIII., would, in future, have secured for these dissidents from the Catholic Church, the full and free exercise of their religion, under the sanction of the national law. Circumstances have, however, lately arisen which too clearly demonstrate that the spirit of intolerance has not yet been effectually subdued in that portion of France, and that there are persons invested with a "little brief authority" who are ready to lend their official aid to repress every species of dissent, and to restrict all public religious exercises to the worship of the national church. The pamphlet which is now before us, an authorized official document, details some new attempts at persecution, which, if not at once met by the reprehension of the public voice, and the intervention of the proper legal authorities, may end in very calamitous consequences. We wish to assure our suffering brethren in the South, that we are sensibly alive to their grievances, and will gladly lend them every assistance in our power to awaken the public sympathy on their behalf, by giving more ex-

tensive publicity to the interesting narrative of their wrongs.

The consistorial church of Lyons comprehends several rural communes containing many Protestants, who, owing to the distance of their residences, are but seldom able to attend public worship in the city. At the solicitation of the Protestants of the commune of Tarare, one of the pastors of Lyons was sent to officiate to them, and encountered some opposition from the local authorities. Several other communes having united with Tarare in an application to have a pastor from Lyons to conduct public worship among them, the consistory, in order, as they say, to prevent any difficulties which might arise from a misapplication of the laws, wrote to the minister of the interior, requesting him to apprise the authorities of the department that their worship and their ministers were entitled to legal protection. This request was acknowledged by the minister to be perfectly just, and he communicated his opinion to the prefect of the Rhone. Intimation of this was given verbally by the prefect himself, who added, that if the consistory would only name the places where they wished to hold their religious meetings, he would take care to give the necessary instructions to the mayors of the communes. The places were accordingly mentioned, and no farther difficulty was apprehended; when M. Claparède, while performing divine service at St. Consoce, was interrupted by the mayor of the commune, who requested him to dissolve the meeting as being in violation of the 291 article of the penal code. Remonstrance was vain. The minister was informed that he would have to answer for his conduct before the king's prosecutor. The prefect, on being appealed to, replied, that the article of

the penal code, quoted as authority, did not apply to the case, and that nothing more was needed than that the owner of the houses, in which it was proposed to assemble for divine worship, should ask permission of the municipal authority. Though the consistory did not think this formality to be demanded by the charter, the intimation was complied with in all the communes where their pastors were to officiate.

In granting his license, conformably to this suggestion, the mayor of St. Consoce inserted, among other restrictions, the following conditions, viz. that the meeting should be composed exclusively of the Protestants of that commune; and that no stranger should be allowed to be present without intimation being previously given to the mayor. Against these restrictions the consistory transmitted a remonstrance to the prefect, complaining of them as extrajudicial, and at variance with the liberty of worship granted by the charter. After a long delay the prefect sent them an answer which excited their astonishment. He informed them that remonstrances had been forwarded to him against acceding to their request; that it was then dangerous to intermeddle in religious matters; and concluding by requesting them to postpone the visits of their pastors to the communes. When they were about to reply to this letter an event occurred which engaged the whole of their attention.

After leave had been granted by the mayor of St. Consoce, religious worship had been regularly conducted in that commune. M. Claparède was engaged to officiate there on Sunday, the 3rd of September, but was obliged to postpone his visit to the 10th. On the 3rd, however, a body of men, about thirty in number, wholly unknown to the inhabitants, arrived in the Commune, made several inquiries about the Protestant worship, and seemed much disappointed that the service had been put off. On the 10th the same men again appeared in the commune, and assembled near the place of worship, into which four or five of them entered. In the midst of the service one of these persons interrupted the minister by the following speech: "Having been educated in the Catholic religion I have learnt that out of that religion no man can be saved; why then do you come to withdraw this people from the Catholic faith, and to conduct them to damnation?" As he could not be silenced a peace officer removed him from the

house and placed him in proper custody. The mildness and the firmness manifested by the Protestants on this occasion, induced his associates to withdraw, and the service was peaceably concluded.

On the return of M. Claparède to Lyons, he apprized the king's procurator of these facts, and lodged a complaint against the unknown disturber of the meeting, and gave in the names of two of his companions. The Protestants now expected a more effective protection, instead of which, on the 16th of September, the prefect transmitted to the consistory an order of the mayor of the commune, which he had countersigned, suspending the permission which had been given them to meet for worship, on the pretended plea of the disturbance which had taken place on the 10th, until the decision of the minister of the interior could be obtained.

Against this order the consistory remonstrated, first, because the facts were greatly exaggerated, and the interruption of an individual construed into a serious disturbance and contest; and, secondly, because it was a manifest incroachment on the freedom of worship secured by the charter: for it put it in the power of any petty officer, upon a false pretence, to prevent their public religious services.

The consistory now wrote to the minister of the interior acquainting him with these circumstances, inclosing copies of the complaint lodged with the king's procurator, and of the remonstrance sent to the prefect. On the 5th of October they received an answer, intimating, that as the affair had been put into the hands of the king's procurator, the administration could take no farther cognizance of it. The consistory after this addressed another letter to the same minister in explanation of their former communication; and here the matter rested when this pamphlet was printed.

We have since learned that the minister of the interior has thought it proper to reconsider his answer, and to grant the consistory the protection for which they sought, and to which they were legally entitled. He has, for the present, interposed his authority to restrain the bigotry of the mayor of the commune of St. Consoce and his Catholic abettors. We hope the publicity that has been given to the case in France will prevent the repetition of such intolerant and arbitrary proceedings. If such vexatious measures are in the least countenanced by the king's government, there is an end of the boasted

liberty of worship secured to the Protestants by the charter.

ART. V.—*An Affectionate Appeal to the Sons of Israel, the Chosen Nation.* By one of their Brethren, Abraham Elias Caisson. London. 1827. Hunter. pp. 12.

MUCH laudable zeal has been of late years devoted in this country, both by Churchmen and Dissenters, to attempts to convert the Jews to Trinitarian Christianity. We believe that the sanguine hopes of success which were once entertained by the promoters of this scheme have been greatly allayed by the result of their experiments. They have, in some cases, suffered themselves to become the dupes of the selfish and the crafty, who have made a show of changing their religion for the sole purpose of sharing the good things which, it was understood, their pious friends had to dispense to their proselytes. The number of their actual converts has, we suspect, been very small; and how could it be otherwise? It is not in human nature that men who have deeply imbibed, from their earliest childhood, the religious faith which had been imparted to their fathers by a divine revelation, and which they had been appointed to guard and defend as a sacred deposit, should at once relinquish it for a system which must appear to them to propose new objects of worship, against the repeated injunctions and the awful denunciations of Jehovah, by their lawgiver and prophets. If Jews are to be converted to Christianity it must be to that form of it which maintains, in agreement with the Jewish revelation, that Jehovah alone, the God and Father of Jesus Christ, is to receive religious service and adoration under the Messiah's kingdom.

We have been led to these remarks by the perusal of the little pamphlet whose title we have transcribed above. The writer is a member of the Jewish nation, a native of Constantinople, who has passed a great part of his life in Italy and France. By his own reading and reflection he has been brought to believe that the Messiah is come, and that Jesus was the Messiah. With this belief, however, he retains his former opinions as to the strict personal unity of God, and maintains the perpetual obligation of the Jewish ritual on Hebrew, but not on Gentile, proselytes. With these views,

he still frequents the synagogue, and joins in its worship.

Being himself a decided convert to Christianity, he is desirous of effecting the conversion of others of "the sons of Israel," and of taking such steps for the promotion of this object as he may be able, either through the press or by personal conference. The present pamphlet is to be considered as an introductory measure, designed chiefly to make known his principles and wishes. The Unitarians may possibly think the author and his scheme entitled to some attention. We subjoin a few extracts as explanatory of Mr. Caisson's religious notions.

"What a privilege this is, my brethren, to be a chosen nation, a peculiar people; chosen, doubtless, for wise purposes, which in their own time must be accomplished! Every believer in the Law must agree with me in this; but many among you will, I fear, be offended, when I appeal also to the words of the Messiah. For they will say, The Messiah is not come, and we are in patient expectation of his coming.

"But, my brethren, this is a vain expectation. Age has succeeded age; but we, who have been favoured with marks in the Law and the Prophets by which to know the Messiah when he comes, must, if we pay attention to them, perceive that his first coming is passed; and his second coming, which is looked for by all the followers of Jesus, can be known only by those marks which are given as well in the writings peculiar to our nation, as in those which, composed all by men of our nation, complete the history of the dispensations of God to mankind. The Messiah, after his resurrection from the dead, ascended into heaven in the presence of his disciples, all of our nation; and it was then declared to them, that as they saw him ascending into heaven, in like manner should he be seen returning: seen, doubtless, by disciples of the same nation, when it shall be restored to its ancient habitations, and become, under its Lord, the glory of the people of the earth.

"These are great encouragements to us in our present forlorn condition; in which we must remain unless our eyes are enlightened, and we thankfully accept the covenant as made with our fathers. It is in vain that we look for blessings on the one hand, whilst on the other we reject the precepts on which they are founded."—Pp. 3—5.

“Ye are living, my brethren, in the midst of nations professing to be followers of Jesus; and in this are many persons, with great zeal, endeavouring to convert you to their peculiar opinions, and to draw you away from the law given to our fathers. But to what are they endeavouring to convert you? Each has his Shibboleth. And what would they make of you?—a divided people, separated from each other, aliens from the house of Israel. They cannot agree among themselves; nay, they carry with them such distinctive marks of hatred, that they not only deny to each other their civil rights on account of some peculiar doctrines, but in many places, and on a variety of occasions, they have delivered each other over to prisons and to death. This, my brethren, cannot be the religion of the Messiah, the Prince of Peace.”—P. 6.

“The Law, they cannot deny it, was given from heaven. It was given to our nation,—commanded to be observed for ever by us. By whom, then, was it abrogated? By Jesus! by him who followed the Law, and declared not one iota of it should be abolished till the consummation of all things? By his apostles! who constantly worshiped at the Temple, who were satisfied with a few necessary injunctions to the nations, but thought it needless to speak to their own nation on this subject, as they said, ‘Moses was read every Sabbath-day in the synagogues’? Neither Jesus nor his apostles departed from the Law. How, then, can any man in these days call on you to forsake your privileges, your honourable distinctions, your part in the covenant made with our fathers? Let them, at any rate, shew us their authority. Whence do they derive it? Be not deceived by them, my brethren. The Messiah, when he comes again, will come to his own people, to the house of Israel: and though he was once rejected by our fathers, yet will their descendants ‘look on him whom they pierced,’ and acknowledge him as their Saviour, the King of Israel.”—Pp. 6, 7.

“We are not, my brethren, let me repeat it, called upon to forsake the Law, because we acknowledge *Jesus* to be the MESSIAH. We are not on that account to quit our synagogues. We are still the peculiar people of the Almighty, destined by him to make his truth to be known

to all nations. We will rejoice in the conversion of the nations to the worship of one God, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, him whom Jesus, the Messiah, proclaimed to be his God and our God. We will acknowledge them to be our brethren in one faith, not called upon to follow our rites and customs: for the Law was not given to them; ‘but grace and truth came by Jesus,’ the Messiah, equally to them and to us.”—Pp. 8, 9.

“We shall not, then, be objects of jealousy and suspicion to any party. We shall not say to them, There is no salvation unless you follow our rites and customs. We shall exhort them as brethren to compare together the Law, the Prophets, the Gospels, and to be assured, that the whole makes one consistent system, worthy of Him who declared his will to the Patriarchs, to Moses, to the Prophets, and lastly to our nation by his beloved Son, the Messiah, by whose command the chosen messengers, all of our nation, were sent to promulgate these great truths to the whole world.”—P. 11.

ART. VI.—*Letters from his late Majesty to the late Lord Kenyon, on the Coronation Oath, with his Lordship's Answers: and Letters of the Right Hon. William Pitt to his late Majesty, with his Majesty's Answers, previous to the Dissolution of the Ministry in 1801. Second Edition. London. 1827. Murray. pp. 40.*

It cannot be denied that this pamphlet comes forth most seasonably. It places the honest but obstinate and ignorant difficulties raised by the late King, and those who seek to justify their unreasonableness by his, in excellent contrast with the more enlightened and equally manly opinions of Mr. Pitt; and it deprives of all support those who would now more loudly than ever cover their opposition to every improvement by the authority of his name. Mr. Canning and his friends will now most clearly have the sanction of that authority on their side, and the notoriety given to the facts will contribute, we trust, still more decidedly to fix him in the course which the country has a right to expect from him.

The letters have all appeared in the public newspapers, but we think it right to record in our pages the important tes-

* See *Acts* xv. 21.

timony of Mr. Pitt in favour of concession to the Catholics and Dissenters.

“LETTER OF MR. PITT TO THE LATE KING.

“Downing Street,

“Saturday, January 31st, 1801.

“Mr. Pitt would have felt it, at all events, his duty, previous to the meeting of Parliament, to submit to your Majesty the result of the best consideration which your confidential Servants could give to the important Questions respecting the Catholics and Dissenters, which must naturally be agitated in consequence of the Union. The knowledge of your Majesty's general indisposition to any change of the Laws on this subject would have made this a painful task to him; and it is become much more so by learning from some of his colleagues, and from other quarters, within these few days, the extent to which your Majesty entertains, and has declared, that sentiment.

“He trusts your Majesty will believe, that every principle of duty, gratitude, and attachment, must make him look to your Majesty's ease and satisfaction, in preference to all considerations, but those arising from a sense of what in his honest opinion is due to the real interest of your Majesty and your dominions. Under the impression of that opinion, he has concurred in what appeared to be the prevailing sentiments of the majority of the Cabinet,—that the admission of the Catholics and Dissenters to offices, and of the Catholics to Parliament, (from which latter the Dissenters are not now excluded,) would, under certain conditions to be specified, be highly advisable, with a view to the tranquillity and improvement of Ireland, and to the general interest of the United Kingdom.

“For himself, he is on full consideration convinced, that the measure would be attended with no danger to the Established Church, or to the Protestant Interest in Great Britain or Ireland:—That now the Union has taken place, and with the new provisions which would make part of the plan, it could never give any such weight in office, or in Parliament, either to Catholics or Dissenters, as could give them any new means (if they were so disposed) of attacking the Establishment:—that the grounds on which the laws of exclusion now remaining were founded, have long been narrowed, and are since the Union removed:—that those principles, formerly held by the Catholics, which made them considered as politically dangerous,

have been for a course of time gradually declining, and, among the higher orders particularly, have ceased to prevail:—that the obnoxious tenets are disclaimed in the most positive manner by the Oaths, which have been required in Great Britain, and still more by one of those required in Ireland, as the condition of the indulgences already granted, and which might equally be made the condition of any new ones:—that if such an Oath, containing (among other provisions) a denial of the power of Absolution from its obligations, is not a security from Catholics, the sacramental test is not more so:—that the political circumstances under which the exclusive laws originated, arising either from the conflicting power of hostile and nearly balanced Sects, from the apprehension of a Popish Queen or Successor, a disputed succession and a foreign Pretender, and a division in Europe between Catholic and Protestant Powers, are no longer applicable to the present state of things:—that with respect to those of the Dissenters, who it is feared entertain principles dangerous to the Constitution, a distinct political test, pointed against the doctrine of modern Jacobinism, would be a much more just and more effectual security, than that which now exists, which may operate to the exclusion of conscientious persons well affected to the State, and is no guard against those of an opposite description:—

“That with respect to the Catholics of Ireland, another most important additional security, and one of which the effect would continually increase, might be provided, by gradually attaching the Popish Clergy to the Government, and, for this purpose, making them dependent for a part of their provision (under proper regulations) on the State, and by also subjecting them to superintendence and controul:—

“That, besides these provisions, the general interests of the Established Church, and the security of the Constitution and Government, might be effectually strengthened by requiring the Political Test, before referred to, from the Preachers of all Catholic or Dissenting Congregations, and from the Teachers of Schools of every denomination.

“It is on these principles Mr. Pitt humbly conceives a new Security might be obtained for the Civil and Ecclesiastical Constitution of this country, more applicable to the present circumstances, more free from objection, and more effectual in itself, than any which now

exists;—and which would, at the same time, admit of extending such indulgences, as must conciliate the higher orders of the Catholics, and by furnishing to a large class of your Majesty's Irish subjects a proof of the good will of the United Parliament, afford the best chance of giving full effect to the great object of the Union,—that of tranquilizing Ireland, and attaching it to this country.

“It is with inexpressible regret, after all he now knows of your Majesty's sentiments, that Mr. Pitt troubles your Majesty, thus at large, with the general grounds of his opinion, and finds himself obliged to add, that this opinion is unalterably fixed in his mind. It must, therefore, ultimately guide his political conduct, if it should be your Majesty's pleasure, that, after thus presuming to open himself fully to your Majesty, he should remain in that responsible situation, in which your Majesty has so long condescended graciously and favourably to accept his services. It will afford him, indeed, a great relief and satisfaction, if he may be allowed to hope, that your Majesty will deign maturely to weigh what he has now humbly submitted, and to call for any explanation, which any parts of it may appear to require.

“In the interval which your Majesty may wish for consideration, he will not, on his part, importune your Majesty with any unnecessary reference to the subject; and will feel it his duty to abstain himself, from all agitation of this subject in Parliament, and to prevent it, as far as depends on him, on the part of others. If, on the result of such consideration, your Majesty's objections to the measure proposed should not be removed, or sufficiently diminished to admit of its being brought forward with your Majesty's full concurrence, and with the whole weight of Government, it must be personally Mr. Pitt's first wish to be released from a situation, which he is conscious, that, under such circumstances, he could not continue to fill but with the greatest disadvantage.

“At the same time, after the gracious intimation, which has been recently conveyed to him, of your Majesty's sentiments on this point, he will be acquitted of presumption in adding, that if the chief difficulties of the present crisis should not then be surmounted, or very materially diminished, and if your Majesty should continue to think, that his humble exertions could, in any degree,

contribute to conducting them to a favourable issue, there is no personal difficulty to which he will not rather submit, than withdraw himself at such a moment from your Majesty's service. He would even, in such case, continue for such a short further interval as might be necessary, to oppose the agitation or discussion of the Question, as far as he can consistently with the line, to which he feels bound uniformly to adhere, of reserving to himself a full latitude on the principle itself, and objecting only to the time, and to the temper and circumstances of the moment. But he must entreat that, on this supposition, it may be distinctly understood, that he can remain in office no longer than till the issue (which he trusts on every account will be a speedy one) of the crisis now depending, shall admit of your Majesty's more easily forming a new arrangement; and that he will then receive your Majesty's permission to carry with him into a private situation that affectionate and grateful attachment, which your Majesty's goodness for a long course of years has impressed on his mind,—and that unabated zeal for the ease and honour of your Majesty's Government, and for the public service, which he trusts will always govern his conduct.

“He has only to entreat your Majesty's pardon for troubling you on one other point, and taking the liberty of most respectfully, but explicitly, submitting to your Majesty the indispensable necessity of effectually discountenancing, in the whole of the interval, all attempts to make use of your Majesty's name, or to influence the opinion of any individual, or descriptions of men, on any part of this subject.”—Pp. 27—33.

ART. VII.—*The Westminster Review*. No. XIV. London. 1827.

OUR contemporary sometimes startles us with the novelty if not the vigour of its propositions. We cannot forbear extracting the following denunciation of the connexion between religion and morals, which, we must say, if it convey as important truths as it pretends to do, has not the good fortune to give any very clear perception of the process of reasoning, by which so original a conclusion, so long hidden from mankind has been evolved, and is to be maintained in this age of improvement.

“The most injurious mistake, or misrepresentation, that has ever been made

on the subject of religion, is the common and vulgar error of supposing that it is connected with morals: an error mischievous to society, pernicious to morals, and nearly fatal to the cause of true religion. The morality that crafty priests would inculcate is, that men should imitate the Deity; but in no system of religion has the Deity ever been represented, nor is it possible he ever should be, as a fit subject of imitation for mere mortals; our notions of morals, in consequence of this absurd and impious mistake, are very confused, and many actions are loudly extolled as most virtuous, which really deserve heavy censure and sharp reproof for their immorality, whilst many others are tumultuously condemned, which are either innocent or praiseworthy.

“To combat this destructive error is the grand aim of ‘Truth’—to demonstrate and make plain and palpable to the most ordinary understanding, that there is no connexion whatever between morals and religion. In order to attain this noble and important end, a variety of characters are introduced. We find two persons of extraordinary strictness of ritual, and of the greatest religious accomplishments, but of consummate wickedness and moral turpitude; a person destitute of religion, but of exemplary virtue and absolute moral purity and perfection; and, as it were, to hold the scales even, to shew that the author has no bias, that the scope and aim of the work is not, as the short-sighted vulgar may pretend, irreligious, and to answer that stupid objection by anticipation, a person who is, in fact, the author’s favourite, the hero of the piece and the pride and glory of his parent, and who is, accordingly, decorated with all ornaments, and copiously endowed with every precious gift, as to prove that, as religion and morals are not necessarily connected, so, in the author’s opinion, they are not necessarily incompatible, and who is, equally distinguished for piety and morality. If any proposition is clear and self-evident, it should seem to be this, that religion was given to mankind to sanctify them in this life, and to save their souls in a better, but not to teach morality in the present, or for any other secular purpose—that such a plain and broad distinction should be confounded, and the difference between morality and religion lost sight of, ought to surprise us, if we did not remember,

that it has always been the object of wicked and designing men to produce confusion, in order to profit thereby, and to indulge a criminal ambition. Artful hypocrites gave themselves out, therefore, as being, by virtue of their office of religious instructors, the teachers of morality also, that they might obtain secular power, and govern the world by moulding the conduct of men, and by fashioning ethics into such a form as would best suit the narrow-selfishness of their private ends. Men of good intentions, but of weak judgments, and who were therefore incapable of seizing distinctions, although sufficiently obvious, were misled by their sophistries, and chiefly because the moral character of the divine Founder of Christianity was, of course, exemplary, and indeed, of necessity, perfect, and they forgot that he came upon the earth to complete the revelation of religion, and not to teach morality, or to cure moral evils: not to instruct mankind in a superior system of medicine, or to cure physical evils: although it cannot be denied that, as proofs of his mission, he healed, both in his own person and by his apostles, many sick persons and miraculously cured various diseases. So strong, indeed, is the analogy between physical and moral evil, that during many centuries of barbarism, the former circumstance was also impiously turned to profit; and rude statues, vile relics, and mouldering bones, the tombs of monks, and sacred springs, were falsely declared to have the power of healing the sick, and many weak persons have been deluded in this manner by the vilest impostures, to the great advantage both in authority and wealth of sordid and tyrannical deceivers. It is more easy to detect failures in physical than in moral experiments, and the symptoms of bodily disease are more obvious than those of mental derangement; the existence of physical impostures in religion was therefore of shorter duration; this lucrative quackery has been almost entirely exploded; the professors of religion no longer meddle with medicine: their more mischievous interference with morals, at least as far as the vulgar are concerned, unhappily still subsists, but it will rapidly disappear in proportion as religion is purified and cleared from the practices of superstition and from worldly dross, and as knowledge is diffused amongst all ranks of society.”

OBITUARY.

MR. JAMES TOUCHET.

Mr. TOUCHET was born in Manchester, where his family had been long and reputably engaged in commercial pursuits, on the 15th of June, 1742. He early enjoyed the advantages of an excellent education, first under the Rev. Mr. Russell, of that town, and afterwards under Mr. Burgh, of Newington-Green, near London, the author of "A Treatise on the Dignity of Human Nature," and of other works. From both these instructors, of whom he was always accustomed to speak with affection and gratitude, he derived a taste for classical and general literature, which continued undiminished to the close of his life. Nature had endowed him with an excellent understanding and a most tenacious memory; and he diligently employed those faculties in acquiring stores of knowledge, which were ever afterwards ready at his command, and at all times applicable to purposes of practical wisdom. He was a striking instance of the safety of an enlarged and liberal education to one moving within the sphere of mercantile life, and of the perfect compatibility of considerable literary acquirements, with those habits of arrangement and attention to the details of ordinary business, which are essential to active and successful commerce. If, indeed, there was any part of his intellectual character peculiarly conspicuous, it was a sobriety and soundness of judgment which led him to assign to the various objects of life their just value; and prevented him from pursuing any one, to the neglect of another of equal importance. In forming opinions, his vigorous mind investigated facts with caution and accuracy,—examined arguments with coolness and impartiality,—and finally drew conclusions, which might safely be relied upon as guides for his own conduct, and for that of the numerous friends who, in cases of difficulty, were accustomed to have recourse to his counsels. No man was ever less in danger of being caught in the snares of sophistry; or lost in the mazes of delusive speculation; or had seldomer occasion to recant opinions once deliberately taken up. In discussion, he united, to an inflexible firmness, in defending what appeared to him to be the truth, so much calmness and candour, that even when he failed

to convince, he never, by exasperating the feelings of an opponent, confirmed him in error, but rather disposed him to a renewed and dispassionate examination of the ground of difference.

The subjects most congenial to Mr. Touchet's taste were not those connected with the physical sciences, nor yet with the lighter and ornamental branches of literature. He delighted most in history, in ethics, in morals, and generally in whatever affects the great interests of man, as an accountable being and a member of society, or tends to establish sound principles of domestic and international policy. He had diligently studied, and he ardently admired, the British Constitution. He leaned, indeed, to the side of those who think that there is less danger in strengthening the power of the crown, than in giving a greater preponderance to the popular branch of our Government. But he was a decided and irreconcilable enemy to every abuse of authority; and strenuously advocated the extension, as far as appeared to him consistent with the general safety, of civil and religious liberty, to all classes of his fellow-subjects.

The moral qualities of Mr. Touchet were in perfect keeping, not only with his intellectual ones, but with each other; and it was this harmony and justness of proportion that constituted perhaps the most striking charm and beauty of his character. From nature he derived a temper of uncommon equanimity and sweetness; and this natural gift he had improved by the constant exercise of the kind and gentle affections, and of those social feelings which issued in a generous but well-regulated and unostentatious hospitality. In his manners there was an urbanity, a composure, and a simple dignity, not unallied with real humility, by which he obtained, unsought, the respect that is reluctantly yielded to persons of greater forwardness and more lofty pretensions. When in the company of friends whom he esteemed, the benevolence of his heart beamed through his fine and expressive features; and his spirits, always cheerful, flowed out in a current of agreeable, lively, and even playful conversation; while his sympathy with the feelings of all around him rendered him

a delightful companion to the young, as well as to those of maturer years. His kind sympathies extended, too, to the wants of his less fortunate brethren. From principle, he disapproved and condemned indiscriminate almsgiving; but in cases of real and obvious distress, or when satisfied by investigation of the justness of a claim for relief, his compassion was deeply touched, and his hand most generously opened.

It remains to speak of Mr. Touchet's religious character. From inquiry and conviction, as well as from early example, he was a Dissenter from the Established Church; and he not only maintained, zealously and uniformly, the principles of his dissent, but endeavoured to perpetuate them by a liberal patronage of the various institutions which have been formed for educating ministers of his own persuasion. But with this zeal there was no tincture of bigotry or intolerance. In the friendly intercourse of life, and in accomplishing works of practical benevolence, he was in the habit of mingling cordially with persons of various religious persuasions; and in this way he frequently softened the animosities of sects, and became, within his sphere, a bond of union between Christians of all denominations. His religious views and principles tended to confirm that constant cheerfulness, which was partly the result of natural temperament; and he enjoyed, with habitual gratitude, the bounties which Providence had so liberally placed within his reach. In the duties of divine worship, both public and private, he regularly and earnestly engaged. He felt that they warmed and cherished his piety, — encouraged his aspirations after virtuous excellence, — and were his best support under those trials, which he was not unfrequently called upon to bear, both in his own person, and in the removal of those who were attached to him by the tenderest natural ties, and by the most amiable and engaging qualities.

Mr. Touchet's habitual temperance happily exempted him almost entirely from the ordinary infirmities of old age, and secured to him, in almost undiminished vigour and enjoyment, the possession of the faculties of his mind, and the sympathies of his heart, till within a few months of his death. Nothing is more usual than for aged persons to retain a correct remembrance of the events of earlier life; but it is very rarely that, in them, the power survives of recalling recent facts and dates, and

of recollecting trains of reasoning which have been lately, for the first time, presented to their minds. In this respect, Mr. Touchet exhibited a striking illustration of the maxim of the Roman moralist—“*Manent ingenia senibus, modò permaneat studium et industria: nec ea solum in clarissimis viris, sed in vitâ etiam privatâ et quietâ.*” His last illness, though tedious from its duration, was happily unaccompanied by acute suffering; and on the first of the present month, he calmly and without a struggle closed a life full of years and honour, leaving to all an example of Christian excellence, and, to those who enjoyed a nearer view of his character, a persuasive lesson to “go and do likewise.”—*Manchester Chronicle.*

June 16, 1827.

REV. JOHN HORSEY.

(See above, p. 448.)

OF the earlier part of Mr. HORSEY'S history I know little more than that he was the son of a very pious minister at Ringwood, in Hampshire, was educated for the ministry at Homerton, and in a short time after leaving the Academy, was invited to become the pastor of the Independent Congregation worshipping at the meeting-house on Castle Hill, in Northampton, in which situation he remained till his death. Soon after he was settled he married a daughter of the Rev. Mr. King, of Welford, in the same county, who died about two years before him, highly-respected for her strength of mind, clearness of judgment, and exemplary conduct as a wife, a mother, a friend, and a Christian. She was the mother of three daughters and two sons; the elder son died, about 1793, the younger and his three sisters survive their parents.

The writer of this became a member of Mr. Horsey's family in 1792, as a divinity student, and having completed the usual course of five years, left the Academy. A residence of five years, as a member of his family, together with occasional interviews since, induced him, as well as others of his pupils, to form such a view of his character as affords no moderate degree of pleasure in the recollection.

The Rev. Thos. Belsham having relinquished his situation as Divinity Tutor at Daventry, Mr. Horsey was appointed by Mr. Coward's Trustees to succeed him, and in 1789 the Academy was removed to Northampton. The first two or three sessions, it is understood, were

by no means so comfortable as the succeeding five, which were followed by the stormy session of 1797, 1798, after the close of which the Institution was removed to Wymondley.

The situation of superintendent Tutor of a Dissenting Academy is known, by those best capable of judging, to be one which requires a happy combination of talents, temper, and habits, which are to be met with in comparatively few men. In Mr. Horsey they existed in a very respectable degree; he was a good disciplinarian; he had a happy method of communicating knowledge and exciting the youthful mind to useful inquiry. He was courteous in his behaviour, and though he never lost sight of the respect due to his station, he did not, by overacting the part of the Tutor and *Rector Academiæ*, keep at unreasonable distance youths who possessed a tolerable share of good feeling and well-regulated affections. A young man under his superintendence must have been guilty of very censurable conduct if he did not find in Mr. Horsey the judicious, discriminating, and affectionate friend and adviser, as well as the successful promoter of his pursuit of those branches of knowledge which were to prepare him for the proper discharge of the duties of a Christian minister. He had a judicious mode of directing the attention to the point on which difficult subjects in Metaphysics and Divinity hinged; and his plan of lecturing on disputed points, in both those branches, was quite exemplary in one particular view; he was so anxious not to give an undue bias to his youthful auditors, that it was very difficult to ascertain in the lecture-room his own precise views in the more controverted subjects.

In the freer intercourse of the parlour and social circle, his conversational talents were of a superior order; he was cheerful without descending to censurable levity, he had a fund of amusing and instructing anecdotes, and he was very successful in a branch of entertainment in which so many clever men fail—I mean that of telling a story well.

As a Christian, his views of the paternal character of Jehovah produced in him habitual, cheerful piety, and his full conviction of the harmony of the Divine attributes inspired habitual acquiescence in all the arrangements of Providence respecting him, and exemplary resignation to the will of God in his afflictions. In the relation of husband, father, and friend, he excelled. His memory will continue to be cherished by his remain-

ing pupils with esteem and affection; his children and more immediate connexions will fondly and affectionately cherish the recollection of his varied excellencies, and his congregation, who enjoyed his public services for so long a period, will express their high sense of his ministerial faithfulness, by proving to the world that his labours were not in vain.

H.

DUKE OF LA ROCHEFOUCAULD-LIANCOURT.

Mar. 28, at *Paris*, at the advanced age of 81, the DUKE OF LA ROCHEFOUCAULD-LIANCOURT, Peer of France, Member of the Institute (the Academy of Sciences). In this great and good man the sacred cause of humanity has lost one of its best friends and defenders. His whole life was employed in benevolent and patriotic exertion. Vaccination was introduced into France through his means, and for twenty years he never relaxed his efforts to render it universal. He was also the chief founder of schools upon the improved principle of mutual instruction, and helped to set on foot a society for the express object of advancing elementary education. He established the Schools of Arts and Manufactures at Compiègne, at Châlons, and at Angers, and presided over the formation of the Conservatory of Arts and Manufactures at Paris. His active benevolence was employed in regulating and improving the management of prisons and hospitals; and he attended likewise to many institutions set apart for the reception of deserted and friendless children. Weakness, poverty, old age, and misfortune, found in him a constant and devoted friend. The powerful assistance he rendered to industry was felt in the legislative chambers, and in all councils whereof he was a member; in the society for the encouragement of national industry, and more particularly in the commune of Liancourt, where his advice and example gave a great impulse to the whole district. A little work called the *Statistics of the Canton of Creil*, proceeded from his pen, although his excessive modesty prevented him from publishing it with his name. It contains an account of all improvements in agriculture, in manufactures, in education and the arts of life, which took place in that part of France which he inhabited. There was also another Society of great and good men to which he was warmly attached, and a field where virtuous and benevolent feelings were

displayed in the brightest colours—the Society for the Application of Christian Morality to the relations of Social Life. In a country where so many deadly attacks have been made upon the religion of the gospel, and at a time when its benign influence is smothered or perverted to the most unrighteous purposes, it is consolatory to learn the history of that small band of genuine disciples who have kept alive, in the midst of superstition and priestcraft, the pure, enlightening flame of Christian love. The Society of Christian Morality is composed of members of different denominations of Christians. Avoiding the discussion of those questions which relate to doctrines, it proceeds upon the principle of supporting Christianity as a great moral system, and extending its practical good effects by every possible means. It was joined by Catholics as well as Protestants, and furnishes a glorious example of that liberal spirit which can subdue party and sectarian feelings, and cooperate with heart and soul in the great objects of an enlightened philanthropy.

But of such noble, high-principled characters, bigotry is the sworn and bitter enemy. Full of hatred for new institutions and for every attempt to emancipate the human mind and teach the value of freedom and knowledge, the partisans of tyranny and superstition spared not this excellent man. He scorned to be indebted to such support as might require a compromise of conscience, and called no man his friend who stood in the way of his disinterested efforts for the public good. No less than six public offices which he held gratuitously and adorned by his virtues he was obliged to resign, and great was his regret at being separated from those children of adversity whom he cherished as his own.

The funeral of the Duke of La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt took place on Friday, the 20th of March, at the Church of the Assumption. A numerous assemblage of the Peers and Deputies of France, and a concourse of distinguished men of all classes were present from different parts of the kingdom on this affecting occasion. With the consent of the deceased Duke's family, his body was to be carried to the grave by a band of young people who were pupils in the school of Châlons. Their deep sorrow was soothed by the thought of performing the last sad duties to their benefactor and father; no law forbade, no regulation of the police opposed this tribute of popular respect, honourable alike to

him who was the object of it, and to those who desired to pay it. Can it be believed, or can it be read with patience, that a police and a military officer united their influence to disappoint and exasperate the public mind, and actually employed an armed force to keep the people from shewing their fervent gratitude? Some of the citizens were knocked down, covered with mud, and even wounded. The funeral procession became a scene of bloodshed. The honoured remains were overthrown into the kennel, and were with difficulty replaced upon the hearse!

At the gate of Clichy, where the body was removed to a carriage which was to convey it to Liancourt, M. Charles Dupin, a Member of the Academy of Science, pronounced an eloquent discourse, which, we regret to say, has not been preserved; he proved himself the faithful organ of the different sentiments which agitated the hearts of the assembled multitude. The Chamber of Peers, in their sitting of the 31st of March, resolved upon the motion of the Duke de Choiseul, that proper steps should immediately be taken for inquiring into the cause of the disturbance which took place at the obsequies of the Duke of La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, and a report made thereupon to the chamber.

We hope to see some account of the long and useful life of this excellent citizen and virtuous man. Concerning that society which has peculiar claims to be distinguished in a work like the *Monthly Repository*, we are able to give some interesting details from another source. They shall appear in an early number.

S. R.

BAYES COTTON, Esq.

June 14, at his house in *Kenilworth*, BAYES COTTON, Esq., in his 71st year.

It was the honour of this excellent person to be descended on both sides from ancestors distinguished by piety, learning, usefulness, and an invincible attachment to religious freedom.* He lived in far happier times than some of them, but he inherited their spirit; he acted upon their principles, nor sacrificed

* For notices of members of the family of *Bayes*, see Hunter's *Hallamshire*, Kippis' *Life of Lardner*, Toulmin's of *Neal*, and Morgan's *Memoirs of Dr. Price*. In Toulmin's *Hist. of Dissenters*, (pp. 255—258,) is a very impressive account of *the Rev. Thomas Cotton*.

his most important convictions at the shrine of worldly interest. To say of him, merely that he was a steady and well-informed Protestant Dissenter, were faint praise, could it not be further declared that he valued truth and liberty for their tendencies and influence, and adorned his Christian faith, and his mode of avowing it, by qualities the most estimable and amiable; by a devotion which rendered him eminently upright, kind, candid, and unassuming. He was hospitable and generous in full proportion to his opulence, and became the cordial friend, the wise and faithful counsellor, of numbers, beyond even the wide circle of a family, which he loved with a warmth of affection that was completely mutual.

For many years he exercised a profession, which his integrity contributed to make truly respectable. A great portion of his life was passed in the metropolis and its neighbourhood: and in the office of Secretary to the Deputies for watching over the Civil Rights of the Dissenters, he rendered essential services to the religious body of which he was a member.

In the beautiful village to which he afterwards withdrew, he was frequently visited by his friends, nor least by those with whom he had mixed in busier scenes. Much of his leisure was passed in useful reading: and he availed himself of every opportunity of promoting the peace and comfort of his neighbours.

Mr. Cotton was characterized by that admirable good sense which is so beneficial in the daily intercourse of society and the world. At the same time, he derived from his constitution, but still more from religion, a cheerfulness of temper and manners, which caused him to be an universal favourite. He accommodated himself with ease to all the innocent customs of modern life, while in some yet more important respects he belonged to a generation of which few survive.—*Christian Reformer.*

N.

MRS. EEDES.

June 15, at *Saffron Walden*, aged 77, Mrs. EEDES, the relict of Mr. Joseph Eedes, and forty-eight years a member of the General Baptist congregation in that town. After a long conflict with a disease which exhausted her strength and defied the power of medicine, she submitted to the high decree of Supreme Wisdom. As her life had been devoted to the interests of piety and virtue, says

of Christian hope gilded her chamber of affliction and cheered her mind in the dying hour.

REV. JOHN SMALL.

June 21, at *Pimlico*, after a short illness, the Rev. JOHN SMALL, one of the ministers of the Unitarian chapel, York Street, St. James's Square. Mr. Small was a native of Dundee in Scotland, where his father exercised the profession of a schoolmaster. It is understood that he lost both his parents whilst he was very young. In the early part of his life he joined one of the congregational churches founded by Mr. Robert Haldane, but which were afterwards deserted by that gentleman upon his adopting other religious views resembling Sandemanianism. Mr. Small was for some time a member of one of these congregations meeting at Perth, of which Mr. Little, now of Washington, N. A., was the minister. In the year 1804, he was admitted a student at the Homerton Academy, on the foundation of the King's Head Society, and remained there for the full term of six years. During his stay in this institution he was considered one of the best scholars, and was distinguished by his superior talents, especially by his singular powers of extemporaneous address. There is reason to believe that his religious sentiments had undergone a considerable change before he left Homerton, though he had made no direct avowal of his relinquishment of Calvinism. Soon after quitting the Academy he withdrew from his Calvinistic connexion and joined himself to the Unitarians. In 1811, he went to Hinckley in Leicestershire, where he officiated, during nearly a year, for the late Rev. Herbert Jenkins, whose health was at that time in a very precarious state. From Hinckley he went to Birmingham, where his old friend Mr. Little was then residing, and intending, we believe, to apply himself wholly to the occupation of a schoolmaster. His stay here was, however, but short, for at the recommendation of Dr. Toulmin he went to officiate to the Unitarian congregation at Wolverhampton, and shortly afterwards removed to Coseley, where he continued to exercise his ministry till his removal to London, at the close of the last year, to be one of the ministers of the York-street Chapel. Mr. Small had complained of indisposition from his first settlement in the metropolis, but the state of his health had not obliged

him to suspend the public duties of his profession till within a few weeks of his death. Nor did his medical attendants for some time apprehend danger: the bursting of an abscess in the intestines, the existence of which had never been suspected, first revealed the nature of his complaint, placed him at once beyond the relief of medical skill, and terminated his life in a few hours. He was buried in the ground belonging to the General Baptist Congregation in

Worship Street, on Monday, June 25th. Dr. Rees officiated at the funeral, and also preached a sermon on the occasion of his death on the following Sunday, July 1st, at York-street chapel. The black cloth with which the pulpit, desk, and communion table were covered, were first provided, a few weeks before, on the mourning for the Duke of York, when Mr. Small preached a funeral sermon. They were next used for a similar service on his own decease!

INTELLIGENCE.

Unitarian Marriage Bill.

PATIENCE and perseverance overcome many difficulties; even the House of Lords is not proof against their power, in a session too when reason and public spirit have not possessed very great sway over its deliberations. Lord Eldon now speaks with the odds which a station on opposition benches interposes against him, and the woolsack is occupied by a lawyer who has some disposition to listen to common sense and history.

We believe we may now congratulate the Unitarians on the certainty that relief in *some* form will be conceded to them next session, for no one but Lord Eldon has opposed the principle; and *he* has done it only by the dexterous jumbling up of principle with details into which his own objections alone have driven the promoters of the measure. Our readers will see that, on this important occasion, (when the House of Lords has really, for the first time, set to work seriously to consider the subject in detail,) we have spared no pains in obtaining, expressly for our work, a perfectly accurate and minute account of all which passed. We shall, in the succeeding number, (as our limits compel us to divide the subject,) give the debate in Committee, together with a copy of the Bill, as it passed the Lords' Committee, and as it may be proper to bring it into the House of Lords next session, where the promoters, as well as opposers, will have the opportunity of making any further alterations. As it at present stands, it is to be considered as the project chiefly of the Bishop of Chester, and not as the plan of the committee of the Association. We were glad to hear that the real difficulty in regulating all these

matters was hit upon by Lord Redesdale in the committee. If there were (as it is a disgrace to this country that there is not) a good general register of all marriages, births or baptisms, and burials, there would be no difficulty whatever in allowing all Dissenters, under the regulations of such a registry, to solemnize their own marriages, without any of the incumbrances arising out of the ecclesiastical character of the present institutions, which are totally inconsistent with practical religious liberty.

It will be observed that the present Bill leaves the matter of religious ceremonial entirely to the parties; it provides only for the civil requisites, and this is all that the State has a right to concern itself about; it will be for the Unitarians, (or for each Unitarian,) to decide whether they choose to associate the occasion with any and what religious observances. Practically, we believe the Bill will not work inconveniently. If the magistrate is disposed to accommodate, (and in few places will it be difficult to find one who will,) there can be no great difficulties in its operation.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

JUNE 26, 1827.

The Marquis of LANSDOWNE, in moving that the House should go into a Committee on the Dissenters' Marriage Bill, wished to avail himself of that opportunity to make some observations on the *principle* of the Bill, which it had been agreed should be discussed in this stage. Before he entered upon these observations, he must remark upon the irregular discussion which had just occupied their time, not for the purpose of adding any thing to what had been already said upon that subject, but as an illustration

of the inconvenience of entering upon the discussion of subjects of which notice had not been previously given. He adverted to this inconvenience, as it had deprived him of the advantage of the support of the Right Reverend Prelate at the head of the Bench of Bishops, who had attended that evening, at great inconvenience, for the express purpose of supporting the Dissenters' Marriage Bill, but who was prevented from remaining in the House by the state of his health. Their Lordships, who had remembered the sentiments of that Right Reverend Prelate (the Archbishop of Canterbury) on a former occasion, must bear testimony to the spirit of liberality displayed by him, which he hoped would always characterize the Clergy of the Established Church, and by which he was particularly anxious to see the Heads of that Church distinguished. He was instructed, however, by that Right Reverend Prelate, on his leaving the House, to say, that his sentiments remained unaltered upon this subject. With regard to the measure before them a few words were necessary. Bills, containing provision for the relief of these Dissenters, had been two or three times sent up to that House from the House of Commons, and rejected by their Lordships, chiefly from difficulties which presented themselves in points of form; but he was happy to say that a very general feeling now prevailed amongst many of those who had formerly opposed those Bills in favour of the principle of giving some relief to the Dissenters; and he believed he might even say, that several Right Reverend Prelates had expressed an anxiety, and had in fact contributed their assistance, to adopt some measure by which the Dissenters might be freed from the necessity of giving utterance, as a mere matter of form, to sentiments which they entertained not at heart; and, at the same time, to avoid that scandal to the Church which resulted from having its creed and its ceremonies prostituted by calling upon Dissenters, for temporary purposes, to give a false and feigned assent to doctrines which they declared they did not believe. That was the situation of the Church, and the evil from which the Right Reverend Prelate and other members of the ecclesiastical body wished to be relieved; and, he confessed, it was beyond his power to conceive how those persons who attached importance to the due and strict observance of all the forms and doctrines of the Church, could wish to continue a state of things

under which those ceremonies were used for the purpose of extorting a consent, intended to evade, and not to fulfil, the purposes of the Legislature. He could easily conceive that the careless and indifferent could view these matters with little concern, but in proportion to the seriousness of a Churchman's convictions ought to be his desire to free the doctrines and services of his church from this compulsive conformity. Under the strong impression of the scandal which the law, as it stood at present, brought upon the Church, he could not but express a hope, that their Lordships would do something to meet the difficulties which presented themselves with respect to those laws. Different modes of meeting these difficulties had been suggested at different times. A Noble Earl, lately at the head of his Majesty's Government, (Lord Liverpool,) and who, he was authorized in saying, felt deeply the inconvenience which resulted from the state of the laws affecting the Dissenters, had expressed an opinion that the difficulty might be best met by allowing some alteration to be made in the service of the Church of England, but the Right Reverend Prelate thought otherwise upon that subject, and no attempt was made to carry that suggestion into execution. Different plans had since been submitted to their Lordships and rejected. The Bill which he had now to bring under their consideration attempted to reconcile, as far as possible, the jarring opinions which prevailed, and proposed to meet the objections which had been made at various times to the measures which came under their Lordships' attention. Its design was to unite two objects—that of making the ceremony of marriage a civil security, combined with attention and consideration for the religious scruples of the conscientious Dissenter. In this country, up to the times of the 26th of George the Second, the object now contemplated by the law had been very imperfectly provided for; but an innovation upon the existing law, commonly called Lord Hardwicke's Act, then received the sanction of the Legislature. At the time when Lord Hardwicke introduced that measure to their Lordships, it became necessary, however, to exempt two classes of religious believers from its operation—the Jews and the Quakers; but he apprehended that no man could rise up in that house, and contend, that this exemption was intended to fix any slur upon the marriage of those persons, or to declare that they were not perfectly

legal. Some insinuations had, he knew, been thrown out from an authority of great importance, that the marriage of those opulent, industrious people, the Quakers, a people remarkable for the purity of their lives, the excellence of their characters, and the extent of their good works, could not be legally recognized; that they had only been *excepted* from the Marriage Act, and left without any legal sanction; but he apprehended that there could be no doubt upon the subject; and some of the greatest and most learned lawyers of which this country could boast, had distinctly declared their opinion that the marriage of Quakers was perfectly legal. Sir Matthew Hale had distinctly given his sanction to the legality of the marriage of Quakers. Burnet, in his life of that great man, in alluding to the circumstances gives this account of the conduct and expressions of that eminent person on the occasion:—"In a trial that was before him, when a Quaker was sued for some debts owing by his wife before he married her, and the Quaker's counsel pretended *that it was no marriage that had passed between them, since it was not solemnized according to the rules of the Church of England*; Sir Matthew Hale declared that he was not willing, on his own opinion, to make their children bastards, and gave directions to the jury to find it special, which they did." After some observations upon the nature of the case, and the conduct of the parties, the learned, eminent, and pious historian, goes on to add the weight of his own opinion by observing, "that if this judge had not been more their friend than one of those they so called, their posterity had been little beholding to them. But he governed himself indeed by the law of the gospel, of *doing to others what he would have others do to him*; and, therefore, because he would have thought it a *hardship*, not without a *cruelty*, if, amongst Papists, all marriages were nulled which had not been made with all the ceremonies in the Roman ritual; so he, applying this to the case of the *sectaries*, thought all marriages made according to the several persuasions of them, ought to have their effects in law." The Noble Marquis, after some observations upon the legality of the marriage of the Quakers being thus clearly proved, proceeded to contend that he was entitled to claim the same right for the Unitarians, and expressed a hope that the time was now come when persons of that persuasion should no longer be invited to approach

the altar with falsehoods in their mouths, or be compelled to subscribe to principles which they could not respect, and thereby bring into contempt that faith which others hold sacred, for the gratification of mere secular and civil purposes. Adverting to the clauses of the Bill, the Noble Marquis declared that he did not hold himself responsible for their perfection; but he knew that those who framed them had had the assistance of some of those whose experience and information best qualified them for the task, and that the most anxious desire was felt to meet and obviate the objections which had been raised on former occasions. In the first place, the banns were to be published, for the security of the public; and then the parties, with a certificate of such publication, are to go before a magistrate, and go through the ceremony of marriage, in the mode pointed out; and having procured his certificate thereof, the same is to be taken to the Clergyman for the purpose of being registered. Some objections, he understood, were made to the imposition of this duty upon the Clergyman; but he, for one, thought it was one of those inconveniences which could not be avoided. The Registry Act had been passed in the time of William the Third, as a tax, for the purpose of raising money to carry on the war which was then waged against Louis the Fourteenth, and the clergy then had not objected to registering the baptisms, &c., of all classes, as they were directed to do, for the purposes of the tax. Indeed, so beneficial had it since been found, and so important was it, in every point of view, for the interests of the public, that if the Bill now before the House did not contain a clause to make that registry imperative, he could not possibly consent to give it his support. The registration of one of the most important acts of our lives was, in every point of view, public or private, of such infinite importance, that he thought the Bill must prove altogether inefficient, unless the clergyman was called upon to register the certificate. The Noble Marquis concluded by imploring their Lordships to relieve the Church of England from the effect of a state of things which was calculated, not to attract, but to repel, converts to its doctrines.

The Earl of ELDON regretted the absence of the Right Reverend Prelate (the Archbishop of Canterbury) on this occasion, because it was his misfortune to be compelled to say, that he differed with him very much in the view he took of this subject, and it would have been

some satisfaction to have been able to state the grounds of that difference in his presence. He wished, in the first place, to separate from the consideration of the question every thing which had been said with regard to the state of the Jews and the Quakers. In his opinion the state of the Jews had no possible connexion with the subject before their Lordships. It was somewhat different with regard to the Quakers; and he would here take leave to make an observation or two upon what had fallen from the Noble Marquis when he spoke of a doubt having been thrown out respecting the validity of a Quaker's marriage. If that doubt rested on any thing which had fallen from him, he desired to say that he must have been completely misunderstood; for he had no doubt on the subject, and on the contrary, desired distinctly to give it as his opinion, that their marriages were perfectly valid according to law. He was the more anxious to say this, because he was aware that doubts had once been raised as to the law on that subject. In 1661, they would find that a proceeding at law took place on the subject, which ended in establishing the validity of such marriages; and again, in 1730, in another proceeding at common law, though a doubt was cast upon the legality of a Quaker marriage, its validity was afterwards confirmed. The 7th and 8th of William and Mary contain, however, a clause which certainly had given rise to doubts on the subject, (though he thought they were not of much weight,) for by a clause of that act (which he concluded was the one adverted to by the Noble Marquis) it was for the purposes of taxation declared that all persons *living together after the manner of the Quakers*, should be taken and held to be married persons, whether they had been married or not according to the established forms. Having now looked into this question more than he had been able to do on a former occasion, he was of opinion, not only that the Quakers were intitled to the benefit of the law as valid marriages, but that they ought to have *further* benefits in that respect which he believed they had not, with reference in particular to the ecclesiastical law. Certainly, if the House did more for the present applicants, that same they ought to do for Jews and Quakers. With respect to the marriages of Jews, a question arose in the Court of Chancery as to their validity so lately as the time when Lord Rosslyn was Chancellor. A man claimed a legacy as due to him on

the ground of its having been left to a person whom he called his wife. The persons were a Jew and a Jewess, and the question in the case was whether the legatee *was* his wife. The Lord Chancellor sent the question to be tried by the Ecclesiastical Court, and the case came on before the present Lord Stowell. Lord Stowell, and also Sir W. Wynn, who afterwards affirmed the judgment of Lord Stowell, expressed their surprise that this case should have been sent to an Ecclesiastical Court by the Court of Chancery, inasmuch as the Lord Chancellor had just as much right as an Ecclesiastical Court to decide incidentally on the validity of a Jewish marriage, or on that of a foreign marriage. They, on the other hand, were Ecclesiastical officers, and bound by the stricter rules and maxims of Ecclesiastical Courts. They decided, however, that a marriage of Jews was to be considered as a marriage of foreigners. Now the validity of a foreign marriage must be decided by the *lex loci*; but it is a maxim of law, that the Jews, who are in one sense every where, are, in effect, no where; being foreigners, and yet having no country to which they can be assigned. As the Jews, therefore, have no place, as they have no locality, no *lex loci* could apply to their case, but the validity of their marriages must be determined by their conformity with their own peculiar laws. But whatever had been done for the case of Jews and Quakers, the legislature had never yet called on the Church of England to assist them. Whatever it might be disposed to do with regard to the marriages of this particular class of Dissenters, he trusted it would never assent to any measure, the effect of which would be to degrade the Church of England in the public estimation, as he would presently shew this Bill would do. With respect to the marriages of Quakers, he was certainly of opinion that it was fair to argue that the very exception in the 26th George II. implied that they were to be considered legal marriages. But let their Lordships consider at what period of the Session it was that they were discussing, and were called upon to decide, this most important question. He (Lord Eldon) had given the greatest attention to this Bill; he had weighed every sentence and line in it; but he found it utterly impossible to assent to the passing of this Bill without a great number of alterations. Now if, labouring as he (Lord E.) had done, with a view to make this Bill better than it was, he had been unable to accomplish his object, he did think that no time or labour ~~their Lordships~~ could be-

stow upon it would enable them to execute their work as, in his judgment, it ought to be executed. If this Bill was now to go through a committee, he for one must withdraw from the attempt to make it, as he should wish to do, better even for the parties than it then was, if the House determined that they were to be relieved. If their Lordships introduced amendments, the amendments of this most important Bill would go down to the House of Commons on Friday, and on that very evening the other House of Parliament must decide upon the propriety of all of them, for their Lordships were perfectly aware that no other opportunity would be afforded for considering them. The time, therefore, at which this measure was brought under the consideration of their Lordships, was a sufficient ground for not passing it, even if the objections to it were less strong than he believed he should be able to satisfy the House they were. It had been argued, that it was but just to do for Dissenters of this description what the Legislature had done for Jews and Quakers. But, admitting that the marriages of Jews and Quakers were legalized under the exception in the Marriage Act, he begged again to ask their Lordships whether the Church of England had ever been called in to assist in those marriages by publishing their banns and registering them? In the time of the Commonwealth, when men were married, as it was now proposed, before Justices of the Peace—a measure then adopted for the express purpose of degrading the Clergy—the Clergy were not called upon to aid and assist in their own degradation. If their Lordships should think it right to do that for Dissenters generally which had been done for Quakers, let them do so, but let them not say that they were justified by that precedent in doing *more* than they had done for those parties, as they would do if they passed this Bill. He begged to call their Lordships' attention a little to what this Bill did, and to what it did not. In the first place, he should be glad to know who the persons were whom this Bill proposed to relieve? It was said, indeed, in the preamble, that these persons *had scruples*, and that they were called *Unitarians*, but neither their scruples were explained, nor their name. What an Unitarian was had never yet been explained. He had taken occasion last year to ask a Right Reverend Prelate, who was now unfortunately absent, what was an Unitarian, and he could get no answer. Since that time he had received the present of a Sermon, preached by a Minister before an Unitarian congregation

tion, and the first words that fell from the lips of the preacher, after giving out his text, were—"The Lord Chancellor asks, What is an Unitarian?" This was, certainly, rather a singular commencement of a Sermon; it was, however, he must do the preacher the justice to say, a very good and well-written sermon, as far as he could understand subjects of that kind. But the reason which led him (Lord Eldon) to ask the question—and if their Lordships should go into the Committee, he should ask it again—was, that it might be recorded upon the face of this Bill what an Unitarian was. He again called on the Reverend Bench to define the term. He should like very much to see that Rev. Bench vote that a person who denied the divinity of their Saviour (if that was, as he understood, the definition of these persons' opinions), was, *on that account*, deserving of this especial favour. His object was to get a plain and distinct definition of who it was they were thus called on to favour. He did not know what distinction there was between Unitarians and another set of persons who were before their Lordships, calling themselves Free-thinking Christians, who also entertained these scruples about marriages; but he begged their Lordships to look at the language of these petitioners, that they might judge of *their* claims to the special interposition of the Legislature.—The Noble Earl proceeded to read some passages from a petition lately presented* by the Free-thinking Christians, in which they "declare and avow that the Church of England, whose religious worship they are thus called upon to sanction, they know only as a Church, 'teaching for doctrines the commandments of men:'—as a Church professing a religion which has no other claims than that of being by law established;—as a Church whose laws have no earlier date than Popery, no higher authority than Acts of Parliament," &c. The petitioners proceed thus: "Viewing the Church of England as part of such a system of political religion and corrupt spiritual power—regarding the form of marriage, as contained in the Book of Common Prayer, as one of the rites of such a Church, how can your petitioners conform thereto? How, in the language of Scripture, can they do this thing, and

* His Lordship seems to have practised a little stratagem here. No such petition was ever presented, we learn, to the Lords at all; and it does not appear that his Lordship moved for a copy of it from the Commons.

sin against God?" Such was part of the language of these petitioners, and the remainder was, if possible, still more offensive. Let them see what particular case was made out by these Dissenters, whom he took to be persons denying the divinity of our Saviour, or if not he hoped the Right Reverend Bench would favour the House with some other definition. They had no objection to baptize their children according to the form of the Established Church; they were baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and he did not hear that these Dissenters made any objection to this baptismal ceremony. With respect to the marriage ceremony, what was objected to was, he understood, that the husband was called on to say that he married his wife in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and also the mention of the Godhead under the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, when the Clergyman, at the end of the ceremony, prayed the blessing of God upon the man and his wife. The calling upon God to bless them under the terms of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost—(and every minister of the Church of England of common honesty and integrity, when he said "God bless you," meant the Godhead in that acceptation of the word which was according to the views of Christianity held by his Church so constituted)—was what these persons deemed so great a hardship. It was on such grounds, and this address was so great offence to these persons, that their Lordships were called upon to make a law, not for the benefit of all Dissenters of all denominations, but for this particular class of Dissenters, which, according to all the evidence of history, had been almost deemed the most offensive of all the sects. In his opinion, the best security for a religious establishment was a religion of the purest form, with a large and liberal toleration. Such was the spirit of the toleration granted in the Act of the 53d of the late King; and he was perfectly ready to admit, that the Act of William and Mary enacted penalties on account of religious opinions which ought never to have been thought of. But till the repeal of that Act these persons were under especial penalties, and yet their Lordships were called on to do for them what they never thought of doing for any others. Why, at any rate, were not all to have the benefit of this provision, if it was to be conceded to these? He would proceed, from these observations, on the principle of the Bill to consider some of its enactments.

By the provisions of the Bill now before their Lordships, the Clergy of the Church of England were called upon to publish the banns on the declaration of the parties that they were Dissenters of this description, of which fact there was to be no proof before hand, and no disproof afterwards. The clergyman was to certify that he had published the banns to a justice of the peace, and the justice of the peace was to appoint some time and place (at his office or any where else that suited) where the marriage ceremony, such as it was, was to be performed. Here again arose difficulties, and to avoid them in the Commonwealth Act, they were pleased to use the words, "justice, or reputed justice." In point of fact, when the Noble Lord who held the Great Seal had had as much experience as he (Lord E.) had had—and he trusted that he would hold it as long, and longer than he had done, namely, as long as he lived—he would find that cases might frequently arise where, in consequence of certain informalities, it was questionable who was or was not a justice of the peace. There were practices which he had put an end to, by which magistrates were made, by what was called "the Cold Seal," and these were thought to be justices and as good justices as these Unitarians could wish to have and be married by, and yet, for all that, were no justices at all. The banns having been published, the justice of the peace (if he be a justice) was to give a certificate that the parties had gone through certain forms before him, and upon this certificate the clergyman was to be called upon to register the marriage. Now, he would put it to their Lordships, whether a clergyman of the Church of England was not degraded and dishonoured by being compelled to act as a sort of clerk to a justice of the peace; and whether even the Lay Magistrate of the Church of England was not also dishonoured, by being concerned in such a transaction. Suppose the clergyman—as must frequently be the case—to be himself a justice of the peace; was he to go through this species of marriage ceremony, as a justice of the peace, which he could not possibly perform without a gross violation of his duties as a conscientious clergyman? Was it contended that the scruples of those Dissenters who denied the divinity of our Saviour were to be respected, because they could not in their consciences allow a clergyman of the Church of England to say to them, at the end of the marriage ceremony, "God bless you, in the name of the

Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost;" and yet that they were to be allowed to turn round upon the clergyman, and say, "You have published our banns in deference to our scruples, but you are also a justice of peace; and *your* conscience shall be so dealt with that we choose you, in despite of any thing you may urge on the score of your conscience, to perform our marriage ceremony in that capacity?" He was perfectly satisfied that their Lordships would not suffer the clergy of the Church of England to be so degraded and dishonoured, and there *must* therefore be an amendment there. Did the Act contain any clauses which sufficiently secured the observance of what was necessary to be observed with respect to licenses, &c. *There* must also be amendments, and how could such amendments be properly considered now? Was there any sufficient precision (considering that they were dealing with a felony without benefit of clergy) in the clauses which related to forging registers, making false entries, and similar offences? It would be necessary to guard against clandestine marriages, and yet all which this Bill did for that purpose was to call upon the parish clergyman to publish the banns. Quakers and Jews were generally married in full assemblies of their connexions and friends; the publicity and regularity of these bodies gave a protection against fraud; but by the proposed Bill, the greatest door was open to frauds. A person had nothing to do but to pretend to be a Unitarian, to have his banns published in a Church to which he never goes, and then proceed to the private room of any justice of the peace, who will give him his certificate. He might put this certificate in his pocket, if he chose to run the risk of a penalty of 20*l.*, which this very justice might reduce to five pounds, with the privilege also of putting the informer by an appeal to an expense, perhaps, of 100*l.*; and then he might turn round and say to the woman, "You cannot prove the marriage if you *are* a Unitarian; and if you are *not* the whole is an imposition." He not only objected to the Bill because it was intended to put the Unitarians on the same footing as Quakers, but he would go further, and say, that if the House did intend to adopt the principles of the Bill, its enactments were not calculated to carry those principles into effect. He would not object to give to these persons the same sort of exemption as Jews and Quakers; but the House should recollect that these very Quakers were not so tolerated originally except on

their making a declaration of their belief in all which these persons, for whom they were asked to do so much more, disbelieved. If the House thought that the Bill ought to pass, he still objected to its passing in the present session. It would want so many amendments, so many serious alterations, to make it a bill such as it ought to be, that it would be impossible to get through with it in the present session, and he should feel himself bound to move that it be read this day three months. Having no inclination to do more than his duty, if the House consented to the principle, he would give his best assistance in the details; but he still objected to being placed in a situation where the House could not do its duty by such a bill; and if they could, the Commons certainly could not do *theirs*. There was another point on which he anticipated that the Noble Lord on the Woolsack, and the other Learned Lord near him, would support him, namely, that this Bill sought to make that evidence, which the clergyman was to certify without actual knowledge that it was true. At present the register of a marriage was taken as evidence in a court of justice, because the Marriage Act required the clergyman who celebrated the marriage to sign the registry. This was making the clergyman certify what he knew to be true. The same principle applied to baptism. The entry was received because the clergyman certified what he had actually done, but (unless this was altered by a late act) if the clergyman went on to state the date of the *birth*, this was not evidence of *that* fact, because he did not know it. It was not necessary for him to give any opinion upon the principle of the Bill; the only thing to consider was, the necessity of having time to consider how to make the Bill, upon its own principles, effective. He trusted that their Lordships would feel in favour of the old law of the land, and let the present Bill stand over till next session. If it were said, that the parties aggrieved by the present law ought not to be allowed to continue so long under the injury they suffered, he would ask, whose fault was that? Why did they not come earlier? Year after year, this Bill had been proposed to the House, and always at this inconvenient period. They who so delayed were alone to blame if the relief they sought was deferred. All the great questions, the Test and Corporation Acts, Parliamentary Reform, the Corn Bill, and various other important matters, by common consent stood over; he must entreat them

to add this to them, and to "bond and warehouse" this bill too for the present; and he assured the House that next session, let who will be minister, he would, if they determined that it should be done, do his best to make the Bill what it should be, on the principle which they might please to lay dawn. He moved that instead of "now," the Bill be committed "that day three months."

LORD CALTHORPE said, that the chief reason for his supporting the Bill was not exactly that which had been given by the Noble Lord who had proposed going into a Committee. He (Lord Calthorpe) was inclined to think that the great practical grievance was what the Church itself laboured under as long as the law continued in its existing state. With reference to the arguments urged by the Noble and Learned Lord about the Bill being a measure of partiality to the Unitarians, as a sect distinguished from all other Dissenters, he had overlooked the fundamental difference which existed between the Unitarians and all other religionists whatsoever, except, perhaps, the Jews. Upon this ground alone, the Unitarians might not have any claim upon the consideration of Parliament; but the public had strong claims that the Legislature should relieve the Established Church from what he might call the species of blasphemy or profaneness committed by its ministers in being called upon to pronounce, in the most solemn manner, services founded on the doctrine of the Trinity, to persons who did not believe in it, and to exact from such persons an implied assent to a faith which they did not entertain. He did not imagine that human ingenuity could have conceived a more certain means, in the present state of society, which rejected coarse and vulgar blasphemy, to make the Church degrade and pollute itself by mixing profaneness with its most sacred and solemn service. He thought the House owed it to the honour and dignity of the Church itself, not to allow the present law to continue another year. The Unitarians were stated by the Noble and Learned Lord, to be asking of Parliament what was not granted to Jews or Quakers; but the fact was, that neither of the two latter sects were obliged to submit to the marriage ceremony of the Church of England. The Church was, therefore, bound at present to carry on the imposition with respect to Unitarians, whilst it was relieved from the degrading duty with respect to Jews and Quakers. Was it a proof of the high reverence of the Church for that sacred

doctrine, which was the vital principle of her faith, that she should call upon her ministers to declare her doctrines, and to oblige individuals to repeat them, who were known not to entertain any such tenets? It would be most disadvantageous to the Church itself to suffer another session to pass without putting an end to the existing state of things with respect to Unitarian Marriages. He begged in what he said not to be misunderstood,—no one had a deeper sense than he had of the religious errors of the Unitarians; but, speaking of them as individuals, (and he spoke from personal knowledge of many,) he must say that in feelings of humanity, liberality, and justice, in all social and moral virtues, they would not suffer in comparison with those whose religious opinions were, as he believed, purer; and, for the sake of the Church Establishment itself, as well as for their sakes, the grievance of which they complained ought to be redressed. Several amendments in points of detail might be necessary, but he had much rather pass the Bill at once in an imperfect state and correct it next session, than leave a matter of so much importance to the Church as well as to the parties, unredressed to another session.

LORD FARNHAM was willing to grant relief to the Unitarians as far as was consistent with religious propriety. He fully agreed that the law was in a most inconvenient state. He thought that the Unitarians might be allowed to marry before their own ministers; but he wished that all marriages should have a religious sanction, and a Bill of that kind he would support. This was the first time that it had been proposed to divest marriage altogether of its religious character, and as to this he felt great difficulties. He felt also considerable objection to forcing a magistrate, who was a clergyman, to perform the ceremony according to this Bill. He regretted that bills of this kind were frequently hurried on at the close of a session, when it was impossible to give them due consideration. On such subjects their Lordships ought to legislate with the greatest circumspection.

The Lord CHANCELLOR observed, that it was with considerable diffidence he addressed the House, after the very able speech of his Noble and Learned Friend Lord Eldon, a speech, indeed, one of the most able and efficient perhaps that had ever been delivered in that House—for the object which the Noble Earl had in view. But he was apprehensive that it might be thought that he did not do his

duty if he remained wholly silent on this question. But if he understood his Noble and Learned Friend correctly, the whole of his objections applied, not to the principle, but to the clauses of the Bill, and it was his duty to remind their Lordships that they were, by common consent and arrangement, now considering the principle, and *not* the details on which the Noble Earl had bestowed the greater part of his observations. He hoped, therefore, that their Lordships would allow the Bill to go into the committee, and then, if in considering the Bill clause by clause, the objections should appear to be insuperable, he would subscribe to the course proposed by his Noble and Learned Friend, and agree to the postponement of the measure till next session. But their Lordships ought not, in his opinion, to abandon the Bill in its present stage, on account of any supposed difficulty in its details, when the only question was, whether in principle it was a proper measure. If he thought that the measure would degrade the clergy, or injure the Church Establishment, no person would be more zealous against it; but when he saw a Right Reverend Prelate, who had been alluded to, appearing there, as on former occasions, to support this very Bill; when he knew that another Prelate of distinguished learning and talents had even lent his assistance and advice in the formation of the Bill; he could not for a moment believe that such a measure was one in the slightest degree calculated either to degrade the clergy or injure the Church. In order that they might proceed to consider the question before them fairly, he would, with their Lordships' permission, advert briefly to the history of the law of marriage. When he heard Noble Lords gravely talking of a religious ceremony as essential to marriage, he could not help reminding them, that every one knew that throughout the whole of Christendom there was no religious ceremony necessarily connected with marriage till the time of the Council of Trent; and that still, in the countries which did not acknowledge the authority of that Council, no religious ceremony was essential to marriage. Every one again knew that none was essential in this country till the Marriage Act of 1754. He stated this not on his own authority, but on the authority of a most eminent Judge—he meant C. J. Lord Holt, who had held in two cases that a marriage was valid and effectual without any religious ceremony. He might refer to another Noble and

Learned Lord, (Stowell,) who was a light and an ornament to that House, and whose profound erudition was graced by his elegant and classical taste. That Noble and Learned Lord had proceeded on the ground which he had stated in his judgment in the case of Dalrymple and Dalrymple, in which he had set out the authorities, and mentioned the case of Lord Fitzmaurice in 1730, where a marriage *per verba de presenti* was held to be valid without any religious sanction, and that the parties could not even by their own consent render it of no effect. Such then was the law here before the Marriage Act, which, as Judge Blackstone had said, was so far an innovation on the law of England. And here, in adverting to that Noble and Learned Lord (Stowell) to whom he alluded, he might observe, that if he had thought that this Bill had any tendency to degrade the clergy or injure the Church, he would have been here to oppose it, and his absence was an argument that, at least in his opinion, it had not that tendency. He would now advert to the exceptions contained in the Marriage Act. By an especial clause, the Quakers were excepted from the operation of the Marriage Act, and their marriages were therefore left to stand upon the same footing as all other marriages of Dissenters did before the passing of that Act, receiving, however, the additional sanction and confirmation which the very exception gave them. Was it possible to conceive that if the Unitarians had then existed in the same way as that in which they now existed, they would not also have been excepted? The principle of the exemption was, that this was a matter of conscience, and that to force the Quakers to go through the ceremony as appointed by the Act, would be a constraint upon their religious liberty; and upon the same principle the Unitarians should be exempted. There was probably another reason no less cogent for the exception given to the Quakers; that it was not thought right or decent that the ceremonials of the Church should, for its own sake, be applied to persons who did not conform to its doctrines. A Right Reverend Prelate had most justly, on a former occasion in this view of the subject, said, that it was a solemn mockery, to make the Unitarians perform the Marriage Ceremony according to the rites of the Church of England; and would they not then have been exempted from the Marriage Act if they had existed in a legal form as they did now? He contended that if this class

of Dissenters had then existed in the position in which they now stand, they *must* have been excepted on the same principle as the Quakers were. He should, perhaps, be asked why they were not so excepted, and he would proceed briefly to state the reason. They had not, at the time of passing the Marriage Act, a legal existence. The profession of their tenets was then in the highest degree illegal. Rightly or wrongly, it was not for him there to discuss, they were at that time in a state of proscription. They were specially excluded from the benefit of the Toleration Act. Nine years afterwards even this was not thought sufficient, and it was considered wise and expedient to accumulate penalties upon their heads. Thus, then, they remained up to the time of the passing of the Marriage Act, and it surely was not extraordinary that they had not the benefit of the exception, when they were marked out by law as objects of punishment. But mark the progress of the history! In the 19th of the late King, the laws against them had been softened to a certain extent, and, in 1813, they were entirely exempted from the penalties to which they had before been subjected. They ought now, therefore, to have the benefit of exemption from the Marriage Act. It was a necessary consequence of the principle then adopted. It never could be right to have been acted on then, if it was not equally right, wise, and expedient to do the same as to the parties then before the House. But something had been said as to the opinions of these persons, and it had been suggested out of doors, and glanced at there, that they raised scruples and objections which were not entitled to any weight. It was asked then, and had been asked before, who and what they were? They were persons who believed in and received the same Scriptures, the same word of God as their Lordships, who used and drew their rules of faith from the same source; but they did not come to the same conclusions that their Lordships arrived at. They did not, it was said, even object to the ceremony of baptism, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, using in that respect words which they found in the New Testament. But they *did* object when they found, as in the Marriage Ceremony, those words connected with another, which was of the very essence of the points in difference; they did object to the blessing in the name of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. That with them was no trifling objection, but

one which goes to the very essence of their faith. They say this is the most direct admission of what they disbelieve, the Divinity of Jesus Christ. Their Lordships were not there discussing the propriety of their reasonings or conclusions. The only question was, were such opinions held conscientiously and in sincerity. He believed they were, and if that were so, how could it be treated as a trifle that they objected to words on which the whole question, and one of so much importance, turned? It had been said, that they were not called upon to repeat these words; but then they were present when they were pronounced, and were supposed to assent to them; and they could not protest against them, without being guilty of an infraction of the law. This solemn mockery, this unhal- lowed equivocation, as the Right Reverend Prelate called it, ought to be got rid of, for the sake both of the Dissenters and of the Church. But then came the question, in what way could this best be done? More than one Bill had already been brought in and thrown out, not so much on objection to principle as to details, though every attempt had been made to meet and obviate such objections. A new Bill was brought up, and that again opposed; not, indeed, avowedly on the principle so much as on details; though the Noble and Learned Lord had contrived so to mix up principle and details, that it was hardly possible to know whether his opposition was directed to the one or the other. Now he (the Lord Chancellor) did press upon the House to decide the principle by going into a Committee: he contended that the Bill was founded upon the principle of a law now in existence—he meant the Marriage Act. Since the year 1813, when, by Act of Parliament, these Dissenters became a tolerated body, and were exempted from the penalties to which, by law, they had before been liable, they might be considered as forming a new class in the country. He was of opinion that their Lordships were bound to follow up the principle of that Act, which they might now do in a very necessary and important point, by going into a Committee on the Bill then under their consideration. Although he had said that it was not his intention to go into the details of the Bill, he trusted the House would allow him to say a few words upon some of the matters which might now be considered, as they had, in fact, been used as matters of argument on the principle of the measure. The subjects to which he wished to allude related to the publication of banns, and the entry

in the register of the marriage. It was argued that the publication of banns required by this Bill would be offensive to the clergy of the Established Church. He really did not conceive in what manner they could be offended by it; especially when it was recollected that by the present practice of the Church, notices of all sorts, of highway rates, and even of the most trifling descriptions, were regularly promulgated in the Church during the intervals of divine service. What was there, he would ask, that could offend the clergy in the publication of the banns of marriage between persons admitted to be conscientious, admitted to be of high moral character, and of the greatest respectability, some of them Members of the other House, and therefore sitting to legislate for the community? Was it possible for their Lordships to say that the publication of the banns of marriage between such persons as these would degrade the clergyman who made the publication? Again, his Noble and Learned Friend had complained of the clause in this Bill which required the entry in the registry of the marriage. Now, it seemed to him that the duty thus imposed upon the clergyman was one in which the whole country was interested. It was not a matter that regarded individuals alone—it was in fact a public duty imposed for the benefit of the community. Was it not, he would ask, a matter of public convenience, that all the registers of marriages should be kept in one place, in order that all questions of legitimacy might be easily determined? Were not all parishes interested in the decisions of such matters, even in a pecuniary point of view? And was it no advantage to the country to secure the means of a quick and decisive method of settling those disputes; and should any one fancy he was degraded by being called upon to perform so important a duty? He must acknowledge he felt the force of the objection made by the Noble and Learned Lord to that part of the Bill which related to the marriage before the justice of the peace, of whose person the female might not be aware, and who might turn out not to be duly qualified unless it was provided that the marriage should be at any rate valid. He knew that that objection, and others of a similar character, would require some consideration. But the Noble and Learned Lord had discussed the provisions of this Bill entirely in the spirit of party. It was *not* a question of party, but one which ought only to be viewed calmly, deliberately, and dispassionately, as a

great public measure. The question now before them was, ought they not to give their sanction to the principle, leaving its details for future discussion in the Committee? When it had arrived at that stage, he should certainly use his utmost endeavours to get rid of the difficulties which had now been presented to their Lordships; and if at this time those difficulties were found to be insurmountable—if they were such as could not be disposed of in the present session of Parliament,—he would agree to give up the Bill for a time, satisfied with having established the principle of the measure. If the principle of the Bill was once established,—if the Lower House was, as it had often declared itself, ready to grant relief,—and this House concurred, as he trusted it would, in the same conclusion there *could* be no great difficulty in mastering its details, which seemed to him much overrated when it was thought it could not be surmounted. If he was right in what he had just stated, he saw no reason why this Bill should not be read a second time; or, as the question in form now stood, why it should not be committed. It seemed to him that the respectable body of Dissenters to which he had alluded were entitled to this pledge of their intentions; and, indeed, that not only they, but the members of the Establishment, might claim the relief at the hands of the Legislature; for it would be a relief almost as much to the Church as to these Dissenters. He believed that their Lordships could not act more discreetly than in adopting the principle sanctioned by the Right Reverend Prelate upon this subject; and if they adopted the principle, he would use his best exertions to get rid of the difficulties in the way, or, if it were necessary, consent to the delay in passing the measure until next session, in the hope that they would be enabled to grant the Dissenters and the Church a more perfect remedy, by the opportunity which would then have been afforded them, of fully examining into the nature and probable effects of the proposed measure; and they would in the mean time have satisfied the persons now before them, that they were sensible of the justice of their claims, that they admitted them, and would at the earliest opportunity afford the relief desired.

The Earl of ELDON, in explanation, thought it necessary to say, as the absence of a Noble Lord had been alluded to, that the fact of that absence furnished no argument in favour of the present Bill; to which that Noble Lord had, in the most decided manner, declared his

utter aversion. If in stating his (the Earl of Eldon's) own opinions on the subject, he had used strong language, he could assure their Lordships that nothing he had said or could say upon the subject would express in terms as strong as that Noble Lord would have used, had he been able to be present, his decided opposition to the measure. He said this, because that Noble Lord had been compelled, by unavoidable circumstances, to be absent from this discussion, and it was only by accident that he had not left him his proxy. The Noble Earl then alluded to the hostility which the clergy entertained towards the Bill, and intimated that a meeting of the clergy of an Archdeaconry of Middlesex, was, as he was informed by a letter, about to take place, to express their disapprobation of the measure.

The Bishop of CHESTER said, that he felt himself bound to say a few words in support of the Bill, in conformity with the pledge he had previously given. He agreed with the Noble and Learned Earl opposite, that some alterations were necessary, but he thought with the Noble and Learned Lord on the Woolsack, that these alterations could be well and easily made in the Committee. He would not now go at length into the details of the Bill, but he thought their Lordships would do wisely to acknowledge its principle, by which they would give satisfaction to a numerous body of Dissenters, in declaring to them that the Legislature was ready to give a pledge of its willingness to grant the relief which they claimed, and justly claimed, and to afford them all the assistance compatible with the integrity of the Church, and with the safety of the civil institutions of the country on this subject. He should trouble their Lordships with but few remarks upon this Bill. He should not have trespassed upon their attention at all, but that he thought the question was one of paramount importance, on which, alluded to as he had been directly, and especially after such remarks as had been made, he felt that he was bound not to give his vote without stating the grounds on which his opinion was founded. The marriage ceremony was the only portion of the service of the Church of England to which it was compulsory on every person to conform. He said *compulsory* because marriage was not only a natural right but a Christian duty. Now, by the law as it at present stood, no Dissenters from the Church, except the Quakers, could enter into the married state without appearing to agree

to doctrines from which they in fact strongly dissented. The main part—the essence of marriage—consisted in the consent of the parties; but the State properly claimed some power in the regulation of that important ceremony. There were two points on which alone the State could ground its right so to interfere—first, as it regarded public good in the preservation of the means of promoting order and regularity, and of ascertaining the legitimacy of children, in order to determine the titles to property; and, secondly, that such an interference was necessary or expedient in order to give all possible solemnity to the matter. With the first of these considerations the Church, as a Church, in its spiritual capacity, had nothing to do; and with respect to the second, he could not avoid expressing his serious doubts whether the solemnity of the ceremony was increased, by two persons being compelled to do that which seemed to amount to an acquiescence in doctrines from which they really dissented. Though himself convinced as a member of the Church of England that marriage was a contract which ought to be considered as sacred, and should be attended with every circumstance that would render it a most solemn engagement in the eyes of those who entered into it; he feared that it did not gain much in solemnity, or in sacredness of character, by the laws now regulating the practice of the Church of England. Although he was convinced that matrimony was, to use the language of the Church, a holy state, not to be entered into without the observance of religious forms and ceremonies, yet he could not forget, that in the 25th Article of the Church itself, it was expressly stated, that there were “not any visible signs or ceremonies ordained of God.” Swinburn had laid it down that it is the consent of the parties which is the essence of marriage. It did appear to him that a Christian state was not warranted in imposing upon its subjects an obnoxious form of religious worship, if the civil regulations to which alone it was called upon to attend could be carried into effect without it. He did not mean to admit that *all* sorts of scruples were thus to be allowed to interfere with the general policy and interest of the community. There must, he thought, be some discretion which the state should exercise with a view to the general good. But there were scruples, as in the present case, which it was impossible to disregard without interfering with the most sacred rights of con-

science. There was surely a broad and obvious line, for instance, to be drawn in favour of scruples as to fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith, and such a scruple as a man should set up who should say his objection lay to the person's who performed it wearing a surplice. The state again did not consider, with a view to the general good, that it was justified in yielding to the Quakers' scruples against paying taxes. The principle it was very easy to concede, guarding it by such restrictions of common sense as should prevent its extending beyond utility and justice. There were several amendments in the Bill which he should propose, particularly in the description of the parties in the preamble and declaration. He thought they ought distinctly to ascertain that the persons claiming the benefit of the Act did actually disbelieve the doctrine of the Trinity — for he was not prepared to admit that the term "Unitarian" did necessarily imply a denial of that doctrine. If it were true that any large body of the clergy would think themselves degraded, as had been said, by the operation of this Bill, it was certainly an important consideration; but really it appeared to him that the Noble Lord on the Woolsack had completely removed the difficulty as to the bans. As to the registration, on the most mature deliberation, he could see no ground for objection to a clergyman's, in the performance of a civil duty, notifying the existence of a fact certified to him by a magistrate at the request of the state, with a view to its internal regulations. In Austria, he found that the Protestant minister, as well as the Catholic, was allowed to marry, baptize and bury, but he was required to transmit certificates of so doing to the Catholic clergyman for entry. Surely the Catholic was likely to have quite as strong objections to registering the acts of the Protestant clergyman, as a clergyman of the Church of England could have to registering those of a justice of the peace. The Rev. Prelate concluded by declaring, that he cordially gave his vote for liberating a respectable and important class of Dissenters from a grievance of which they had just cause to complain, and for liberating the clergy at the same time from an irksome and annoying office.

LORD LANSDOWNE explained, that one of the bills brought in did give the celebration of the marriage to the Unitarian minister, and perhaps that plan would be liked best by these Dissenters. But

it was objected to here, and for himself he should say that it was in his opinion most important that one common register should be kept. He should not oppose any amendments thought necessary to render the Bill more perfect; neither should he press it this session if it were found impossible to give it due attention.

The Earl of ELDON again explained; after which the House divided.

For going into a Committee 61
Against it 54

Majority for a Committee .. 7

The Bill then went into a Committee *pro forma*; the Report was brought up, and ordered to be taken into further consideration on Thursday next.

The understanding appeared to be, that the best course to be pursued was, that the friends of the Bill should put it into such a shape as they thought advisable; and that it should then be printed and stand over to next Session.

Manchester College, York.

THE Annual Examination of Students educated in this College was held from Monday, June 25, to Thursday, June 28, in the presence of Samuel Shore, Jun., Esq., *President*; the Rev. John Kentish, *Vice-President*; Messrs. Anderson, Bell, Burnett, Fletcher, Hutton, Paget, Phillips, Thrush, Wellbeloved, and Wood, *Treasurer*; and the Rev. Messrs. Heinenken, Higginson, Hincks, Johnstone, Lee, Taylor, Williams, and Turner, *Visitor*; when the Students were severally examined in Hebrew, the Latin and Greek Classics, the Mathematics, Ethics, Ancient and Modern History, the Evidences of Natural and Revealed Religion, and Theology; and Orations were delivered by Mr. Davidson on the Influence of the Papal Hierarchy in England; Mr. Johnson on the Origin and Effects of the English House of Commons; Mr. Alfred Paget on the Influence of the Age, Circumstances, and Learning of Shakespeare on the development of his Genius; Mr. C. Fletcher on Spenser's Faery Queen; Mr. Lonsdale on the Present State of partial Representation in the House of Commons; Mr. H. Wrenford on the question, How far the Enjoyment of the Drama depends on Theatrical Representation; Mr. Hort on the Character of Christ as an Evidence of his Divine Mission; Mr. Bache on the Doctrine of a Particular Providence; Mr. Davis on the Pleasures of the Ima-

gination as superior to those of Sense; Mr. Philipps on Materialism; Mr. E. Higginson on the Argument for the Existence and Attributes of God from the Constitution of the Human Mind; Mr. Squire on the English Puritans from the Reformation to the Reign of Charles I.; and Mr. Gaskell on the Final Prevalence of Truth. Sermons were delivered by Mr. Martineau, on 1 Cor. iii. 21—23; by Mr. Talbot, on Mark ii. 27; and Mr. Ketley, on 1 Tim. ii. 5. The College prizes for diligence, regularity and proficiency were awarded, the first to Mr. Bache; the second to Mr. Alfred Paget; the third to Mr. Nicholson. Mr. Philipps's, for classical proficiency, to Mr. Alfred Paget in the second year, and to Mr. Nicholson in the first. Mr. Wood's, for proficiency in English composition, to Mr. Robert Mitford Taylor; for the best Oration to Mr. Hort;* for the best delivery, to Mr. Gaskell. The Examination was closed by the following Address from the Visitor: "Gentlemen, I have so often addressed you, or your predecessors, on occasions like the present, that it becomes somewhat difficult to find a variety of topics: but the vacancies which appear among yourselves, and the bereaved state of several of our churches, seem to render it neither unreasonable nor inexpedient to caution you against the danger of overstrained exertion, or, as my late excellent friend, Mrs. Lindsey,† once expressed the senti-

* N. B. This gentleman, having been three years a Student in the Belfast Academical Institution, was not considered, according to former usage, entitled to compete for the College-prizes offered to Students in the first three years; but this could not prevent a "Friend to the College," well acquainted with his uniform diligence, regularity, and consequent great proficiency, from making him (through the hands of the visitor) a public acknowledgment of his merit, by presenting him with Schmidii Concordantiæ, in N. T.

† Since this Address was delivered, the author has laid his hand on another letter of his excellent old friend, (dated June 19, 1804,) from which the following is an extract:

"May I be permitted, in consequence of what Mr. F. told us, to admonish you not to ruin ——'s health by too great confinement and application to his studies? I am a zealous advocate for exertion; but all bodies are not equally capable of it: and a constitution broken

ment to myself, 'of overplying the machine.' Men in every situation, and students among the rest, should consider themselves as members of society, and placed in their various stations in it by the Great Disposer, that they may apply the powers with which they are endowed, and the opportunities afforded to each respectively of improving those powers, for the general benefit; and that even the most honourable, and, in moderation, the most useful, modes of applying their advantages, are wasted and lose their effect, when pushed beyond the prescribed limits. And if studies are ever thus immoderately pursued from motives of mere self gratification, or from a love of fame and distinction, and not for the public good, they sink to a level with other exhausting pleasures, and often yield to the jaded mind as little satisfaction in the review.

"I am aware that this will be thought by many a strange sort of advice to offer to young students, who from the vivacity natural to their age are generally thought to need the spur rather than the bridle. But I am not proposing to encourage you, gentlemen, in any neglect of study; nor have I any reason to think that the moderate plan of study which I would recommend, if steadily and regularly pursued, would tend to diminish the quantity of knowledge acquired, or would lessen your own enjoyment in its acquisition or possession, or your capacity of applying it usefully for the benefit of others.

"I presume not to say that the studies of any of those, whether students or ministers, whose lamented indisposition has occasioned these remarks, have been conducted irregularly, or that they are chargeable with any thing but (some of them) having undertaken more than it was possible for the limited powers of the human mind to perform. But I do say that, with a regular distribution of the hours of study, recreation and rest, and a steady observance of it in the ordinary course of life, time enough may be found for the acquisition of as much

down at an early period shortens usefulness at a more advanced one. I have also a full persuasion that all will be able to do the work appointed to them; but as future time is not in our ken, we must use the knowledge we have to preserve health and lengthen our span, short at best, but long enough, if reasonably employed, to enable us to be in some degree ready to begin again."

knowledge as any man need to have, and also for the discharge of every important and useful duty for which such knowledge may qualify him. But if, in any case, a considerable portion of time be wasted in idleness or worse, and then the hours and days that have been lost are attempted to be redeemed by extraordinary exertions, and the sacrifice of many hours which ought to have been devoted to rest, an injury is inevitably done to the nervous system which, if the irregularity be often repeated, will produce an effect upon the bodily health equally fatal with, and often not very different from, the evils arising from other kinds of intemperance.

“What may be thought the due proportion of time allotted in each day to study, rest, and refreshment, will be a subject of some difference. Dr. Doddridge and Mr. Mason allow only six hours' sleep; Dr. Priestley appears to have taken little more; but his agreeable way of varying his objects of pursuit, so as to make them relaxations from one another, enabled him to get through all the business, which the reader of his life or the peruser of his works cannot contemplate without amazement. A much respected friend,* to whom many besides myself were greatly indebted for the direction of our youthful studies, used to recommend a three-fold division of the day, into eight hours for rest, eight for study, and eight for meals and recreation. And this I am inclined to think (the several portions devoted to study and recreation being properly intermixed, and the whole steadily observed) will get a man through as much business as he can effectively perform, consistently with the due preservation of his health. The hours of rest should of course come all together, and I think that a young and active person, before the constitution is fully formed, may beneficially take the full eight hours. But it appears to me of great importance during what period of the twenty-four hours this rest should be taken. A habit of devoting the hours of night to study is likely to have the effect of still further exhausting the already exhausted body, and will oblige it to carry with it also an exhausted mind, to seek a repose which it frequently fails of finding. The productions of a famous ancient writer were said to smell of the lamp; but I fear that most works produced at such unseasonable hours will partake only of its disagreeable odour. Rather than con-

sume the midnight oil, I would choose, in cases of necessity, *poscere ante diem librum cum lumine*: but this would only be necessary, to one who rises at a tolerably early hour, for a small part of the year; while during the rest *Aurora, musis amica*, would afford him her fair and genial light.

“With regard to recreations, they must depend so much on the taste and habits of each individual, as well as on his constitutional strength and activity, that no general rule can be laid down; only I should think it would be useful to adapt them to supply, as much as possible, what may be wanting in the hours of business: the recreations of the sedentary should therefore in general be active, as walking, riding, gardening, botanizing, or (what I hear is a favourite amusement among you) rowing, which, where moderately and seasonably pursued, is useful, as it brings almost all the bodily organs into action. On the other hand; for persons engaged in active pursuits, the recreations may properly be sedentary. To one who is confined during the hours of business to his study, friendly visits and social conversation are very appropriate and profitable recreations; and by the Christian minister they may also be properly considered as at the same time discharging one of the most useful parts of the duties of his office. But in other respects it seems desirable that relaxation should be accompanied as much as possible with a relinquishment of those trains of thought in which the mind is usually engaged. Mr. Wakefield used to say, that he locked up his books in his study, and made a point of never thinking of them till he returned to them again. And Dr. Priestley, when most busily engaged in philosophical investigations, in controversy, and in ministerial duties, was always ready for cheerful society, and preserved his mind so free from anxious thoughts, that he never recollected to have dreamed except in cases of bodily indisposition.

“How far you may think the hints I have given you worthy of your attention, I must leave to yourselves. I am myself persuaded that a course of study thus pursued will answer all the objects of attaining useful knowledge, and will be at the same time consistent with health, at least in all ordinary cases. May your health be confirmed and your lives preserved, if it please the Giver and the Lord of life: and may the lives which he hath given, so long as it shall please him, be devoted to his service, to

* The Rev. Philip Holland.

the good of mankind, and to the honour of the institution which has been instrumental to your advancement in knowledge—let it also be instrumental to your advancement in all virtue !”

Kent Unitarian Baptists.

THE Annual Association of the Kent Unitarian Baptists was held at Chatham, Tuesday, May 15th. The preliminary proceedings commenced at half-past nine o'clock and the public service at eleven. The Rev. B. Mardon and the Rev. J. Marten engaged in the devotional exercises, and the Rev. D. Eaton, of London, delivered an excellent discourse from John vii. 48.

On the meeting being concluded, the elders and representatives of the churches, with other Unitarian friends, sat down to a well-provided dinner at the Mitre Tavern, after which a number of sentiments were proposed from the Chair, (which, as is customary in the connexion, was occupied by the preacher of the day,) all of which were in unison with the principles of civil and religious liberty, and drew forth appropriate remarks from Messrs. Mardon, Harding, Brent, Ashdowne, &c. After taking tea, the party, consisting of between fifty and sixty persons, departed from the scene of their innocent festivities with expressions of mutual regard and satisfaction.

T. F. T.

Anniversary of the Sunday School at Welburn, near York.

If simple and unpretending zeal, conjoined with those principles which have been too generally represented as destructive of such feelings, be sufficient to interest the Unitarian world, no apology can be required in offering the present communication. Amongst a large portion of our Christian brethren, it is felt and stated as no slight objection to our peculiar sentiments, that they are little qualified for the use of that important class of society, who, being precluded by their station and employments from a very refined and philosophical education, need a religion which shall speak to their hearts rather than one which can approve itself to a discriminating judgment. As furnishing an answer to such reasonings, the religious anniversaries of village Unitarians, in places almost unknown by name, may claim a record in the pages of the Monthly Repository.

The Unitarian congregation at Welburn, who have lately been indebted to public liberality for the erection of their

neat and convenient chapel, owed their origin to the exertions of Mr. John Mason; a man whose only philosophy lay in the natural strength of a vigorous intellect, and whose only literary acquirements were a thorough knowledge of the contents of his Bible. Many among his converts exhibit much of his philosophy and knowledge in their rational creed and their serious and reflecting habits of mind; and, nurtured as this little flock has been by the care of their founder, by the zeal of some among themselves who do not shrink from the duties of divine service, and, of late years, by the assistance of the divinity students of the York College, they furnish a living example of the adaptation of pious and unsophisticated Unitarianism to the capacity and wants of the poor.

The Annual Meeting, announced at the head of this article, was a highly interesting occasion. On Monday afternoon, May 28th, a religious service was conducted, and an excellent sermon preached on behalf of the School, by the Rev. W. Turner, of York. After service, the children, to the number of seventy, assembled at tea; and when they were dispatched to their sports, the members of the congregation sat down, in company with such friends of the school, or of Unitarian Christianity, from the neighbourhood, from Maltou, and from York, as an unfavourable state of the weather would permit to assemble. The evening passed with much life and harmony; and we were not a little pleased to observe many of our orthodox friends in the room, partaking, we assure ourselves, in the kind and liberal feelings which were expressed both by members of the Welburn flock and by their friends from a distance. The encouraging prospects of Unitarianism in Welburn, while they gave occasion for mutual congratulations amongst its professors, led to the mention of the pleasing and truly Christian relation in which the Society stands towards the Wesleyan Methodists, who opened a chapel lately in the village. Long may the profession of either faith be unmingled with jealousy towards the advocates of the other!

The principles of religious liberty and the rights of conscience formed a copious topic for the consideration of our meeting; and in connexion with such sentiments, a petition to Parliament was produced for signature, praying for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, and of all acts imposing civil disabilities

on account of religious opinions. The petition was a copy of one which was at the same time lying for signatures at York. It was signed by forty-five persons, while the York petition obtained about double that number of names. And though the immediate necessity for these and similar exertions seems to be deferred, yet the assertion of our rights cannot be unseasonable, if it only prepare the way for their future acknowledgment, by proving, that Dissenters are not themselves indifferent (as it has been insinuated) about their own rights of conscience.

A VISITOR AT WELBURN.
York, June 2, 1827.

Sussex Unitarian Association.

THE Eighth Anniversary of the Sussex Unitarian Association was held at Brighton, on Wednesday, the 30th of May, when the Rev. Russell Scott, of Portsmouth, delivered on the occasion a very interesting discourse from Gen. xiv. 18: "And Melchizedek, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine; and he was the Priest of the Most High God." The object of the discourse was to expose the fallacy of the opinion so generally entertained by the orthodox, that Melchizedek, who is said by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews to have been "without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days nor end of life," was a type of Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of God. The extensive research, critical acumen, and historical illustration for which the sermon was distinguished, rendered it highly interesting to the auditors; and we are happy to say that Mr. Scott has kindly consented to the request of the Society that it should be printed. The friends and subscribers to the Association dined together at the Ship Inn, where the afternoon was pleasantly spent. Dr. Morell presided, and many gentlemen addressed the meeting.

T. W. HORSFIELD.
Lewes, June 24, 1827.

Shropshire, Cheshire, and Staffordshire Association.

ON Wednesday, the 6th of June, the Annual Meeting of the Association of the adjacent Unitarian congregations in Shropshire, Cheshire, and Staffordshire, was held at Whitchurch. One of the chief objects which hitherto has been contemplated in these meetings—to promote friendly and religious intercourse among the members of the Association,

as a means of encouragement and support to each other in their common work—was pleasingly realized on this occasion. The meeting was attended by various distant lay friends, as well as ministers, all of whom appeared to participate in the high gratification which their presence and encouragement afforded to the congregation of the place, almost all the active members of which are of the labouring class.

There were two religious services on the occasion, which were conducted by the Rev. Hugh Hutton, of Birmingham, as the preacher, and several of the other ministers who were present as supporters. Between the services, the company sat down to an economical dinner: Mr. Hutton in the Chair. In this office as well as in the pulpit, the Rev. Gentleman afforded much gratification to those present, who could not but express their feeling of pleasure in the appointment of one possessing qualities so well calculated to promote the objects of the meeting. The other ministers present were the Rev. J. Hawkes, Rev. R. B. Aspland, M. A., Rev. E. Hawkes, M. A., Rev. H. Clarke, Rev. — Buxton, and Rev. R. Shawcross, all of whom were called upon to address the meeting, and were listened to apparently with much attention and interest. After several hours' social and edifying enjoyment the company withdrew to the School-Rooms, where tea was provided, and a considerable number of the female members of the congregation and some visitors assembled to meet them.

A hope is entertained by some that this Association, though it is in its infancy, and its means are very limited, may yet be made more directly useful to the great cause in the promotion of which it is at present so humble an instrument.

The next meeting will be held at Nantwich, and the Rev. R. B. Aspland, of Chester, is appointed to preach.

R. S.

Lancashire Unitarian Methodist Association.

ON Thursday, June the 7th, 1827, was held at Padiham, the Annual Association of the different societies of Methodist Unitarians in Lancashire. The service in the morning was introduced by Mr. J. Ashworth, of Newchurch, and a very interesting discourse was delivered from Acts xxviii. 22, by the Rev. F. Howorth, of Rochdale. The preacher ably answered many of the popular ob-

jections to Unitarian Christianity, and exhorted his audience to evince the superior excellence of their faith by the parity and holiness of their lives. He pronounced a justly-merited eulogium on those useful men, who, though engaged in secular pursuits during the week, go out on the Sunday to instruct their fellow-creatures in the great and important truths of Christianity, and whose labours have been attended with such signal success in this populous district.

After the conclusion of the services at the Chapel, the friends, in number one hundred and twenty, male and female, retired to an inn and sat down to a plain, inexpensive dinner. This arrangement admitted the poorer brethren to participate in the pleasures which Christian intercourse is so peculiarly calculated to impart.

After dinner the business of the meeting was transacted in the Chapel, the Rev. N. Jones in the Chair. Reports were then given of the different societies connected with the Association, viz., Rochdale, Newchurch, Burnley, Todmorden, Oldham, Rawtonstall, and Padiham. We were happy to hear that most of those congregations and the Sunday-schools connected with them are in a flourishing state. The societies at Newchurch and Padiham have considerably increased during the past year. Padiham is principally supplied by two worthy individuals of the congregation, with occasional assistance from the "Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Missionary Society." The writer of this report spent the following Sunday after the Association with this truly interesting and religious people, and preached to unusually large audiences—in the afternoon to about two hundred and fifty, and in the evening to upwards of three hundred. He likewise preached in some of the adjacent villages, and considers this district a genial soil in which to disseminate the seeds of Christian Unitarianism. We lament to say that trade in this place, and indeed throughout this part of the county, has been so depressed, that the weavers have scarcely been able by honest industry to supply even the wants of nature! One of the humble individuals above alluded to remarked, "that amidst all their distress they had not lost their religion, which imparted to the dejected mind, under the most calamitous circumstances, the purest and highest consolation!" Such is the happy influence of Unitarianism when it assumes its sway over the human mind. It affords us sincere pleasure

in being able to state that the societies in this district have received assistance both in money and clothing from congregational collections and benevolent individuals in the metropolis, for which they return their grateful acknowledgments.

In the evening the friends again assembled for divine worship. Mr. Buckland, the Missionary, read the hymns and engaged in prayer, and a very excellent sermon was preached by Mr. Jones, from the words of the apostle "If any man think himself to be something when he is nothing, he deceiveth himself." No one could listen to the preacher but with a lively interest; and but few we think went away without being convinced that charity and humility are essential to the formation of the Christian character. We regret to state that Mr. Tate, who had engaged to preach in the evening, was prevented in consequence of indisposition.—Thus ended the proceedings of a day devoted to the cultivation of friendship, the promotion of piety, and to the furtherance of the Christian religion.

U. M.

Manchester, June 16, 1827.

Unitarian Association at Hull.

ON Wednesday and Thursday, July the 4th and 5th, the Anniversary Meeting of the Unitarian Association of Hull, Doncaster, Lincoln, Thorne, &c., was held at Hull. On Wednesday evening, the Rev. Dr. Hutton, of Leeds, preached an excellent sermon on the silent and unobserved but constant progress of truth, at the close of which he ably defended the Unitarians against the charge, which has been so pertinaciously brought against them, of the want of missionary zeal. On Thursday morning, the Rev. W. Duffield, of Thorne, preached a sermon on the respect entertained by Unitarians for the authority of the Sacred Scriptures, in which he successfully vindicated them from the charge of irreverence, and, by an appeal to numerous facts, shewed that such a charge could not be maintained against those who consider the Scriptures as of *sole* authority in religious matters, who interpret what is figurative in them by that which is literal, and the obscure by the plain, and who express their religious sentiments in the most unambiguous *scriptural* language. At one o'clock the meeting for business took place in the chapel, when the Secretary's Report, which contained, among other interesting particu-

lars, letters from Doncaster and Thorne, was read. Under the able services of the stated minister, the cause of Unitarianism at Thorne appears to be in a flourishing condition. A respectable company sat down to an economical dinner at the Cross Keys Inn, Mr. Ketley, the newly appointed minister, in the Chair. The Meeting was enlivened by the speeches of several gentlemen present, among whom was Dr. Longstaff, of Edinburgh, who gave very interesting accounts of the present state of the Edinburgh Society, and who stated, in a very eloquent manner, the claims of Unitarianism, and the probability of its future progress, aided by the establishment of various institutions which are calculated to disseminate useful knowledge, and to promote the habit of thinking among the great body of the people. The Meeting was much indebted to the Revds. Platts, of Doncaster; Worsley, of Gainsborough; Duffield, of Thorne; and Lee, of Boston, who, by their animated speeches, considerably increased its interest. The absence of Dr. Hutton, who was obliged to leave at the close of the morning service, was much regretted.

On Thursday evening, the Rev. W. Worsley, of Gainsborough, delivered a sermon, on the evils of persecution, in which he proved that the conduct of the persecutor was in direct opposition to the divine laws, as displayed in the administration of the world and in the revelation of the will of God; that the persecutor defeated the ends which he professed to have in view; and that, however calculated persecution might be to make martyrs and hypocrites, it unavoidably failed in making converts. In conclusion, he pointed out the connexion between particular doctrines and the evil spirit which he so strongly deprecated, and claimed for Unitarianism an exemption from all tendency to promote that unchristian spirit.

J. K.

Hull, July 0, 1827.

Southern Unitarian Society.

THE Annual Meeting of the Southern Unitarian Society was held at Chichester, on Thursday, the 5th of July. The Rev. T. W. Horsfield commenced the service by prayer and reading the Scriptures; the Rev. Russell Scott delivered the second prayer; and the Rev. J. G. Robberds preached the annual sermon from 1 Tim. ii. 5, on the *supposition* of the two natures in Christ, ably proving that it was impossible, and, if possible, inconsistent

with facts, as well as insufficient for the professed purpose. In the evening, the Rev. J. G. Robberds introduced the service, and the Rev. T. W. Horsfield delivered an excellent discourse from John i. 46, in refutation of the prevailing prejudices against Unitarians. After the morning service, Samuel Colby, Esq., being called to the Chair, the Report was read, from which it appeared that the Society had during the past year printed 1000 copies of a tract, written by one of their oldest and most valued members, entitled, "Why do you go to the Unitarian Chapel?" and that the tract had not only been useful in that particular district, but had been circulated in the West of England, where it had been the means of awakening a local controversy, which promised to be of considerable benefit to the cause. The Society had also purchased fifty copies of a tract lately published by the Rev. J. Fullagar, entitled, "The Ignorance of the Apostle Paul of the mysterious Union of Two Natures in Christ, deduced from his Writings," occasioned by the publication of a sermon at Chichester, in which the opinions of Unitarians were attacked. The following resolutions were then passed by the Meeting: "That the cordial thanks of this Society be presented to those Peers, spiritual and temporal, who had shewn a truly Christian feeling in the assistance they had given towards freeing the Marriage Service from those objections which have pressed on the consciences of Unitarians, and particularly to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Right Rev. the Bishops of London, Lincoln, Chester, and St. Asaph; and, also, that the cordial thanks of this Society be given to William Smith, Esq., M. P., for his continued exertions to obtain an alteration in the Marriage Service."

In the afternoon fifty persons dined together at the Fleece Inn; nine new members were added to the Society; and much harmony and good feeling prevailed.

E. KELL, Secretary.

Unitarian Tract Society for Warwickshire and the Neighbouring Counties.

THE Twenty-first Anniversary of this Society was held on Wednesday, July 11, in the Unitarian Chapel, Alcester. The Rev. E. Bristow, of Birmingham, conducted the devotional service and read the Scriptures; and the Rev. John Reynell Wreford, one of the Pastors of the

New Meeting, Birmingham, delivered a discourse on John i. 45, 46. After a few introductory observations on the interesting interview between Philip and Nathanael, recorded in this passage, the preacher proceeded to make the conduct of these individuals the groundwork of some judicious and pertinent remarks on the examination and propagation of truth. For this purpose, he considered the examples set forth in the text, as teaching, *first*, the right and duty of private judgment and free inquiry; *secondly*, the necessity of subduing our prejudices, in order to arrive at a just conclusion in our inquiries; and *thirdly*, the best mode of diffusing the knowledge of our religious opinions. The sentiments expressed in this appropriate and eloquent discourse, were forcibly directed to the supporting of the claims of the Christian Scriptures, to a fearless, candid and patient investigation, and to the recommendation of humility, forbearance and charity, in our controversies with those who differ from us, and of an enlightened, active and temperate zeal in the dissemination of the opinions which we embrace and value as the truth.

At the conclusion of the religious services, Thomas Eyre Lee, Esq., was invited to the Chair, and the usual business of the Society was transacted. The Rev. Hugh Hutton resigned the office of Secretary, which he had held for four

years; and the Rev. J. R. Wreford kindly acceded to the unanimous request of the meeting, by undertaking that office for the ensuing year.

A party of subscribers and friends, to the number of thirty-three, afterwards dined together at the Swan Inn, and spent the evening in that friendly and edifying intercourse which it is one great object of such meetings to promote among brethren assembled from different places, and co-operating in one grand design of diffusing the knowledge and love of scriptural truth.

H. H.

Buxton Chapel.

THIS Chapel was opened for the season on Sunday, the 29th July. The following ministers are appointed to conduct the services which are held in the morning and evening.

July 29.	Rev. J. R. Beard, Salford.
Aug. 5.	Noah Jones,
12.	Peter Wright, Stanington.
19.	Samuel Parker, Stockport.
26.	William Tate, Chorley.
Sept. 2.	J. H. Bransby, Dudley.
9.	John Gaskell, Dukinfield.
16.	James Tayler, Nottingham.
23.	John James Tayler, Manchester.
30.	Joseph Ashton, Halifax.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE Conductors must be allowed to exercise their own discretion as to the mode of acknowledging the communications with which they may be favoured. They would never willingly give offence; and they are surprised that any should have been taken by their Walworth Correspondent. With the personal reflections in his last note, they, as public journalists, can have no concern.

Clericus Cantabrigiensis will appear in the next number; and it will afford the Conductors pleasure to hear from him again. They hope also for a continuance of T. F. B.'s correspondence.

A correspondent is desirous of ascertaining what are the leading features of Kant's System of Philosophy, and wherein it differs from others of a similar kind. Is he aware that there is an English work on this subject? He also wishes to learn the proper name and description of a folio Bible in his possession, from what original derived, and by whom edited: it is inscribed as follows: *Biblia Latino Gallica: La Sainte Bible qui est toute Sainte Ecriture, contenant Le Vieil et Nouveau Testament. A Lyon, par Sebastian Honorati. MDLXXV.*

The author, or translator, greatly overestimates the value of the Demon of Conradsburg at *five shillings*. The manuscript will be returned to him on application at the Office.

The Conductors regret that owing to the length of the report of the important debate on the Unitarian Marriage Act, which they were anxious to record, they have not been able to insert an account of the extraordinary proceedings of the Synod of Ulster. They intend, however, to take up the subject in the next number.