THE MONTHLY REPOSITORY

AND

REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, No. IX.

SEPTEMBER, 1827.

ON THE MYTHICAL INTERPRETATION OF THE BIBLE, FROM JAHN'S BIBLICAL ARCHÆOLOGY: WITH SOME PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

If we look back on the history of Biblical Criticism for the last thirty or forty years, we shall find that, except in Germany, scarcely any member of the Roman Catholic Church has been distinguished by the cultivation of it. The labours of De Rossi, however valuable in the confined department with which he has occupied himself, can hardly be said to form an exception, and the Catholics themselves would decline to produce Geddes. The condition of the Spanish peninsula and of France during that time has been such, that we cannot wonder that they have furnished no contributions towards the improvement of this science. The situation of the British Catholics has been in some respects more favourable, but their countrymen of the Established Church have done little or nothing to excite them to emulation in the study of biblical criticism. The exasperation produced by the political measures of the ruling party in England towards the Catholics, has turned the talents of both parties into the channel of polemics, and those too of the most miserable and personal kind. Whether Gardner persecuted or Cranmer vacillated a little more or a little less, whether Mary or Elizabeth better deserved the epithet of *bloody*, whether the decrees of the Council of Trent or the articles of the English Church are the more intolerant—these, and such as these, are the questions on which the Catholics and Protestants of this enlightened country are content to waste their strength. The Catholic Church, indeed, we are well convinced, will never more take the lead in cultivating the study of the Scriptures; it is the Protestants who must give the example, and make their opponents feel the necessity of furnishing themselves with the same knowledge in order to keep their ground in controversy. As long, therefore, as the clergy of the English Church remain, what we deliberately and advisedly declare them to be, even now, the most destitute of theological knowledge, taken as a body, of any Protestant clergy in Europe,* so long the Catholics may safely confine their professional studies to martyrology, ecclesiastical history, and canon law.

---

* To those who are accustomed to panegyrize the English universities and depreciate all others, we would recommend a comparison of the course of theological study in either of them, with the following statement of the education of the Roman Catholic clergy of Bavaria, as given in the Revue Encyclopédique for May, 1827, pp.

In Germany the state of things is widely different. The wisdom of our ancestors, by excluding Catholics from our universities, has compelled them to found seminaries of theological instruction for themselves, in which we now, with strange inconsistency, complain, that their priests are brought up in narrow and exclusive habits of thought, and strong hostility to Protestantism. In Germany a university is a school for all, without distinction of creed, and all studies which are of a general kind are carried on in common. This association with those of a different belief has produced the most striking and beneficial effects on the minds of the Catholics, both students and professors. Placed in the centre of knowledge and investigation, their academical teachers have felt how futile it would be to endeavour to stop their progress by appealing to authority, or to contend against the new opinions which Protestant critics were diffusing, except by the same weapons of learning and argument which they employed. They made themselves masters of all the improvements in theological science, and examined every argument of the neologists according to its own merit, instead of denouncing them from the pulpit or the altar. The bias of their minds was indeed just the reverse of that of their most eminent contemporaries; but the *stare super antiquas vias*, which, as members of the Church of Rome, would naturally be their motto, might serve as a useful direction at a time when so many went astray, merely because they disdained to walk in a beaten path. The consequence has been, that several of the Roman Catholic professors of theology in Germany have attained a very high rank among the cultivators of that science, and, if we mistake not, will be pronounced by future scholars to have been, on some points, much nearer the truth than their Protestant adversaries.

Among these Roman Catholic professors, the two most eminent are Hug of Freiburg and Jahn of Vienna. Hug's Introduction to the New Testament, which the translator of Schleiermacher has pronounced one of the most valuable works of German theology, is about to be published by Dr. Wait, of St. John's College, Cambridge. His work on the Invention and Antiquity of Alphabetical Writing is by far the ablest answer that has appeared to the bold speculations of Wolf on the origin of the Iliad. The principal work of Jahn is his Biblische Archäologie, in five volumes octavo, containing the most succinct and complete view of all that has been done in

---

537, et seq. Those who are destined to the clerical office must have gone through the regular course of preparatory learning in the gymnasia, and have been authorized by the teachers in them to proceed to the university. On their arrival there, before they begin the study of theology, they must attend the professors of Greek and Latin literature, mathematics, physics, metaphysics and logic, and general history, and must undergo examination by the professors of each of these branches, who, if he finds them competent, gives them a certificate stating the regularity of their attendance and the amount of their proficiency. All this being done they are allowed to enter on theology, which itself comprehends the following branches: Encyclopedia of Theological Study, (a general view of the science, with references to the best authors,) Exegesis of Scripture, Ecclesiastical History, Canon and Ecclesiastical Law, Morals, Doctrinal Theology, and Oriental Philology. No order is prescribed for these studies, but six *semesters* (or sessions of nearly six months each) must be occupied in them. The professor of each branch examines and certifies the proficiency of the student. Lastly, after a very close examination on the subject of all their previous studies, they are received into the *episcopal seminaries*, where they remain two years, and are instructed in the liturgy, in preaching and catechizing, and all pastoral duties. At the same time they retrace their former studies, and are required to attend to what the Germans call *Pædagogik* (the art or science of teaching school). Ordination closes their studies.

ancient or modern times for the illustration of the antiquities of the Bible, systematically arranged under the heads of Political, Domestic, and Sacred. It was first published at intervals from 1796 to 1805. At his death, in 1816, he left large materials for a new edition of the earlier parts, which has since been published; the Sacred Antiquities remain in their original state. Of the first edition the author himself published an abridgement in Latin, under the title of Archæologia Biblica in compendium redacta, 1805, 2d ed. 1814. He also published an Introduction to the Old Testament, Enchiridion hermeneuticæ, (Vienna, 1812,) and an edition of the Hebrew Bible with various readings, (Vienna, 1806, 4 vols. 8vo.,) which enjoys a high reputation; and in the former part of his life, while he was professor of the oriental languages, various works on Hebrew, Syriac, and Arabic Grammar.

There is a smaller work of Jahn's, published in one of the German periodical magazines, (E. G. Bengel Archiv für Theologie, Vol. 2. 3,) by which he has perhaps done more for biblical criticism than by his more voluminous productions. It is well known to every theological student what variety of opinions had prevailed respecting the time when the books of Moses were written, or at least assumed their actual form. It was natural that their language, as compared with that of parts of the Old Testament avowedly of later origin, should be appealed to, in order to decide this question; but the proposed test had proved very unsatisfactory: for while some thought they perceived in the style of the Pentateuch the strongest dissimilarity to Judges or Samuel, and even alleged that words and constructions occur in it which are not found in the later books, others professed to perceive no such dissimilarity in their language, but on the contrary an uniformity which proved their origin in nearly the same age. The latter opinion, sanctioned by the authority of the great lexicographer Gesenius, had gained ground in Germany, when Jahn undertook the examination of the question, and by a most laborious comparison of the words and idiom of the Pentateuch with those of the later books, proved beyond doubt that they were written in very distant ages from each other. At present we shall enter no farther into this subject, as we hope ere long to furnish the readers of the Monthly Repository with such an abstract of Jahn's papers as will enable them to judge how satisfactorily he has decided this much controverted question.

To make the following extract from the Preface to Jahn's Biblical Archæology intelligible, it may be necessary to remark, that after Heyne, by his paper in the Transactions of the Society of Sciences at Göttingen (Vol. VIII.), by his preface and notes to Apollodorus, and still more by his lectures, had given popularity to the opinion that the basis of heathen mythology was physical truths clothed in symbolical and poetical language, theologians had begun to apply the same principle to the Mosaic history. Such is the object of Gabler, in his republication of Eichhorn's Essay on Primæval History *(Urgeschichte);* and the English reader will find in Geddes's Critical Remarks, an exposition of the histories of the Creation and the Fall, upon the hypothesis of their being *mythi.* It will be necessary to retain this word in the following translation, for *fable* in English implies either a fiction, designed to be imposed as truth, an insinuation which was not meant to be conveyed by the authors of this hypothesis, or, as in the familiar case of Æsop's Fables, something so obviously fictitious, that it could never be taken in a literal sense. *Mythus,* as used by these writers, denotes a narrative originally designed to convey some abstract truth in a more impressive

because more sensible form, but which has subsequently been received in a literal sense. It cannot be denied, however, that both the opponents and adversaries of mythical interpretation sometimes understand the word as including all supernatural embellishments of a fact, whether symbolically significant or not. To the antisupernaturalist every miracle is a *mythus*.

The sarcastic reflection at the beginning of the fourth paragraph of the following extract, on "the higher criticism," may require explanation for those to whom this phrase is not familiar. Eichhorn and the critics of his school, who are particularly aimed at, distinguish two kinds of criticism, the *lower*, of which the office is to settle the true reading of ancient authors, by the tangible and ponderable evidence of manuscripts, versions, quotations, &c.; and the *higher*, which, after its "younger sister" has performed her task, and furnished us with the most correct text as far as these authorities can decide it, consults the internal evidence of style, diction, conformity with other works of the alleged author and his age, with his known or presumable circumstances, opinions, and attainments, to determine whether the production which bears his name be wholly or even in part his. Thus the question respecting the authenticity of 1 John v. 7, is one entirely of the *lower* criticism, which, without hesitation, pronounces a passage to be spurious, which is found in no Greek manuscript older than the invention of printing. On the other hand, the question respecting the authenticity of the introductory chapters of Matthew and Luke belongs to the *higher* criticism, because all manuscript authority is in their favour, and the reasons for rejecting them are derived from their inconsistence with chronology and the subsequent history of Christ, and the intrinsic improbability and even absurdity of some of the circumstances. Perhaps the most brilliant example of the successful exercise of the higher criticism, though unknown by name in those days, is Bentley's work on the Epistles of Phalaris. The external evidence was all against him; yet, by shewing that they were written in a dialect of the Greek language not formed when the real Phalaris lived, that they alluded to events and customs, and supposed a state of manners, which had no existence till ages after his time, and that their vapid and yet extravagant sentiments were characteristic of a sophist dreaming over his desk, not of a statesman and a general, he succeeded in convincing most scholars of his own generation, and all who have lived since, that they were a worthless forgery. But the higher criticism has achieved few similar triumphs, though many an adventurous critic has been stimulated by Bentley's success to make inroads on the ancient domain of literary faith. Markland's attack on the authenticity of the four orations of Cicero (*Post Reditum in Senatu* and the three following) has by no means obtained the unanimous suffrage of critics; and Wolf's attempt to include the oration for Marcellus in the same sentence of forgery has met with very general reprobation. The last-mentioned author, who was fond of being considered as the living representative of Bentley's criticism, prided himself especially on the possession of that intuitive perception of all the delicate shades of style which is necessary to the exercise of the higher criticism; and his Prolegomena to Homer, his great work in this department, made a very considerable impression at their first appearance. The scepticism thus temporarily produced has since yielded to a belief that the ancient opinion had been abandoned without reason. Indeed, Wolf himself was led by the self-confidence which deformed both his literary and moral character to subject the higher criticism to a dangerous test, when, by its aid, he *ex cathedrâ* demonstrated the Manuscrit de Saint Hélène to have been dictated by Bonaparte. Within the last few years it has been

the humour of the German scholars to scatter around doubts respecting the authenticity of many works or parts of works of ancient literature, and the authors of the Bible have not escaped this general spirit of scepticism. The speculations of Astme and Eichhorn (approved, as it should seem, by Jahn) on the documents from which the book of Genesis was compiled, are an example of the higher criticism, attended with the unusual result of giving greater antiquity to the work to which it was applied than was previously supposed to belong to it. Several other parts of the Old Testament have undergone an examination by the same critic, with a different result: for example, on grounds belonging to the higher criticism he assigns all the latter part of Isaiah, from ch. xl., and even some of the earlier chapters, to the age of the return from Babylon. That there is a solid foundation for this species of criticism cannot be doubted, but in the practical application of it, so much depends on a feeling at once too complex and too evanescent for analysis, that we can hardly give a reason to ourselves, much less to others, for a conviction which nevertheless is irresistibly impressed upon our own minds. To exercise it with any success requires a profound acquaintance with language and an intimate familiarity with style; and as these requisites can belong to very few indeed, in regard to the original writers of the Old Testament, however satisfactory their conclusions may be to themselves, it is not likely that they should be generally adopted, unless some plain and palpable arguments from chronology should come in aid of their more refined criticisms. And in a prophetical book, even an argument from chronology loses its force, which would be decisive in any other case. But we must not detain the reader by any further remarks of our own from those of Jahn.

"The principal reason for the mythical explanation of the most ancient fragments of the Bible is one of which Varro long ago furnished the hint, when he divided the ages of the world into the *dark*, the *mythical*, and the *historical*. This is the actual course of things among all nations; the history of every people is first obscure, next becomes mythical, and only after these previous stages, historical. 'And, why,' it is said, 'should this not be the case with the primæval history of the Hebrews, or why should their fragments, be exempted from this general law?'

"In former times an answer was ready to such a question, but in our days the ground on which such an answer must rest has been dug from under our feet; since all divine co-operation, guidance, and aid, has been denied to the sacred writers, and even the term divine revelation, though still allowed to keep its place, has been used in such a sense, that it might be applied to Mahomet and Zoroaster, to every philosopher, nay, to every man, when he happens to speak the truth. We must therefore adopt some other mode of reply than an appeal to the inspiration of Scripture. We get not a step further, however, when we remind our mythical interpreters, that Jesus and his apostles have not only taken this ancient history in its literal sense, without the least hint of a mythical meaning, but have even recommended it as historical truth; Luke xvi. 29, 2 Tim. iii. 14—17; for here again we should immediately be told, that Jesus and his apostles only accommodated themselves to Jewish modes of thinking in order to procure a favourable reception for their own doctrine. Thus we are involved in a new controversy, and again diverted from the real question.

"It might have been thought that the persons most proper of all to answer the inquiry would have been those ancient Christians, who had themselves once been Heathens, and among whom there were men of learning and phi-

losophers. The principle of Varro was not unknown to them; they were acquainted with the mythology of the Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, Persians, and many others, of less celebrity, much better than we at the present day. They had been familiar from their youth with these productions of the fancy, they had been brought up amidst them, had themselves once held them in high esteem, and knew all the subtle refinements of interpretation by which their credit was kept up even in their own day. Now, when these men came to read the Bible, might it not have been expected that they would immediately have recognized *mythi* here too, especially as the ancient oriental mode of narrative was not indeed strictly poetic, but yet lively, sensible, graphic, and tropical, qualities of style which might lead them to suppose that mythical which was not so, because the difference between history and mythi is thus made less obvious. Yet they saw in the Bible only historical truth. The difference then between biblical and mythical narrative must not only be real but pretty striking.

"It is very true, these simple-minded ancients knew nothing of 'the higher criticism,' and, it may be said, did not examine things very carefully or very acutely; and being accustomed to what was mythical in heathenism, were not astonished at it in the Bible, and did not recognize it for what it really was. Yet surely it might have been expected, that the more familiar a man is with any thing, the more easily he would recognize it if he met with it again, in different circumstances and with features somewhat altered. Is there then no difference at all between the ancient monuments of Hebrew literature and the mythical narratives of other ancient nations; or is the difference so small as to be discerned with difficulty; or is not rather their similarity and coincidence so slight and forced, that it was only to be found in our days after a lapse of eighteen centuries?

"If we return to the principle of Varro which has been applied to the Bible, we are immediately struck with the absence in the Hebrew documents of that dark age, which, according to him, precedes the mythical, but which they neither record nor presume. The old legends of other nations begin with polytheism; they relate not only marriages of gods and goddesses, but also their adulteries and unions with mortals; they tell us of wars and depositions of the gods; they deify the sun, moon, and stars, and acknowledge a variety of demigods and inferior deities, Genii, Dæmons, Fervers, Izeds, Dews;* the inventors of arts and the founders of nations are gods or heroes; they have either no chronology or a monstrous one, and their geography expands into a boundless field of fancy; things undergo strange metamorphoses, and the reins are given to the most grotesque imagination. The Bible history begins, on the contrary, with ONE God, the Creator, whose power is irresistible, who commands, wills, and every thing is done. We have neither a chaos, nor rebellious and intractable matter, nor an Ahriman, the author of all evil. The sun, moon, and stars are here so far from being gods, that they are subservient to the uses of man, giving him light, and measuring and dividing his time. The authors of inventions are simply human beings. Chronology proceeds in a regular series, and geography does not go beyond the bounds of this earth on which we live. Here are no metamorphoses of men into trees and wild beasts; nothing, in short, which in the early memorials of other nations so evidently betrays the operations of fancy.

"This knowledge of the Creator, without any mixture of superstition, is

---

* These names are borrowed from the mythology of the Zend-Avesta. Tr.

very remarkable in documents of such high antiquity. Who can doubt that it owed its origin to Revelation? What we read in so many modern works, that the knowledge of the one God developes itself naturally from polytheism, is obviously contrary not only to sacred but even to profane history. In no one instance has the knowledge of the Creator issued from polytheism. Even the philosophers did so little to advance the belief in one God, that when polytheism was attacked by the followers of Jesus they took it under their protection. But whatever may have been the source of this primæval knowledge of God in the Bible, there at least it is, and so pure and correct, that the opinions of some few of the ancient Greek philosophers, who taught the existence of a Plastic Nature, a soul of the world, must be admitted to have been far inferior to it. It is true, this knowledge of God, though correct, is not perfect, and from this very circumstance it was the better adapted to the conceptions of mankind in so remote an age. Its very imperfection, and the sensible, simple, and figurative language of these fragments in which it is preserved, are a proof that neither Moses, nor any one else in later times, has forged them, and then attributed to them an earlier date than really belongs to them. This remarkable knowledge of God must have been preserved in its purity from the most venerable antiquity, or from the very beginning of things in a few families, and the collector of the fragments which are found in the first book of the Bible designed by placing them together, to oppose something certain and solid to the fictions and distortions of other nations in more recent times. In what other nation of antiquity is even a ray preserved of that great truth which the first chapter of Genesis proclaims?

"In every country mythology has been allowed the freest scope in the earliest ages, where imagination could be indulged without fear of its dreams being contradicted by fact, and has dwindled away by degrees, till at length it ceased altogether, and history began. The ancient documents of the Hebrews, on the contrary, are most meagre in the remotest times, and gradually become more copious. Had it been the purpose of the collector of these fragments to give us uncertain legends, fictions, and mythi, he would either have been most copious on the remotest times, or he would have exposed himself to detection, by referring his fables to an age of which we possessed historical accounts by which to expose their fabulousness. The scantiness of his earliest history, as it now appears, can only have arisen from his scrupulous rejection of every thing which was extravagant, exaggerated, and embellished, as unworthy of being handed down to posterity. He has related no more, because this was all that he could relate with certainty.

"This scantiness in early, and copiousness in later, times is nowhere more remarkable than in the accounts of miracles, supernatural appearances, and prophetic anticipations. Among other nations they are most abundant in antiquity, and cease as we come downward; in the Scripture this order is reversed, for there is scarcely any thing miraculous in the oldest fragments, while in later times such events become more common; and long periods elapse without a recorded miracle, succeeded by others in which they abound.

"Now, the periods in which the miraculous abounds, the age of Abraham, of Moses, of the idolatrous kings, of Jesus, and the apostles, are precisely those in which such a display of supernatural agency was necessary to establish or confirm the knowledge of God and of religion. The miracles of Scripture have, therefore, every where a grand and worthy object, the

well-being of the human race; they are not derogatory to the majesty of God. Compare with this the marvellous in the legends and mythi of other nations; how mean, how devoid of propriety, and even of decorum, how destitute of every worthy and adequate object do they appear! Surely no impartial inquirer can class together things so essentially different!

"A question still remains, 'Is it possible that these fragments of primæval history should have been preserved pure and without addition, till the time when they were collected in their present form? Granting that the power of memory is great among a people ignorant of the art of writing, yet was it possible that imagination should not interfere with tradition, and that the ancient narratives, which the patriarchs handed down, should have been preserved free from additions and embellishments by which they would at length assume a mythical character? May not the monuments which were erected to perpetuate the knowledge of events, have been made at length to say more than was originally committed to their keeping? May not poets have adorned the narratives which they made the groundwork of their songs, and may not those who first committed the oral tradition to writing have interpolated something of their own? These things are admitted to have happened to the legends of other nations; how is it likely that the most ancient narratives of the Bible should form an exception?' And why should they not form an exception in this respect, since they form so striking an exception in regard to their contents; since their very scantiness would make the task of remembering them more easy; since they were committed to writing at an earlier period than the traditions of any other ancient people; since they have preserved the knowledge of God in such purity; and since, even in their written form, their simple language, abounding in sensible images, is so characteristic, that the collector, had he attempted to interpolate them, would have betrayed himself by his more modern ideas, and even by his more formed and copious language?

"I must, however, break off, and satisfy myself with what I have already said, which may suffice to warn those readers, for whom my book is designed, not to be led away by mere love of novelty, to adopt that mode of interpreting the Bible against which I have been arguing."—Biblische Archäologie, Pref. pp. xxvii—xxxvi.

K.

SONNET COMPOSED IN BURBAGE WOOD.

And this is life to me! How sweeter far
The harmony of nature, than of man!
The sweet hymns of the wood-bird, than the jar
And ceaseless strife of life's each bustling clan.
But onward, sons of men! and I will turn
To the green shades—to pleasures which, when gone,
Shall leave no sting, but, as the hour flits on,
Still sooth and elevate; for here I learn
The love of themes above the vulgar mind;
The thought that dwells upon eternal things;
The hope whose consummating vision brings
The deathless and the beautiful—designed
By heaven for man—and imaged to the eye
By all it looks upon—flowers, field, woods, earth, and sky!

Hinckley, May, 7, 1827. JOSEPH DARE.

THE GENEVA CLERGY.

To the Editor.

SIR, *Liverpool, July* 3, 1827.

SEVERAL of my friends having been much interested by the account which I have given them of my intercourse with the clergy of Geneva, I have been led to think that a paper on the subject will not be unacceptable to the readers of the Repository.

In the autumn of last year, I spent ten weeks at Geneva, and during that time became acquainted with many of the clergy of that city and canton. One of them, M. Bouvier, I had seen, a year or two before, at my own chapel at Kenilworth. When I called upon him at Geneva, he received me in the most kind and hospitable manner, and soon introduced me to many of his brethren. I found them to be clever and well-informed men,* animated and eloquent in their preaching, and extremely desirous of gaining information on all theological topics. In their opinions they are not altogether what we are, but they are not many degrees removed from us. I asked one of them, what, in general, were the sentiments of his church respecting the person of Christ. He replied, "You will find among us a few Trinitarians and many Arians." He professed himself to be much inclined to the sentiments of the latter; and declared, that although, for the sake of conformity, he read the Apostles' Creed in the public service, he should prefer to profess his belief simply in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The candidates for holy orders, he told me, are only required to profess their belief in the Bible—not in any particular creed; and, indeed, there is among the Protestants of Geneva, (and, I may add, of some others of the principal towns in Switzerland,) an increasing disposition, to refer simply to the words of Scripture for the terms of belief—to avoid all sectarian names—and to adopt only the very general and comprehensive appellation of *Evangéliques Réformés.*†

Your readers will recollect the controversy in the Repository between Dr. J. P. Smith and Mr. Bakewell, respecting M. Malan and his church of orthodox Seceders. I am happy to say that the Genevese have too much good sense to give him much encouragement. I attended his service one Sunday morning, and there certainly were not two hundred persons present, exclusive of the catechumens. His cause does not flourish at all; nor do I believe that it ever will, in *such* a soil, though it were under the auspices of

---

* In proof both of the learning and the eloquence of one at least of the Geneva clergy, I need only refer to the following work:—De l'Origine Authentique et Divine, de l'Ancien Testament. Discours, accompagné de Développemens et de Notes. Par J. E. Cellerier fils, Ancien Pasteur, Professeur de'Hébreu, de Critique et d'Antiquités Sacrées, à l'Académie de Genève. Genève, Cherbuliez, Libraire; Paris, Servier, rue de l'Oratoire. 1826.

It is to be hoped that some one will take the trouble to make this work known to the English reader. It is well worth translating. The edition of the Geneva Bible, published in 1805, 3 Vols. 8vo., is out of print; but a committee of the pastors is employed on a new one. They are also preparing a corrected edition of their Liturgy.

† The term Protestant is one which they do not like. They consider it as belonging only to those who protested against the errors of Popery, in the time of Luther. They prefer the term Réformé; and they complain that we English have *spoiled* the term *evangelical*, its simple and proper meaning being, "those who profess to found their belief on the gospel." It is in this sense that they adopt it for themselves.

a less vain and ridiculous man than M. Malan. Let me, however, do justice to all. There was one part of the service at this chapel, which was an agreeable improvement upon what I had lately been in the habit of hearing; that was the singing, which, in the Established Churches, stands in great need of a thorough reformation.

As a proof of the free and liberal spirit with which a professedly Unitarian minister is received at Geneva, I may mention, that I was invited to be present at one of the Monthly Meetings of the Ministers of that town and canton. We sat down nineteen to tea, and afterwards adjourned to another room, where, after we had taken our places all round, the Moderator offered up a short prayer, and then asked all present, each in his turn, whether he had any information to communicate to the company. This elicited much interesting matter. There was one minister, who had been residing at Hamburgh, and who gave us an account of the religious sects in that town; there was another who expressed his wish that some change should be made in the Geneva Catechism, as he thought that one part of the catechumens were too young for it, and the other too old; and there was a third, the pastor of the Reformed Church at Bourdeaux, who explained to us the method which he adopted in catechising the children in his flock. When it came to my turn, I informed the company of the change which was soon to be made in the conduct of the Monthly Repository. I was then asked, what were the leading doctrines of the Unitarians; what their numbers, their form of worship, &c.—all which I explained in the best way I could, not forgetting to state, among other things, that we had a College at York, which was in a very flourishing condition, with respect both to its funds, to the qualifications of the tutors, and the attainments of the young men whom it educated. I was heard with great attention; and although some seemed surprised at one or two things which I stated as part of our belief, there was no manifestation of bigotry or intolerance. The Moderator then asked us all in turn whether we had any thing to propose, and the business was concluded by a short prayer and benediction; after which we conversed freely with one another. The whole evening passed off most agreeably, and I look back to it with feelings of no ordinary interest.

The preaching of the Genevese clergy, though it may be a little too bold for our subdued taste, is yet very *effective*. It is always animated and impressive, addressed to the eyes as well as to the ears of the audience, and well calculated to interest and to fix the attention. But then these preachers have much more time to prepare their sermons than we have; for there is among them a system of perpetual exchanges, a pastor being attached rather to a parish than to a pulpit; and, as there are two pastors for each of the four city parishes, besides one for each of the churches in the suburbs, and a number of young ministers who are not yet placed, no one has occasion to write more than about a dozen sermons in the course of the year. Consequently these are all pains-taken productions, committed to memory, and delivered entirely without notes; and as a list is published every Friday of the preachers for the next Sunday, specifying the church and the hour at which each will officiate, no one can complain that he knows not whom he is going to hear. The discourses which I heard were all on practical subjects. Nor let me omit to mention, that these excellent men manifested the greatest anxiety to know which were our most esteemed works in theology, and on education particularly, which were our best books for children and the poor. "You are absolutely *rich* in these works," said one of them to me, "and you would be rendering us an important service if you would tell us what

is worth translating." Accordingly I made out for my friend a list of our most interesting books of this description;* and since my return to England, I have added a few more to the number, included in a large packet of our best works, which I have just sent off.

From the above, you will easily believe me when I say, that I never became acquainted with a set of men, from whom I more deeply regretted to part, than from the Reformed Clergy of Geneva. They are a fine, intelligent body, full of an excellent and a most Christian spirit; and I shall rejoice to hear that I am not the only minister of our persuasion, whose good fortune it is to make their acquaintance.

I remain, Sir, yours very truly,

S. WOOD.

REMARKS ON MR. ELTON'S SECOND THOUGHTS ON THE PERSON OF CHRIST, &c.

To the Editor.

SIR,

HAVING recently read Mr. C. A. Elton's Δευτεραι Φροντιδες, and Mr. Gilchrist's "Unitarianism Abandoned," and having at the same time heard their secession from the religious party with which they had been connected, attributed to causes not altogether in accordance with disinterestedness and impartiality, I may perhaps be indulged in making a few brief observations on what must undoubtedly have attracted the notice of most of your readers. In the first place, without possessing the means of knowing how far these reports may be well or ill founded, I must beg leave to remark, that in perusing the works of an author, we have no concern whatever with the private motives by which he has been actuated, and that our sole object should be to estimate the intrinsic value of the arguments adduced in favour of his opinions, without being biassed by the circumstances which gave birth to their publication, or by the consequences which they are supposed to involve. Whether in publishing their respective sentiments to the world, the Churchman be influenced by the hope of preferment, and the Dissenter by narrow-minded prejudice or personal jealousy; whether the former be said to indulge a puerile attachment to existing institutions simply because they exhibit the rust of antiquity, and the latter be accused of entertaining, from motives equally childish, an inveterate aversion to every opinion that accords with the popular creed, are points to which the reader's attention ought on no account to be directed. If truth be his object, the latter has only to examine on which side of the question the evidence preponderates, and the reasoning employed in its support is best entitled to claim his assent. That the passions and interests of mankind in too many instances interfere with the decisions of the understanding, no observer of human nature can for one moment venture to deny; but still freedom from prepossession is not on that account less incumbent, nor are our efforts to attain it less imperiously required.

---

* The following are already translated into French, and there are probably others of which I am not aware. Evenings at Home; Sandford and Merton; Parent's Assistant; Robinson Crusoe; Mrs. Trimmer's Fabulous Histories, and Introduction to the Knowledge of Nature; Mrs. Barbauld's Lessons for Children.

Of Mr. Gilchrist's pamphlet it is not my intention to say any thing on the present occasion; for though many of his observations are evidently just, it is nevertheless equally obvious that his manner of writing is more declamatory and eloquent than argumentative and satisfactory. Very different is the general style of Mr. Elton's publication; and whatever feelings his recent secession may have excited among his former friends, it cannot be denied that his arguments bear immediately on the controversial points which form the subject of his work, and that he but rarely indulges in extraneous matter. I say *rarely*, because in one part he has introduced topics which are, in my apprehension, irrelevant to his purpose, and to which I am desirous, in this communication, of briefly adverting.

Before I notice the passages here alluded to, I trust that it will not be deemed any violation of candour, if I mention a practice too prevalent among Unitarians which has always appeared to me to be extremely unfair, and which is censured by Mr. Elton in his present publication: that, in their controversies with members of the Established Church, they fix upon the ultra-orthodox statement of the doctrines in dispute, and think that if they can succeed in shewing them to be indefensible in that exaggerated form, the truth of their own tenets will be the inevitable result. No writer is more liable to this charge than Dr. Priestley; but in the present day his followers have by no means discontinued the same mode of reasoning, and even Dr. Channing, who certainly cannot be called one of his admirers, has, in this particular, thought proper to imitate his example. This accusation is more particularly applicable to the three leading points on which Mr. Elton has recently changed his sentiments, and we might really imagine that respecting the Trinity, Original Sin, and the Atonement, there was but one mode of explanation, and that no perceptible distinction existed between the opinions of Waterland and Wallis, or, in more recent times, between those of Dr. Hawker, of Plymouth, and Dr. Hey, our late Norrisian Professor at Cambridge.

With regard to the first question considered by Mr. Elton, that which relates to the person of Christ, I conceive it to be perfectly consonant with the soundest principles of reason to believe in our Saviour's divinity, without becoming liable to the charge of tritheism; and were there no other corroborative proof of the former in our possession, I should agree with the eminent Griesbach in thinking that the proem of St. John's Gospel would alone be abundantly conclusive. This exordium he describes to be "so perspicuous, and above all exception, that it can never be overturned by the daring attacks of interpreters and critics." I have not yet been fortunate enough, I must avow, to meet with any Unitarian interpretation of this passage, which either does not violate the rules of Greek construction, or which is not glaringly inconsistent with the purport of the context. And it is a remarkable circumstance that the best Greek scholar, perhaps, of that denomination of Christians was so well aware of the difficulty incurred by rejecting the natural explication of St. John's language, that he frankly acknowledges that he was deterred from embracing it solely by the apprehension of the inferences to which it must lead. The following confession occurs in the Monthly Repository (No. CCXL. of the Old Series): "And here justice and candour force me to allow, that this interpretation is what the Evangelist seems at first glance to suggest, it being for the most part conformable to the primary acceptation of the words and to the rules of construction in Greek. The Logos is said to be from the beginning of time, to be God, to be with God, and, as it must appear to common sense,

to be different from that God whom he is said to be with. This same Logos made all things, and afterwards became a human being in the person of Jesus Christ. No competent person would reject this view of the subject, were it not for the perplexing consequences which follow," &c.

It is candidly admitted also by Mr. Frend, that the term *Trinity* is not to be regarded "as contradictory to, but only as a modification of the term *Unity*, and which modification is expressed by the compound term *tri-unity*." Nor does he consider it as at all unfair that those who believe in the doctrine of the Trinity should (as Bishop Blomfield has done) lay an equal claim to the appellation of Unitarian with the party by whom it is now exclusively appropriated.

Again, in adverting to the doctrine of Original Sin, I feel no hesitation in acknowledging that there is one exposition of its meaning which is equally at variance with Scripture and reason. It is well known to be a leading tenet of Calvinism, that in consequence of Adam's transgression the human heart has become so radically tainted with corruption, so inherently debased by moral depravity, as justly to merit the eternal vengeance of God, even without the aggravation of actual sin. But because this view of the subject is, in the estimation of more rational divines, utterly at variance with the plainest principles of equity and benevolence, and has arisen from a palpable misconception of the sacred writings, is there no alternative but to adopt the opposite extreme, and to maintain that the mind of man is in its natural state absolutely exempt from all propensity to evil? If it be true that the disobedience of our first parents introduced death into the world, (and I cannot perceive any advantage to be gained by Dr. Middleton's *figurative* explanation of the Mosaic narrative,) is there any thing unreasonable in believing that their descendants would inherit the frailty and imperfections both of body and mind necessarily consequent on their subjection to mortality? For not only would the physical frame of man become liable to a thousand ills, his understanding, his will, and his affections would all share in the same deterioration, and would consequently give rise to those moral evils which have since so universally prevailed. The objection to this account, that the innocent are thus made to suffer for the guilty, is at once removed by a recurrence to the argument from analogy. How often in the course of human affairs has the extravagance of the son involved the most exemplary father in irretrievable ruin! How often has the profligacy of the parent entailed incurable disease on his guiltless offspring!

These reflections conduct us to the third topic referred to—the doctrine of what is usually called the Atonement. Here also I must take the liberty of making the same complaint against the conduct of the Unitarians; and we might infer from the language they employ, that the members of the Church of England were united in holding but one opinion respecting this controverted point. Is there no difference then between believing that the sacrifice of Christ was demanded as a full satisfaction to the inexorable justice of an incensed Deity, without which even infinite power could not rescue mankind from everlasting punishment, and believing that our Saviour's death was chosen by the Divine mercy to be the means of restoring the human race to the same prospects which they had enjoyed before the transgression of our first progenitor? Is there no difference between the rigid doctrine of the atonement as asserted by the Calvinist and the ultra-orthodox, between the *central gallows* pictured in the fervid imagination of Dr. Channing, and the happier view of the subject entertained by that liberal class of theologians who have at least an equal claim to our attention, and who

number among their advocates men like Balguy and Powell, Ogden and Hey? It was the opinion of these and many other eminent divines "that the sufferings and death of Christ are the medium through which the Almighty in his infinite wisdom and goodness is pleased to confer forgiveness of sins on the human race." In what particular way this is effected, they conceived that it was "not for us to examine, nor to carry our notions farther than Scripture authorizes." Even the speculative sentiments of Archbishop Magee, with all his vituperative vehemence against sectaries of every denomination, are acknowledged by Dr. Carpenter to imply little or nothing, as far as concerns this particular question, to which he could not readily subscribe.

Certain it is that repentance alone, however wisely inculcated, can never replace any human being in the same situation in which he existed before his transgression. No sorrow, of whatever duration, for his past folly can restore to the gamester the property he may have squandered in play. No penitential feelings, however intense, can recall health to the victim of profligacy, or even remove the effects of thoughtless imprudence. Still it is not less true that by the timely aid and intervention of others the property of the gamester may be replaced, and the health of the diseased may be at length recovered. Where then is the irrationality of believing that repentance for past sins may be rendered available in removing their evil effects by the efficacy of the death of Christ? That the reinstatement of man in the privileges which he enjoyed before the fall, and his restoration to immortality and happiness, should be effected through the instrumentality of a *Mediator*, has been shewn by Bishop Butler to indicate nothing contradictory to what we observe in the course of nature, and entirely accords with the declarations of the sacred volume.

I cannot help coinciding with Mr. Elton in disapproving of the mode of interpretation adopted by the Unitarians relative to the sacrificial nature of the death and sufferings of our Saviour. If the strong language of the epistles on this subject is to be regarded as altogether figurative, and borrowed solely for the purpose of conciliating the minds of the Jewish converts, then must the rites and ceremonies of the Levitical law be considered as unmeaning and inconsistent, as possessing little or no superiority to the superstition of the heathens, and as utterly unworthy of their divine origin. There is a second objection not less forcible,—that the same language and the same sentiments respecting our Saviour's passion repeatedly occur in the *general* epistles, and in those of St. Paul addressed to the *Gentile* converts.

Agreeing however, as I do, in many particulars with Mr. Elton, there are two subjects introduced into his publication, (with little judgment, in my conception,) on which I differ from him most widely,—the freedom of the human will, and the ultimate happiness of the whole human race. A more ill-founded opinion is rarely professed by sound reasoners than that which maintains, that it is only on the scheme of *Necessity* that *an eternity* of suffering can be brought to impeach the goodness or equity of God! Mr. Elton appears to me to have examined the important questions involved in this opinion in a very prejudiced and superficial manner; and I think that I am fully justified in applying this remark to any individual who can seriously imagine that the gift of free agency is alone sufficient to vindicate the Deity from the imputations of injustice and cruelty in consigning a majority of his rational creatures to never-ending torments! Admitting for one moment, what is absolutely absurd, that the mind possesses the power of choosing by what motives it will be governed, (as this gentleman contends,)

that is, that *the effect can make choice of the cause* by which it is to be produced, I wish to know by what mode of reasoning the paternal character of the Almighty can be vindicated in bestowing a privilege on his intelligent offspring which he foresees they will pervert to the worst purposes, and which will inevitably involve by far the greater portion of them in irremediable perdition? How, on this supposition, *his mercy* can be said *to endure for ever*, the acutest dialectician, from Aristotle to Condillac, would find himself completely baffled in every attempt to explain. Nor would the Divine *justice*, so often resorted to when the argument from mercy is found to fail, be at all less implicated by this horrid system of *relentless wrath*. But I cannot better express my sentiments on this topic than in the earnest language of a learned, an amiable, and an orthodox prelate of the Established Church, who was as decided an enemy to the doctrine of necessity as Mr. Elton himself. In Bishop Newton's "Dissertation on the Final State and Condition of Mankind," will be found the following striking passages:—

"'But known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world.' He foreknows what courses they (his rational creatures) will take, their beginning, their progress, and their end; and nothing can be more contrary to the Divine nature and attributes than for a God all-wise, all-powerful, all-good, and all-perfect, to bestow existence on any beings whose destiny he foresees and foreknows must terminate in wretchedness and misery, without respite or end..... His goodness could never give birth to any one being, and much less to numberless beings, whose end he foresaw would be irretrievable misery; nor could even his justice for short-lived transgressions inflict everlasting punishment. Imagine a creature, nay, numberless creatures, produced out of nothing, and, therefore, guilty of no prior offence, sent into this world of frailty, which it is well known beforehand that they will so use as to abuse it, and then, for the excesses of a few years, delivered over to torments of endless ages, without the least hope or possibility of relaxation or redemption. Imagine it you may, but you *never seriously believe it*, nor reconcile it to God and goodness. The thought is shocking even to human nature; and how much more abhorrent then must it be from the Divine perfections! God must have made all his creatures finally to be happy; he could never make any whose end he foreknew would be misery everlasting."

Not less extraordinary and destitute of foundation is another remark which Mr. Elton has advanced with more zeal than discretion: that if a man be a *material* being, he must obey the strongest motive, "but if he have *a spirit* within him, he must possess a self-determining power over his own volitions, a deliberative choice and mastery over his motives"!! As well might it be affirmed that man can *will* without any motive whatever. If he can resist the stronger motive, he can of course resist the weaker; and in that case he must either act without any incentive, or he must remain in a state of perpetual inaction. It is scarcely possible to conceive a human creature more completely devoid of principle than the man who is gifted with Mr. Elton's *power of choosing his motives;* and, indeed, it has been unanswerably proved, in my apprehension, that did the system which he attempts to support really prevail, morality could have no existence. As this gentleman appears to entertain some degree of partiality for Calvinistic writers, and quotes with much complacency the apothegms of Mr. Fuller and Mr. Rowland Hill, I could wish that he had paid more attention to a celebrated author of the same school, and had devoted more time to the pages of Jonathan Edwards. If this task be considered as too severe, perhaps I may be allowed to recom-

mend to his perusal a more compendious work on the same subject by a dignitary of our own Church, who was regarded by his Cambridge friends as viewing with no unfavourable eye some of the tenets of Calvinism. A more argumentative and impartial discussion he will not often meet with than that which is contained in the admirable "Essay on Human Liberty" by Dr. Isaac Milner, the late Dean of Carlisle.

Without adverting to *Materialism*, a subject on which our knowledge amounts to little that can be deemed satisfactory, I am at a loss to perceive what essential support is afforded by the doctrines of *necessity* and *universal restitution* to the system of the *Humanitarians;* and if I mistake not, a considerable proportion of the Unitarians, more especially in America, openly avow their disapprobation of those particular opinions. For my own part, however vehemently the proofs on which the Necessitarian doctrine is supported have been assailed, I have never yet seen them seriously invalidated and much less satisfactorily confuted; and with respect to the second of those doctrines, the ultimate felicity of all who have worn the human form, I consider it as absolutely essential to the vindication of the Divine justice and mercy. Without it the face of nature would be enveloped in darkness and gloom, and the efficacy of the Saviour's death, with all its boasted universality, would be limited to the Calvinistic elect. On the other hand, once establish this sublime truth, and the character of the great Father of mercies is no longer obscured by perplexity and doubt; harmony and consistency are again restored, and the beauty of the Christian religion instantly expands into a purer flame, and will continue to shine "like the brightness of the firmament, and as the stars for ever and ever."

CLERICUS CANTABRIGIENSIS.

ON THE CHARACTER OF MOORE AS A POET AND TRANSLATOR OF POETRY.

Rotherham, July 5, 1827.

Of all the amatory poets, ancient or modern, *Moore* is decidedly the first. His earliest productions, indeed, were characterised by a voluptuous softness, which ought not to escape the censure of the moralist, and the lay of his youthful muse might well be called "the syren song of luxury." Breathing the warmth of passion in verse of a seductive sweetness, he was justly denominated by a contemporary bard, the

> ——— "Young Catullus of his day,
> As sweet, but as *immoral* in his lay."

His muse, however, grew more chaste as she grew older, and his verses, consequently, were more pure and refined. That grossness of feeling which had led him to introduce indecent images and immodest expressions, was succeeded by tenderness of sentiment and delicacy of language; and his imagination, formerly too much the slave of his senses, was gradually emancipated from their debasing thraldom. Hence the colours of his language became less ardent and glowing, and the impure flame, which the licentiousness of passion had cast over his pages, was changed into the vestal light of love. The elegance and sweetness of his later songs (of which, with few exceptions, both the sentiment and the expression are blameless) may be

considered as some expiation of the faults of his more early lays; whilst "*Lalla Rookh*" and the "*Loves of the Angels,*" the purest and noblest of his poems, cannot but "win the smile" of all "who frowned before." The chief fault of Moore's poetry is excess of beauty—a superabundance of illustration and ornament; and it springs directly from his distinguishing excellence. His fancy, ever active and lively, like a young bird, flits from bough to bough and field to field, and, never content with the sunny mound on which it lights, is continually seeking with a restless wing some brighter spot, until it at last almost loses itself in the light it so fondly courts. We have, therefore, often to complain of the very brilliancy of his verse, which is too fervid and dazzling, whilst its images are numerous as the motes that float and sparkle in the sunbeam. Like a lovely woman, fond of ornament, the muse of Moore is covered with too great a profusion of glittering diamonds and jewels, all most elegant indeed of their kind, and disposed with the greatest taste, but destroying in some degree that graceful simplicity which is not more becoming to female than to poetical beauty.

As a *translator* of poetry, Moore is decidedly too paraphrastic. He does not adhere, with sufficient exactness, to the thoughts or the style of the original: he, instead of imitating his object, seems only to embellish. In proof of this remark we would refer to his translated odes of Anacreon. The charm of the Teian bard is an union of simplicity with elegance; and poetry, in the dress he has given her, is adorned with none of those ornaments and flowers in which the most celebrated of his modern imitators has invested her. Like the mistress of Horace, the verse of Anacreon is strictly *simplex munditiis.* To illustrate these observations we shall now give a very literal prose translation of that beautiful poem in which this poet represents love as coming in the form of a child and knocking at his door at midnight, contrasting with some passages in it those parts of Moore's version which appear to us much too paraphrastic for translation.

Prose Translation.

Once about midnight, when the Bear is already turning at the hand of Bootes, and all the tribes of articulate-speaking men, overcome by labour, are lying at rest, then Love, having come, continued knocking at the bars of my door. "Who," I exclaimed, "raps at the door? You will interrupt my dreams." Love replies, "Open it; I am a little child, do not be afraid; I am wet, too, and I have gone astray in the moonless night." Hearing this, I was moved with pity, and immediately trimming up my lamp, I opened the door, and I beheld a little child indeed, carrying a bow and arrows and a quiver. But having made him sit near the hearth, I revived the warmth of his hands by chafing them with the palms of mine, and from his hair I wrung out the moist water. When the cold abated, "Come," says he, "let us try what injury the string of this bow of mine suffers from being wet." He stretches it, and pierces me through the very heart like a gadfly; then he springs up, laughing heartily; and "Mine host," said he, "congratulate me; my bow is indeed uninjured, but you shall be sick at heart!"

In this ode of Anacreon, so strongly characterized by that light, playful, and elegant spirit which constitutes the charm of his style, and which may justly entitle him to the epithet of the *Ariel of Poets,* the simple graces of the original are not preserved in the more metaphorical and ornamented translation of Moore. The unadorned expression,

Τότ' Ἔρως ἐπισαθεις μευ
Θυρέων ἔκοπτ' ὀχῆας—

"Love, having come, continued knocking at my door," he renders, with all the luxuriant embellishments of his own style,

"An infant, at that dreary hour,
Came weeping to my silent bow'r,
And wak'd me with a piteous prayer
To save him from the midnight air."

Here, the "weeping," the "silent bow'r," the "piteous prayer," and the "midnight air," are all fictions of the translator's fancy. We do not deny that they are in themselves elegant and poetical, but we do maintain that the introduction of them entirely destroys the beautiful simplicity of the original. The natural gradation of circumstances is also not preserved by Moore. In the original ode, Love first knocks impatiently at the door for admittance—the poet then asks who he is, and in reply to this question, he prefers his artless petition to be let in, saying he is a little child who has lost his way; but, in the translation, Love is at once introduced as an infant offering up a prayer for admission before he has knocked at the door, and stating the cause why he wished to be admitted, viz. to be sheltered "from the midnight air." By this new arrangement of the circumstances, the subsequent question of Anacreon is rendered almost unnecessary, and the reply of Love becomes mere repetition. In that reply itself the beautiful line

Βρέφος εἰμὶ, μὴ φοβησαι·

"I am a little child, be not afraid," (which is so simple that a child might in reality have uttered it, and for this reason so appropriate to the character which Love is represented as having assumed,) is very much injured in the translation by a change in the order of the ideas, and a new turn which is given to the natural expression "be not afraid." Moore renders this line,

"Nor fear *deceit;* a lonely child," &c.

Now it is not likely that the poet would have feared deceit in a child, nor would a child have thought of putting him upon his guard against it. By the use of such a precautionary phrase, Love, notwithstanding his assumed disguise, would have betrayed himself before he had accomplished his design, and been less artful than it is the object of the poet to represent him. In the translation the little god is, indeed, a sad blunderer; for no sooner is the door opened than he forgets his purpose of concealment, and discovers himself by the sparkle of his wings.

"*T'was Love!* the little wandering sprite,
His pinion sparkled thro' the night;
I knew him by his bow and dart;
I knew him by my fluttering heart!"

All this is directly opposed to the spirit of the original ode, in which Anacreon represents Love as preserving his disguise to the very last moment; and when the poet opens the door he expressly says he saw only a little child—"I beheld a little child, indeed, carrying a bow and arrows and a quiver"—without adding a single word to intimate that in this child he recognized Love. Indeed had he done so his compassion would have been misplaced and ridiculous, and, instead of chafing the little child's hands, and wringing the water from his hair, he would naturally have fled from him in

terror. The beauty of these circumstances, as of those which succeed them, depends entirely on the supposed ignorance of the poet as to the divinity concealed under the form of the child. Whilst, forgetting this, the translator has departed from the leading idea in the original ode, he appears to us to have injured it further by destroying the simplicity of its language. One instance will be sufficient to illustrate this observation. Anacreon represents himself as wringing "the moist water from the hair" of Love: now this *moist water* Moore, by his all-transforming fancy, converts at once into *crystals:*

> " Press from his dank and clinging hair
> *The crystals of the freezing air.*"

Moore is too good a poet to be a good translator; he has too many beautiful images of his own to submit to the drudgery of copying or confining himself to those of others. Over the simple beauties of Anacreon he has, therefore, thrown the flowers of an ever-budding fancy, which Anacreon had not, and which no poet ever possessed in so luxuriant a degree as himself. The character of Anacreon's poetry is, indeed, very different from that of Moore. The language of the former is altogether simple and unadorned, whilst that of the latter is highly figurative and embellished; and though both wrote under the inspiration of the same passion, their verses are distinguished for opposite beauties. The song of the Grecian bard may be likened to an Arcadian shepherdess, divested of all ornament whatever, yet lovely in the simple graces of natural beauty; whilst that of the Irish minstrel resembles an Eastern queen, whose voluptuous charms are set off with all the pomp of dress and splendour of ornament. Thus differing in the character of their genius and the style of their composition, the one was not by nature fitted to catch the spirit and preserve the beauties of the other; this he has not done, and though we cannot but admire his translation, it is for original charms of its own, not for the resemblance it bears to the original. There never was but one Anacreon, and we may safely prophesy there never will be a second Moore.

J. B.

HINTS TO UNITARIANS.

SIR,

ALLOW me to ask admission for a few observations which will not increase your responsibilities, speaking as they do only the thoughts of an individual.

It may be all very well for Unitarians to comfort themselves, when alive to the comparatively slow progress of their opinions, by the reflection that it is not in human power to secure success to the best directed efforts, that truth continually presented to the public eye will sooner or later be recognized and received, and that time will certainly do what they, the people of this generation, cannot do. But it is a far more useful, though an humbling and not very agreeable thing, to reflect how much might be done by the advocates of a (comparatively) purified faith which is sadly neglected by ourselves; how many just claims to the gratitude and affection of our fellow-creatures might be associated with the religion of Christ, and are *not* so associated.

Unitarians conceive, and are very apt to glorify themselves in the reflection, that they have renounced some great errors. If it be so, it is so far well; but this after all amounts to little more than a negation of wrong; a relief from incumbrance at starting; and where is the vast superiority of a mind which has emptied itself of some erroneous principles and is content to rest in that vacancy, over a mind in which the errors, it is true, remain, but where there is a proportionate quantity of activity in the mental system, from which good as well as evil may, and often does, emanate? Unitarianism, it should never be forgotten, can only profess to be a republication of first principles. It is no new revelation, but a bringing back to simple Scriptural truth; truth which was given to put all our forces into immediate action; to stimulate every man to do all the good and remove all the evil in his reach. When it has taken the building of error down to the foundation, IT (i. e. Unitarianism distinctively so called) has no more to do—its work is accomplished; it has reached apostolic ground, and there ought to be no more saying, "I am of Paul, and I of Apollos," for its disciples are "Christ's;" but upon this foundation let every one build in the best manner he is able. Merely to stand upon the ruins of error and beckon our neighbours round us to come and see what notable fortress we have overthrown, is a present gratification, but no realization of future success. It may be that this obnoxious building, like some of our feudal castles, though a strong hold of tyranny and oppression, was a shelter to some destitute people, and we must provide them another dwelling-place, or we shall do them quite as much harm as good. But the misfortune is, that Unitarians, though feeling a good deal of zeal and spirit in pulling down, are apt to grow cool when building up again is in question. To drop the metaphor—they are anxious to rescue and convert the people from what they deem error, and are not sparing of the *direct* means by which this is to be accomplished; but this is conversion only up to a certain point. There may be individual exceptions to this general charge; but that such is the tendency of Unitarian teaching and preaching among those who are considered as zealous, I hold to be as notorious as it is lamentable. It need not surely be so—there is no incompatibility in helping our neighbours, and at the same time urging our own onward course; but because we have got a little more insight into religious truth than others, (truth, so plain and palpable, according to the assertions of many Unitarian writers, that the merit of superior sagacity is reduced to almost nothing,) to rest there and devote ourselves wholly to the task of bringing those in the rear up to our point of progress, is a strange misapprehension of the spirit of the Gospel. If we are told that a man has gained a truth, the next question to be asked is, *what he means to do with it.* Does he strive to follow the apostolic example—"Forgetting those things which are behind and reaching forward unto those which are before, I press toward the mark of the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus"?

Let me not be misunderstood or thought willing to favour the injustice of those among us, who are continually shifting the burden of their own responsibilities upon the shoulders of their clerical guides, if I say it is a minister's perpetual danger, and very often his ruin for every purpose of practical influence, to be the advocate of very partial, negative, and inoperative truth: to become a teacher, not only before he has learned what it is of most consequence he should know, but often before he has acquired even *the habits* of a learner. Difficult as it is to point out a remedy suited to the nature of the evil I complain of, we ought not to lose sight of it. Let us not underrate our young ministers, but value their services justly and pro-

perly. We ought to remember that they have had at least good opportunities of informing themselves respecting the foundation of the doctrines they are to teach, and be ready to admit the benefit we may, if we are not wanting to ourselves, derive from their hours of secluded study—still more if their hearts are evidently warmed with devotion, our own piety may be excited and heightened by theirs. But let us not be hushed into superstitious silence about their capabilities and our requirements. We know it would be good for the cause of religion, and why should we scruple to say it, that we had a ministry, generally speaking, much better formed by habit and experience to do its work in society at large. I am not instituting a comparison between Unitarian ministers and those of other sects, but considering what may fairly be expected from a set of men whose time, thoughts and talents are or ought to be professedly devoted to the business of doing the highest possible degree of good to their fellow-creatures. We must have biblical critics, it is true, but to pretend that acquaintance with all that can, taking the highest standard, be necessary for the elucidation and exposition of the Scriptures, the dexterities of controversial divinity, and the necessary labours of composition, is employment enough for the best faculties of an educated and vigorous mind, is mere slothfulness. Let those who groan so heavily under the burden of composing or compiling one or two sermons a week, and make the period when the labours of life should only commence a signal for the abandonment of active acquirement in every department but one, look at other professions; let them see the labours of the lawyer and the physician, both in theoretic and practical pursuits; let them keep their eyes on a man like Mr. Brougham, for it is good to fix their standard high, and see to what a pitch mental activity may be carried. In fact, there is something very humbling in the survey of clerical leisure; its quiet days and unbroken nights, when we contrast it with the hurried moments into which many men of business do contrive, some way or other, to crowd a multitude of useful deeds. And ought we to be satisfied with the progress and standard of usefulness of many who seem to think a familiar proficiency with the polemics of a few debateable subjects the *ne plus ultra* of mental excellence? Neither ought we to yield too readily to the plea of necessary labours for the supply of bodily wants and personal comforts. Unless a man be fully impressed with a sense of the duties he has to discharge, unless he has taken pains to establish the habit of performing them, added comforts and pecuniary advantages will do nothing for him. One extenuating circumstance, however, should not be omitted when we bring forward the charge of indolence, or rather of an acquired incapacity for any high standard of mental activity, against many of our spiritual leaders, and this is, that the effect of sedentary habits and scholastic application is not in them, as in the case of men of business, corrected by any sudden transitions or change of ideas. When a young man leaves his college and settles with a congregation, his case is essentially different from that of him who is put upon a new track and obliged to serve an apprenticeship to some totally new employment. He goes on adding to his previously acquired stock of knowledge; he associates, perhaps, with as great a variety of persons as he can; but that knowledge and society are often precisely of the same character as what occupied him before; and unfortunately for him, his station precludes him at the most important period of life from mingling in a free, unreserved manner with his fellow-creatures at large. Always revolving in his own mind the materials of his more immediate duties, the kind of selfish absorption too often consequent on those attempts to benefit others which depend

upon a prominent display of one's own ability, is apt to take place; the bodily health too is injured by the want of active employment, and the spirits become unequal. Strong stimulus is required, the habit of reiterating the solemn truths of religion without connecting those truths with repeated active exertions, weakens the susceptibility even with respect to *them*, and there is much danger of losing the inward sincerity with which we set out. Flattery and that sort of deference, which his station even in youth commands, often produce soporific effects. All this time a character is forming, the very reverse of what will recommend itself by its practical usefulness. A considerable degree of mental talent may remain; a power of thinking and of expressing thought; but there will not be an example, a living specimen, of the bright influence of vital Christianity, because the anti-social propensities will have received a greater degree of developement than the social. Thus the most promising openings are too often closed in sloth and inactivity.

A minister might do a good deal to avert the evil complained of, if attention to the dangers to which he is peculiarly exposed were but kept alive in his mind, and it is no unfriendly office to direct his eyes towards it. Let him struggle against those circumstances in his situation which engender selfishness, idleness, and exclusive habits; let him lay his mind and his heart open to outward influences, and turn his strength to acts of real kindness and usefulness as the best antidote to the danger of resting in mere sentiment. There is one cause dear to the hearts of all who feel that the religion of Christ is a revelation of light and knowledge, in which, if no other opportunities offer, he may ever be occupied with advantage, that of education. Though a religious mind cannot rest satisfied with merely diffusing principles and cultivating habits which tend to the augmentation of *temporal* advantages, yet he whose business is to go about doing good should be "thoroughly furnished unto all good works." Here the youngest minister may do much: there must be many subjects upon which he possesses more information than a large proportion of the youth of his congregation. Let him assemble round him a few of these and endeavour to improve them; let him look beyond them, and strive to extend any light he may possess in all directions. But there are a hundred other ways in which practical usefulness may be combined with what is more strictly professional eminence. When we think how great a work is yet to be achieved, even in this land, which is so often held up by blind boasters as a land of superior enlightenment, we cannot but desire that an order of men set apart to minister to the mental and moral wants of the people, should scrupulously remember the highest mark of their vocation, and labour to qualify themselves for raising the tone of society around them. Let them strive against having their minds exclusively occupied about some particular species of good, even though it be the removal of what they conceive to be religious corruptions, for this often stands sadly in the way of the performance of actual services to our fellow-creatures. He who is for ever thinking of one particular duty of his profession, or of the future and present triumphs of truth, cannot bring his mind to those little casual circumstances by taking advantage of which the Christian character is formed and Christian influence diffused.

I have extended these remarks farther than I originally intended, and yet much more might be added, were not the task rather an invidious one. The minister of religion may say, that he professes but to lay before his hearers the precepts and commands of a revelation which is the object of their common belief, and that he deeply feels himself to be far from the standard of

excellence which yet he is persuaded both he and they ought to labour to attain; but if in the midst of all his deficiencies the Christian temper and spirit do not at least predominate, and manifest themselves in works and words of utility and benevolence, it cannot with reason be expected that the cause of religion will prosper in his hands. In what other profession is mere *theoretical* knowledge successful? Will a surgeon be employed because he can declaim against erroneous theories or can explain by induction how an operation should be performed, and yet cannot perform it himself? Will acquaintance with the theory of business stand instead of practical experience? And they are the practical habits of men of business which in nine cases out of ten rise up and condemn the ministers of religion. Practical men are used to associate the name with the thing, and they naturally dislike mere empty exhibitions of doctrinal ingenuity or eloquent declamation not connected with practical qualifications.

Let our ministers then strive to acquire the habits of practical men, and be for the sake of religion what some men of the world are for the sake of worldly expectation, that it may no longer be said with truth of them, "the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light."

D. Z.

EARTH AND HEAVEN.

THERE'S not a star in all the heaven,
But tells us goldenly of Thee;
There's not a ray, at sunset given,
To wreathe* with beams the locks of Even,
But speaks of Him no eye can see—
The Veil'd One of eternity.

We read the radiant page of Spring—
'Tis all thine own, and all of Thee;—
For nought can shine, or breathe, or sing,
No breeze waft sweets upon its wing,
Or stir the green and sunny tree,
Hadst Thou not bidden these bright things be.

No dewy braid can Summer twine,
No virgin rill can Summer pour,
To fill with life the sultry vine,
On green meads write a greener line,
Or bathe in woods the hermit flower,
But tells of Thy benignant power.

Oh, if in this inferior sphere,
So vast Thy might, so rich Thy love,—
If, in this world of sin and fear,
So deep, so bright, Thy ways appear,—
What may we hope from spheres above,
Where Thine own blest Immortals rove!

---

* With these that never fade the spirits elect
Bind their resplendent locks unwreath'd with beams.—MILTON.

There, where those glories will be seen,
  Unnamed, unglimpsed, undreamed below—
A heaven immortally serene,
An earth of everlasting green,
  Rich woods whose glooms a lustre throw
  That pales the emerald's earthly glow;—

Streams, brighter than the sunset sea
  Whose waves are all transparent gold,
Like liquid rainbows wandering free,
Warbling elysian melody,
  Or in cascades of glory roll'd,
  Iris'd with hues, undreamed, untold;—

Flowers of undying bloom, that breathe
  Odours upon the radiant air,
Each meet for an Immortal's wreath,
More bright than our pale stars beneath,
  Yielding no thorn, no poison there,
  Nor made the slumbering adder's lair!—

All these, and Oh, yet more than these,
  The dwellers of that world of joys,
Who roam beneath the starry trees,
Inhale the amaranthine breeze,
  Drink the life-streams of paradise,
  And weave the flowers of seraph-skies;—

How must they tower, great God! above
  The sons of earth, of grief, and time!—
Children of glory and of love,
What sacred bliss must melt and move
  Ethereal hearts in that pure clime,
  Estranged from fear, and pain, and crime!—

Yet even on Earth, O God! we see
  Enough to teach our hearts to soar—
To shadow forth futurity,
To fix our fear and hope on Thee,
  And daily wean our spirits more
  From the frail dust-gods they adore.

Earth is* the type of Heaven, and Time
  The echo of Eternity;
And Man may learn to rise sublime
From this dim sphere to that bright clime,
  Which thought can dream nor eye can see,
  But where Thou art, and Thine will be.

Crediton. ——

---

* ——— What if Earth
Be but the type of Heaven? MILTON.

CANONICAL AUTHORITY OF THE BOOKS OF THE PROPHETS.

(Concluded from p. 506.)

6. It is to be lamented that, in the prosecution of our inquiry into the authenticity and credibility of the prophetical books of the Old Testament, so little information can be collected from works published before the translation of those books into the Greek language; but this circumstance can scarcely excite our surprise, if we consider how imperfectly acquainted Heathen writers were with the history of the Jewish nation prior to the time of Christ. Josephus, in the first book of his Treatise against Apion, has some judicious remarks upon this subject, in which he proves the superior accuracy of the Jewish historians in every thing relating to the affairs of the Jewish nation, and of the Eastern world generally. The ignorance of Heathen writers, indeed, is never more conspicuous than when they are led incidentally to advert to circumstances which occurred in Judea before the events which led to the last Jewish war. With just as much reason, however, might it be contended that the *historical books* of the Old Testament are undeserving of credit, because many of the accounts contained in them are not corroborated by the testimony of Heathen historians, as that *the books of the prophets* are spurious productions, because they appear to have been but little known to the earlier Greek writers. The silence of these writers is mainly attributable to the absence of all direct intercourse between the inhabitants of Greece and those of Palestine. Had the Jews been a maritime people, like the Egyptians and Phenicians, the case might have been different; but obstacles were intentionally thrown in the way of foreign commerce by the Mosaic institutions, and it was the regular if not the invariable policy of the Jewish rulers to prevent rather than encourage intercourse with foreign nations.* There were, however, many Greek works existing in the time of Josephus, and probably some centuries later, in which distinct mention was made of the Jews, but few of these have descended to our own times. Among other writers Josephus enumerates Clearchus, a celebrated pupil of Aristotle, who introduces an account of the Jews into his treatise, "De Somno," and Hecatæus of Abdera, who published a separate work concerning them. He likewise mentions Agatharcides, Theophilus, Theodotus, Mnaseas, Aristophanes, Hermogenes, Euhemerus, Conon and Zopyrion, as having made occasional allusions to the history and customs of the Jews; but observes, that their information is not always to be strictly depended upon, because they had no means of obtaining access to the books of the Jewish people. He adds, however, that Demetrius Phalereus, and the elder Philo, together with Eupolemus, have not greatly deviated from the truth in their description of circumstances connected with the Jewish history, and that the errors into which they have fallen must be placed to the account of ignorance rather than intentional misrepresention †

Alexander Polyhistor, who is placed by Priestley and Lempriere in the year 88 B. C., relates, according to Eusebius,‡ "that Nebuchadnezzar, king of the Babylonians, having been made acquainted with Jeremiah's prophecy concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, entreated Astibares, king of the

---

* Joseph. Contra Ap. Lib. i. C. xii.; Michaëlis's Commentaries on the Mosaic Law, Vol. I. Book ii. Chap. v. Art. 37—39.

† Contra Ap. Lib. i. C. xxiii.

‡ Præparatio Evangelica, Lib. ix. C. xxxix.

Medes to enter into an alliance with him; that he collected together a large army of Babylonians and Medes, conquered Jerusalem, and took Jehoiakim prisoner; and that, having seized upon the gold, and silver, and brass of the temple, he sent them to Babylon." With this exception, there is not a single sentence, among the numerous fragments preserved by Eusebius, which contains the remotest allusion to any of the Jewish prophets; much less any passage in which mention is made of their written predictions. This fate, however, many valuable Heathen works have shared in common with the writings of the Jewish prophets. The History which we now have under the name of Velleius Paterculus, and which brings us acquainted with some things not mentioned by any other historian,* is not known to have been quoted by any writer till the time of Priscian, who lived about five hundred years after the author; and from this period we hear no more of it again till the time of Aventinus, a further interval of nine hundred years: † yet no one doubts the authenticity or credibility of that work. It by no means follows, therefore, that the writings of the Jewish prophets, because they are not quoted by early Greek writers, were composed at a later period than the one usually assigned for the composition of them. The literary intercourse between the Greeks and the Jews, before the Babylonish captivity, and for a very considerable time after the re-establishment of the latter as a nation, was certainly far less than that which now subsists between the English and the Brahmins, and yet it was not without great difficulty that Warren Hastings, Governor-General of India, obtained a complete code or digest of the Brahminical laws and customs in Sanscrit; which it was necessary to translate first into Persian, and afterwards into English, before it could answer any useful end. The truth is, that Greeks and Jews, at the period in question, were notoriously ignorant of the literature of each other; and that we might with just as must reason contend that the "Iliad" and "Odyssey" of Homer, and the "Theogony" and "Works and Days" of Hesiod, are the fabrications of a later age, because they are not quoted in the books of the Old Testament, as that the writings of the Jewish prophets are spurious, because they were unknown to early classical Greek authors. These writings were composed in a language, the genius of which was totally different from that of the Greek, and the knowledge of which Heathens had few inducements, and still fewer opportunities, for cultivating; and as no Greek translation of them existed before the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, it is altogether unreasonable to look for evidences of their existence, much less for passages tending to establish their authenticity and credibility, in the works of Greek writers prior to the middle of the second century before Christ.

There are various methods, however, of establishing the date of a composition, besides producing passages with that view from the works of authors who lived in or near the time when such composition professes to have been written. It sometimes happens that the age of a work may be ascertained by collecting and analyzing the peculiar modes of expression found in it, or by comparing the sentiments which it contains with those which are known to have prevailed in the country, and at the period in which the supposed author flourished: and sometimes the sense, or even the orthography, of a

---

* "Quædam habet, quæ haud alibi invenias." See an extract from G. J. Vossius *De Historicis Latinis*, prefixed to Mattaire's *Velleius Paterculus*.

† Bentley's Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris, &c. Ed. 1699, p. 508, Ed. 1817, p. 366.

single word may do more than whole pages of laboured reasoning to determine the particular period when a work was written.

The name DAVID supplies us with an argument of the latter kind, the novelty of which may interest, while its successful application to the subject in hand may serve to convince the reader. This name is sometimes written *with*, and sometimes *without* the I, in the Hebrew copies of the Old Testament; and, as we find the same letter arbitrarily omitted or inserted in other words, this variation in the mode of spelling the name *David* passed without any particular notice on the part of critics and commentators, till Dr. Kennicott undertook to collate the Hebrew manuscripts of the Old Testament, and was led to observe, in the course of his labours, that the omission or insertion of this letter in the name of *David* did not originate with the transcribers of the different books in which the name occurs, but with the authors themselves. On examination it was found that, in the books which were composed after the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity, whenever this name occurred, it was written דויד; but that, in those which profess to have been composed before or during the captivity, whenever this name was introduced, it was written דוד.* Here, then, an infallible test unexpectedly presented itself for ascertaining whether any particular book of the Old Testament, in which the name of *David* occurs, was written before or after the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity. In the application of this test, however, Dr. Kennicott was less fortunate than he was in its discovery. He employed it as an argument against the antiquity of the "Song of Solomon," because in this book (iv. 4) the name of *David* is written *with* a yod, whereas it was the constant practice in and near the time of Solomon to write it *without* a yod.† But for this change a particular motive may have existed in the mind of the transcriber who first made it; a motive, however, which, though exceedingly obvious and natural, does not appear to have presented itself to the mind of Dr. Kennicott. The word דוד signifies *beloved*, and is found in that sense far more frequently in the Song of Solomon, than in all the remaining books of the Old Testament put together. It is by no means improbable, therefore, that the name of *David* was originally written *without* a yod, in this passage, and was intended as a play upon the word דוד, which occurs so frequently in the course of the poem; but that some scribe, after the captivity, ventured to insert a yod, with the intention of removing a supposed ambiguity, whence it has happened that all our present copies read דויד.

Of the books which constitute the present Jewish canon, the first and second of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and Malachi, are said to have been last added; and this addition is supposed to have been made in the time of Simon the Just, who succeeded his father, Onias, as high-priest, B. C. 300, and retained that office nine years.‡ Now, all the above-mentioned books, except Nehemiah and Malachi, are, upon good grounds, attributed to Ezra, though not inserted in the canon till about a century and a half after his time. We find, accordingly, that the name of David, whenever it occurs in these books, is invariably spelt with a yod; but that, in the historical books of an earlier date, it is with the same undeviating regularity spelt without a yod. It seems impossible, therefore, to avoid the conclusion that the authors themselves adopted the mode of spelling the name which prevailed in their own times, and that the transcribers, faithfully copying

---

* Kenn. Diss. I. p. 20. † P. 22.

‡ Prid. Conn. Vol. I. Part i. Book viii.

what the authors wrote, unconsciously transmitted to posterity an infallible criterion for determining the age of any particular book in which the name of David happens to occur.

In applying this criterion to the prophetical books, it will of course be necessary to exercise some degree of caution, because it can hardly be expected, after the numerous transcriptions which these books have undergone, that they should be entirely free from orthographical errors. But if we find the exceptions few, and those of such a nature as to admit of a rational and easy explanation, the rule must then be considered as established.

The prophetical books of the Old Testament are sixteen in number. Three of these (Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi,) are acknowledged to have been written after the return of the Jews from Babylon, and the remaining thirteen are generally supposed to have been written either before or during the captivity. Of the three which are acknowledged to have been written after the return of the Jews from Babylon, Zechariah is the only one in which the name of *David* occurs. We meet with it six times in this book, and it is invariably written *with* the yod. In Isaiah and Jeremiah it is repeatedly found, but always *without* the yod. In Ezekiel xxxiv. 23, it is written *with* the yod, but evidently by mistake, because that letter is omitted in the verse immediately following, and the same omission is made in other parts of the book. In Hosea iii. 5, Amos vi. 5 and ix. 11, the yod is inserted in most printed editions; but with regard to the passage in Hosea, it may be observed, that, in the celebrated Venice or Bomberg Bible, edited by Felix Pratensis, and published so early as the year 1518, the yod is omitted; and, though it is inserted in both the passages from Amos, in the former of these passages the name has the little circle (o) over it, to indicate that it is a false reading, and in the latter it is printed דוד in the margin.

The result of this investigation, then, is quite as favourable as could have been anticipated or wished. Had Zechariah adopted the ancient mode of spelling the name of David; or had the books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, or any other prophet who is supposed to have written before the captivity, contained undoubted instances of the modern orthography, it must be admitted on all hands that the antiquity, and, consequently, the authenticity and credibility of the prophetical writings, would have been in great jeopardy. But when the conclusion to which a fair application of this test leads, is found to correspond so exactly with that which had previously been deduced from totally different premises, the agreement must be acknowledged to furnish as strong a presumption in favour of the antiquity and genuineness of the books of the prophets as it is possible for human testimony, under any circumstances, to supply.

With regard to the particular question of authorship, it may be proper to observe, in this place, that, though no direct evidence can, at this distance of time, be adduced to prove that each individual book was written by the person whose name it now bears, and though no such evidence can in reason be expected, yet many circumstances concur to place this point beyond all reasonable dispute, and to shew the utter improbability of the contrary supposition.

No chain of evidence can be conceived more complete than that exhibited in the proofs already adduced of the existence of these books, and their universal reception among the Jews, from the fifth century after Christ till the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, about the middle of the second century

before Christ. Nor will it be an easy matter to evade the force of the argument arising from the orthography of the name *David*, establishing, as it does, in so satisfactory a manner, a criterion for determining whether any particular book of the Old Testament, in which it may chance to occur, was written before or after the time of Ezra. It may nevertheless be thought, and has in fact been openly contended by some, that the whole of the prophetical books are from beginning to end a mere fabrication; but before such charges as these can be alleged against them with any show of reason, it behoves the person who is bold and reckless enough to prefer them to shew by what miraculous combination of circumstances the supposed fraud escaped detection; to point out how it happens that each separate book is written in a style altogether peculiar to itself;* to ascertain whether these suspected forgeries were the work of a single individual, or of a number of individuals; and to bring to light the model after which each particular book was framed. In the mean time we may stand excused in the eye of the less fastidious reader if we take the liberty of assuming every book to be the production of a separate writer, and consider the authenticity of each as resting on grounds entirely peculiar to itself; assumptions which we are fully warranted, by the circumstances of the case, in making, and which nothing short of actual demonstration can subvert or set aside.

It was a very ancient custom among the Jews to adopt the words with which any particular book of Scripture began as a title to that book. Thus *Genesis* was called בראשית, IN THE BEGINNING, and *Exodus* ואלה שמות, NOW THESE ARE THE NAMES; because the books so denominated began with these particular words.† Upon the same principle the book of Isaiah was called THE VISION OF ISAIAH THE SON OF AMOS, not, as the words at first view seem to import, because the subject matter of that book was originally confined to a single vision of the prophet, but because these words happened to stand at the head of that collection of prophecies which the Jews attributed to Isaiah; and under this very title we find it quoted in the second book of Chronicles (xxxii. 32). "Now the rest of the acts of Hezekiah, and his goodness, behold they are written in '*The Vision of Isaiah*, the prophet, *the son of Amos*.'" The portion of Hezekiah's history to which the author of the second book of Chronicles refers in this passage, is found in the 36th, 37th, 38th, and 39th chapters of Isaiah. We are fully warranted, therefore, in concluding, that the book which we now have under the name of Isaiah, was known to the author of the second book of Chronicles, and, consequently, received as the undisputed production of that prophet, at least as early as the end of the fourth century before Christ, if not a century and a half earlier.

In the book of Daniel mention is made of certain volumes or rolls containing the celebrated prophecy of Jeremiah concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, from which Daniel himself is said to have ascertained the exact period at which the captivity was to terminate; and, although no direct quotation is made, in this passage, from the book of Jeremiah, the similarity of the expressions used by both writers is too close to have been the result of mere accident. "In the first year" of Darius, the son of Ahasuerus, "I, Daniel, understood by books the number of years whereof *the word* of the Lord *came to Jeremiah* the prophet, that he *would accomplish seventy years* in the *desolations* of Jerusalem." (Dan. ix. 2.) If the reader will now be

---

* Hieron. Præf. in xii. Proph.—Lowth, De Sacra Poesi Hebræorum. Præl. xxi.

† Hieron. Prologus Galeatus.

at the trouble of comparing the words printed in Italics with others of similar construction and import in Jeremiah xxv. 1, 9, 12, he will find that the books to which Daniel refers must have been rolls upon which certain predictions of Jeremiah were written, and, consequently, that a very important part, if not the whole of the book which we now have under the name of Jeremiah, was known to Daniel, and regarded by him as the genuine production of that writer.

It appears, from a variety of passages in the Old Testament, that the character of prophet among the Jews was attended with great responsibility and danger. Those who sustained this character were often seen in the palaces of their sovereigns, restraining the profligacy of the court, and boldly censuring such measures as were calculated to entail disgrace and ruin upon the Jewish people. No apprehensions of personal danger could deter Jeremiah from warning his countrymen of the calamities impending over the Jewish state, and the approaching destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. This he did openly and unreservedly, braving the fury of an incensed populace and a wicked priesthood, at the hazard of his life. "Then," we are told, "rose up certain of the elders of the land, and spake to all the assembly of the people, saying, 'Micah, the Morashthite, prophesied in the days of Hezekiah, king of Judah, saying,'—'Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Zion shall be ploughed like a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps, and the mountains of the house as the high places of the forest.'" (Jer. xxvi. 17, 18.) These words were a literal quotation from Micah iii. 12, and produced the intended effect. The appeal grounded upon them (v. 19) was successful, and the prophet's life was saved. Here, then, we are incidentally furnished with a proof of the authenticity of the book which we now have under the name of Micah, and likewise of the high repute in which the predictions of its author were held within less than a century from the time of their publication.

If it were necessary to multiply remarks of this kind, it might be shewn that Jeremiah* and Micah† contain quotations from Isaiah; and that clear references to the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah are found in the book of Ezra.‡ But, as the instances already adduced are amply sufficient to prove that the books which we now have under the names of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Micah, were received as theirs in times almost immediately succeeding those in which it is said that they were written, and as Haggai and Zechariah are acknowledged to have been comparatively late writers, we may here consider the chain of evidence in favour of the antiquity and authenticity of the books of the prophets as terminating, and proceed to make our inferences accordingly.

In the first place, then, we have the independent testimony of Jews and Christians to the existence and genuineness of these books for a space of more than eighteen centuries. This fact, it must be acknowledged, is a highly important as well as interesting one. To set it aside, "we must admit a principle, which, in no question of ordinary criticism, would be suffered for a single moment to influence our understandings. We must conceive, that two parties, at the very time that they were influenced by the

---

* Lowth's Isaiah, Introd. Rem. to chap. xv.; Blayney's Jeremiah, note on chap. xlviii. 31, &c.

† Lowth's Isaiah, note on chap. ii. 2—4; Newcome's Minor Prophets, note on Micah iv. 1—3.

‡ Ezra v. 1, vi. 14.

strongest mutual hostility, combined to support a fabrication; that they have not violated this combination; that the numerous writers on both sides of the question have not suffered the slightest hint of this mysterious compact to escape them; and that, though the Jews are galled incessantly by the triumphant tone of the Christian appeals to their own prophecies, they have never been tempted to let out a secret which would have brought the argument of the Christians into disgrace, and shewn the world how falsehood and forgery mingled with their pretensions."* In the second place we have to boast, in favour of the authority and credit due to the prophetical books, the separate testimony of the Jews of Palestine and those of Alexandria, as exhibited in the writings of Josephus and the books of the New Testament, on the one hand, and in the works of Philo and the Septuagint Version, on the other. This too is a material point in the question before us, since it proves that we are in possession of all the testimony which it was possible for the writings of those times to furnish. In the third and last place, the books of the prophets were acknowledged and appealed to by the Jews in times closely bordering upon those in which they are said to have been written; a circumstance for which it is quite impossible to account on the supposition that they were forgeries. If, then, any faith is to be placed in human testimony, we are bound to admit the authenticity of these books. The credibility of the predictions contained in them will form the subject of some future communication.

W.

THE SCEPTIC AND THE CHRISTIAN.

Toss'd on the world's wide sea of storms,
  How helpless toils the Sceptic's bark!
No ardent faith the region warms,
  The course is rough—the way is dark!
He views no beacon light on high,
No pilot's skilful hand is nigh,
But doubt stands trembling at the helm,
Till bursting waves the bark o'erwhelm.

See, where the Christian bends his way!
  Though wildest tempests swell around,
He follows Heav'n's directing ray,
  Which points where safety's port is found.
Fearless, he steers as God commands,
From passion's rocks, and pleasure's strands;
Hope cheers his spirits through the strife,
And bears him on to endless life.

Birmingham. H. H.

---

* Chalmers's Evidence and Authority of the Christian Religion, chap. vi. p. 185. Fifth Ed.

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.

(Concluded from p. 583.)

IF Mr. Elton, now a deserter from the Unitarian camp, be to be credited as a competent and faithful reporter, the Unitarians are ignorant, crafty, and dishonest men, who are either incapable of understanding the original languages, and comprehending the obvious sense, of the Scriptures, or else deterred by no reverence for the truth, by no sense of shame, by no regard to religious or moral principle, from wilfully perverting their meaning, and publicly professing opinions which they know to be in opposition to their genuine declarations. In his present judgment of them, they are ever ready to resort to the basest artifices to serve their own ends; they scruple not to reject any doctrine which, from whatever cause, they may be disinclined to admit, and to embrace tenets which they believe to be false, merely because they wish them to be true; they have in no case any higher aim than to defend the system which it suits them to adopt, with an utter disregard of the moral character of the means, that, for this purpose, they may find it necessary to employ; they are, in short, if his estimate of them be correct, men who stick at nothing provided only they can succeed in their object, and bring over proselytes to their cause.

We will yield to no provocation to question Mr. Elton's motives in submitting to the change that has taken place in his religious sentiments; but we are utterly at a loss to comprehend by what intellectual or moral discipline he has brought his mind to conceive and his pen to record such "Thoughts" of a body of religious professors, with whose principles and conduct he cannot be unacquainted, and whom, he ought to know, he grossly calumniates. When did this new light break in upon his understanding, and disclose to his astonished vision the dark and foul recesses of the Unitarian character, with all its disgusting appendages of craft, and fraud, and hypocricy? Had it but just flashed upon his eyes from the portals of heaven, when he sat down to proclaim the important revelation? Or, had he this knowledge when his "intimacy of some standing with Unitarians," as an associate and a brother, might have taught him what they were? And does his conscience now, for the first time, accuse him of having partaken their turpitude and merited their condemnation?

In the very first page of his "Second Thoughts," Mr. Elton betrays his anxiety to commence hostilities against the Unitarians. Because, in their controversies with Trinitarians, they have argued that the Athanasian scheme, as held by Dr. Sherlock and others, which alone they recognize as proper Trinitarianism, maintains in effect three objects of worship, they are accused (p. 9) with "a hundred times preferring," with "unwearied perti-

nacity," an "imputation a hundred times steadily denied;" and, therefore, pursuing "a course of argument illustrating rather the zeal of proselytism than the virtue of candour." What is the plain import of this charge, but that Unitarians, for a mere party purpose, continue, against their better knowledge of facts, wilfully to misrepresent their religious opponents?

Mr. Elton must give us leave to ask, whether, as he seems to intimate, a sinister motive be, in all cases, to be assigned to those who charge Trinitarians with having three distinct objects of worship? In such case, he will perhaps explain with what views the following passages were written, in books now before us, acknowledged to be the productions of his own pen.

"To Catholic polytheism has succeeded what may be called the polytheism of Protestants, who worship the *Son* of God, and the attribute of God's Spirit, as equally perfect Gods."*

"As to the nature of the Trinity, notwithstanding the dogmas and anathemas of councils, Trinitarians themselves differ; some, with Dr. Sherlock, holding that the three persons are *three* distinct infinite minds or intelligences; others, with Dr. South, that there is only one infinite mind, with *three modes* or attributes, or offices, manifested under the three different states or relations of Father, Son, and Spirit. The former scheme retains the *Trinity* but loses the *Unity*, as it makes distinctly three Gods, which, indeed, the Catechism of the Church EXPRESSLY AFFIRMS."†

"A *plurality* means more than one. More than one, in one godhead, are several persons, who all partake of the same divinity, and are therefore *several distinct Gods*. They are no more one God, because they are combined in one Godhead, than the judges of the *Areopagus* were one judge, because they formed one tribunal."‡

"By persons, then, we are to understand intelligent agents; an intelligent agent is, in common parlance and acceptation, a proper being; three persons are then three beings, and three beings, each by himself God, are three Gods."§

The writer of these passages unequivocally asserts, that proper Trinitarians have three distinct objects of worship. We leave it to himself to answer, whether the man who could publish these statements as the result of his deliberate reasonings upon the subject, was pursuing "a course of argument illustrating rather the zeal of proselytism than the virtue of candour."

From the frequency with which they are advanced, Mr. Elton would seem to take peculiar pleasure in preferring accusations against Unitarians for "tampering" with the Scriptures, and wilfully mangling and perverting them to prop up their cause. They are said (p. 10) "to pare down the Bible itself to the very narrowest dimensions of Christian faith." Of a particular interpretation of a controverted text, it is alleged, (p. 13,) that it "must be the right one, because it squared with the Socinian hypothesis." Speaking again of the meaning assigned by Unitarian writers to a passage in the Gospel of John, the writer thus eloquently and loftily expresses his indignation (p. 15): "After this portentous display of sciolism and of sophistication in the history of theology, and in the philosophy of grammar, nothing, which can hereafter be done in the way of tampering with texts, will be likely to excite surprise."—"It is true," the author again writes, (p. 22,) "that ardent Unitarians, taking some of the early 'reputed' (qr. convicted?)

---

* Appeal, as above, pp. 3, 4. † Idem, p. 18.
‡ Unitarianism Unassailable, &c., 1818, p. 8.
§ Plea for Unitarians, or Professors of the Ancient Nazarean Faith, 1823, p. 99.

heretics for their models and authorities, have been busy with exscinding and italicizing of entire *inconvenient* chapters, and the wholesale condemnation of entire epistles."

In the recital of these passages we are almost tempted to put it to the author, in his own temperate and polite language, whether such flimsy efforts to fix upon Unitarians an odious and criminal accusation, "be calculated to impose even on a savage"! Mr. Elton has himself been an Unitarian, and an Unitarian critic and apologist. We appeal to him whether, whilst he sustained those characters, it was *his* practice to "pare down," and to "tamper" with, the sacred writings, and to fix the sense of passages by the sole consideration that "they squared with the Socinian hypothesis"? Would he not have repelled such an insinuation, if directed against himself, with unmingled disdain? Nay, has he not applied the scourge to a false accuser who had anticipated him in this ungenerous and reprehensible mode of attack? We will quote his words; he may, if he so please, transfer the just castigation to others whom it will equally suit.

"With this comparative method of Unitarian criticism staring you in the face, and after thus riveting your eyes on the letter of a *single text*, and refusing to look an inch beyond it, you modestly observe that it is 'one part of the Unitarian system not to take the whole sense of Scripture as it stands, and to believe it (I suppose *without examination)* reconcileable with itself in every part, but *to take only a portion, and make the rest give way to it*;' and you say, 'we have also a strong objection to that syllogistic faith which builds itself up upon *single texts* of Scripture. The Christian should feel that the whole Bible is his creed: whether obscure or clear, mysterious or simple, his faith should comprise all: he should be able to lay his hand upon the book and say, 'I believe in this:' and he should see the peculiarities of Christianity not merely gasping for existence in single texts, but living, burning, breathing throughout.' 'Nothing short of this approaches either to the 'full assurance of faith,' or the full assurance of understanding!' What you exactly mean by the latter clause I do not pretend to guess." "But I would observe, on the general statement, that you need not fear (perhaps I should say, you will be disappointed in the hope), that the Unitarians will withhold their concurrence with these postulates, since they have uniformly asserted them and acted upon them for themselves; *with this proviso*, that the Bible on which they are to lay their hands is THE BIBLE ITSELF; *not a favoured translation only*, but the BIBLE ITSELF, UNSOPHISTICATED, UNINTERPOLATED, and PURE. Whether the disciples of the Trinitarian or those of the Unitarian school of Christianity be more notorious for 'taking portions of Scripture, and making the rest bend to them,' for that 'syllogistic faith' (an odd expression in the mouth of an Athanasian) which builds itself on 'single texts,' or for supposing the peculiar truths of faith to 'gasp for existence in those single texts,' let the tenor and texture of their respective writings determine." "The Unitarian replaces these *single texts* in the context from whence they are 'torn live-asunder,' and he collates that context itself with other corresponding parts of Scripture: he permits Jesus and the evangelists and apostles to be their own interpreters."

To this passage the following note is appended:

"It is somewhat *venturously* observed by Dr. C. A. Moysey, Archdeacon of Bath, in a Bampton Lecture, that 'against the general and harmonious evidence of the whole gospel, the Unitarian arrays a *few selected and mutilated passages*, which, if taken *singly*, may *bear a sound* which shall *seem* to concur with his favourite opinions; and he rests his whole system on them, without taking into account the tenor of our Saviour's doctrine in general, as delivered by himself and his apostles.' If the word *Trinitarian* were substituted for *Unitarian*, would not the cap fit as well? I would ask the Rev.

Archdeacon, who has laid aside the candour and courteousness natural to his disposition, in order to pin his faith on the authority of those intrepid creators of facts and sophisticators of quotations, Bishop *Magee* and Mr. *Rennel*, I would ask him whether he means to describe the prayer of Jesus to the Father, 'the only true God,' John xvii. 3; the prayer of Peter and John and the believers, Acts xiv. 24; the sermon of Peter on the day of Pentecost, Acts ii. 14; the sermon of Peter in Solomon's Porch, Acts iii. 12; the oration of Peter for the Apostles before the High-Priest, Acts v. 29; the sermon of Peter to Cornelius, Acts x. 34; the sermon of Paul at Athens, Acts xvii. 22; and the collective Apostolic doxologies, all of which, without a single redeeming exception, are systematically excluded from the liturgy of the Church of England,—I would ask whether he means to describe these as 'mutilated passages' which 'bear a sound' and 'have a seeming'? Yet these (how perverse!) are simply and altogether Unitarian."*

Before we dismiss this class of Mr. Elton's charges we must advert to a canon which he states to be adopted by Unitarians in disposing of the "doctrines received by the Church as those peculiar to Christianity." He arranges this canon under four heads, but the statement is too long to be transcribed. It is, however, in its spirit and tendency, among the most reprehensible portions of the book, as a fallacious and a gross misrepresentation. The fourth division is expressed as follows: "That the writings most opposed to Unitarian *simplicity*, are either spurious, or probably so, or that *it would be better if they were so*." P. 19. To such an insinuation we shall not deign a reply beyond what the writer may find in his own language on another occasion.

"A man who has general fixed principles, whether they be the fruit of habit and education, or of voluntary study and reflection, would naturally *expect* that the book on which he believes these principles to be grounded, should concur, when appealed to, with his previous views. He would naturally see passages in a different light from a man whose pre-established notions are different: but there is no want of candour or docility in this; *it is consistent with perfect sincerity, and an honest desire to know the truth.* Nothing can be conceived more puerile, superficial, and captious, than your accusing such a man of *purposely culling such proofs as make for his hypothesis, and refusing his assent to those that oppose it.*"

"It is mere vulgar and ignorant sophistry to call this admitting or rejecting Scripture, according as it favours a system; it is admitting or rejecting a sense *ascribed* to Scripture, according as that particular sense appears, in the judgment of the individual, consistent with, or contradictory to, the collected evidence of the Scriptures at large."

"The heat of controversy, like the fumes of wine, often surprises a man into an unintended betrayal of his own weaknesses; and we generally suspect others of what we are secretly conscious of being prone to ourselves. This ready inference, that in their textual interpretation Unitarians are guided by the measure of congruity or discordance in a particular text, could only have occurred to a man accustomed, himself to look on isolated texts as complete and oracular authorities. *We* do not, Sir, regard a text here or a text there as deciding the nature of Christian doctrine; but perhaps *you* are acquainted with those who do."†

Mr. Elton has graced his work with a few other controversial embellishments, which, like some already quoted, are not recommended by their novelty or originality, any more than by their candour and truth. Our readers will have seen that he has revived the designation "SOCINIAN,"

---

* Plea for the Unitarians, pp. 61, et seq. † Plea, &c., as above, pp. 52—54.

as applied to Unitarians and their doctrines. There is nothing in the term, taken alone, of which they can see reason to be ashamed. Could they admit their system to have been the work of a human master, they would not blush to own themselves the disciples of the great men that bore the name of Socinus, who were distinguished alike by their brilliant talents, their exemplary virtues, and their devotedness to the sacred cause of religious truth and religious freedom. But the author knew full well that words have often a magic influence; and that an epithet, happily chosen, will sometimes more avail in confounding and defeating an adversary than a long array of arguments. "Men," he lately wrote, before he had cancelled his first thoughts to make room for his "Second," "men are swayed by *sounds*. The term *Socinian* is considered as in itself a term of reproach." "The *title is now used to stigmatize the proper Unitarians*, though they are not strict Socinians." "They compassionate the ignorance, or despise the hypocrisy, of those who affect to consider a scheme of doctrine which, whether it be apostolical or not, was coeval with the apostolic age, as the heresy of a modern speculation." *

Our author has yet another grave charge to prefer against the Unitarians. In his present view of their principles, they are, it seems, DEISTS! The imputation is again and again, in various forms of phraseology, repeated. "Unitarianism," we are told, "occupies the same ground with Deism, as defined by Lord Herbert, of Cherbury," p. 93. "What the Deist could not do, they" (the Unitarians) "cannot do who wield the Deists' wisdom." They are "philosophical Theists, who," it is added with a sneer, "'are no doubt the people with whom wisdom will die.'" P. 97. "It would appear that the Unitarians *(absit invidia)* are Deists, who are 'almost persuaded to be Christians.'" P. 101. "The Unitarians stand on nearly the same ground with the ancient stoics and the modern philosophical sceptics." P. 102.

We almost feel it necessary to apologize for wasting a word on this hackneyed subject. To attempt at this time a serious refutation of a calumny so groundless and barefaced, were to give it the semblance of an importance which it does not possess. Our readers may, however, be gratified by the perusal of what Mr. Elton could himself write in condemnation of this absurd and odious imputation only four years ago; and what he continued to circulate up to the very hour of the publication of his "Second Thoughts."

"I have now, Sir, done with your *arguments*; your general *abuse* will not detain me long. You attempt to identify as with infidels, because infidels find their way into our religious meetings; where, however you may shew white eyes and lifted palms, I acknowledge that we rejoice to see them. It was your business to prove that they *continue* infidels. Unbelievers, who, in ninety-nine instances out of a hundred, have become so from the shock offered to the heart, as well as the reason, by the unworthy notions of God, the irreconcileable contradictions, and the *demoralizing tendency* of your perverted Christianity, would naturally have their curiosity excited by a sect confessing Christ, yet rejecting the 'traditions which had made the word of God of none effect.' They would naturally repair, if they 'wished to know what these things mean,' to a church where the shackles of one man's faith are not imposed on the judgment and understanding of another, but every man is exhorted, by those who stand to him 'in Christ's stead,' to be 'fully persuaded in his own mind.' But why they should repair thither, if they meant to persist in their infidelity, you offer no reason; you think the public will be satisfied (and

* Appeal, &c., as above, p. 3.

perhaps you are right) with the sort of logic, that Unitarians are infidels, and therefore infidels will of course flock to them.

"But every man, who regards the *meaning* rather than the *sound* of words, will perceive that the Unitarian is an infidel in a different sense from the Deist; he is an infidel because he believes Christ rather than men: the Deist is an infidel because, as the natural or *(merely)* rational man,* 'he receiveth not the things of the spirit of God:' 1 Cor. ii. 14; but *such* a Deist would not be found in a Unitarian assembly, for he would be perfectly indifferent as to what he could merely regard as another form of a credulous superstition: and in fact, Sir, the rage of your zeal must both have blinded your perceptions and beclouded your memory, or you must have known and remembered that the infidels of every country are found to mix, not in obscure and despised conventicles, but in churches and cathedrals: they enrol themselves under the religion, whatever it be, established by law and countenanced by fashion. Neither *Hume* nor *Gibbon* would have been found in a meeting-house: connecting with religion a certain creditable public decency, they would go to church in England, or to mass, with Voltaire, in France. But towards Dissenters they would entertain sentiments of dislike and a sort of resentment; because Dissenters shew plainly that they are in *earnest*. *Bolingbroke*, who, in his philosophical works, undermines revelation, (and is, by the bye, one of the most strenuous sticklers for the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures,) had no objection to religion as a state machine, or an engine for the regulation of popular morality and civil order; but he was a sour enemy to Nonconformists: and thus, Sir, it is at present, and thus it ever will be.

"The Unitarians, in particular, so far from being acceptable to the Deists, are regarded by them with an evil eye; because, while removing what they deem 'the hay and the stubble' of Christianity, they cling to the foundation; because they have rescued the Scriptures out of the hands of the Deists, into which the superstition of the orthodox had surrendered them, and contended, with *Locke*, for the reasonableness of revelation. Surely, Sir, you have mistaken the matter, and your recollection, as usual, fails you; or you must remember that it was not with an Unitarian, but with an episcopal defender of the Trinity, that the importer of Paine's bones formed a defensive and offensive alliance: that so far from coveting any companionship with Unitarians, he raised against them the STUPID CRY that they were no Christians; and has entitled himself to the gratitude of the *British Reviewer*, by declaring them OUTLAWS."†

Mr. Elton subjoins, as confirmatory of his own views on this subject, Mr. Aspland's excellent observations, first inserted in the Times newspaper, and afterwards published in the former series of this work, Vol. XIV. p. 708.

Our author has yet one serious objection to urge against Unitarianism. He distinctly intimates (p. 95), that the tendency of its principles is unfavourable to morals; and he insinuates, in no very covert terms, that, generally, Unitarians are not so pure and exemplary in their moral conduct as orthodox believers. He wishes, indeed, to be understood as referring to *principles* and not to *persons*. He admits that "he has found, during an intimacy of some standing with Unitarians, especially with the more eminent of their ministers," "instances of active, benevolent usefulness and moral integrity." These instances, however, are introduced as exceptions to the general rule, and are expressly ascribed to the extraordinary operation of "the grace of God." It affords us pleasure to record this concession, qualified as it is by the author's present theological creed. But we will add another more direct and satisfactory testimony which he wrote when his

---

* "See Locke ad locum, Paraphrase on Paul."

† Plea, &c., as above, pp. 170—173.

mind was capable of taking a more calm and dispassionate view of the case than it is under its present apparent excitement.

"Mr. Wilberforce observes on the few claims of the Unitarians to purity of life; and Mr. Wardlaw speaks of the superiority of his brethren 'in the devotion of the closet, the family, and the sanctuary;' 'in sobriety, justice, holiness, temperance, fervency of spirit for the glory of God and the good of man,' and other graces. To these they answer nothing; the lives of Unitarians, who have 'adorned the gospel of God their Saviour,' are on record before men; and to the Searcher of hearts they appeal in secret from the judgment of the *Scribe* and the *Pharisee*."*

To this we shall subjoin the reply of Mr. Elton to an accusation similar to his own, preferred by a writer who had himself upon "second thoughts" deserted the Unitarian standard, and become an "accuser of the brethren."

"As to the insinuated immoral tendency of Unitarian principles, we may reply to Mr. Scott in his own words, respecting the judgment passed on his own sect: 'To adopt every childish cavil, every vague report, *every scandalous falsehood*, and industriously to propagate them, as if these afforded refutation of all the ARGUMENTS, AUTHORITIES, and SCRIPTURAL TESTIMONIES with which we support our sentiments, is no evidence of a *candid, liberal mind*, or of a *sincere desire to know the truth*."†

At parting, Mr. Elton is careful to remind the Unitarians, and to urge it against them as a demonstration of the erroneousness of their system, that the number of their worshipers is small; that the unsoundness of their creed "speaks intelligibly in the echoing silence of the recesses" of their temples, "at the very time that the courts, in which the crucified Redeemer is proclaimed, are thronged with feet that wear the pavement of the sanctuary." P. 109. According, then, to the author's "Second Thoughts," the popularity of a creed is a presumption or a conclusive demonstration of its correctness; and numbers constitute, it seems, an infallible criterion of truth! Tried by this test, where would Mr. Elton's own semi-orthodoxy stand when put in competition with the authorized formularies of the self-designated orthodox churches of Christendom? If the fact be, as he states, that Unitarian preachers have to speak to the "echoing silence" of empty temples, can he account for it by no other reason than the falsehood of their doctrine? As an *argumentum ad hominem*, or an *argumentum ad verecundiam*, if it be nothing better, we will refer him to the following passage in one of his recent publications:

"You attempt to identify us with the world. It seems 'we are of the world, and the world heareth us.' Your zeal, Sir, always outruns your recollection. Have you forgotten our 'echoing walls' and 'deserted pews'? That we have *some* congregations in *some* parts of the kingdom? That an extension of our principles is not to be apprehended? You are right, Sir, in your conjecture, if it mean that we shall not gain proselytes from the world. We hold out no pious compromise to the covetous or the licentious; we have no flattery for human depravity—no covering mantle of *vicarious or imputed* righteousness: we have no salvo for allowed sin—no gate of faith, at which the unreclaimed reprobate may knock, in his death-cold fit of apprehension, and slip easily into heaven. From our pulpit, Sir, though we proclaim that 'there is one God and Father of all,' we proclaim also that 'what a man sows, that shall he reap.' The ear of the world is not tickled by such preachers as these. The world knoweth its own, but these are not of them."‡

---

* Appeal, &c., as above, p. 193.
† Idem, p. 223.
‡ Plea, &c., pp. 176, 177.

We had marked for observation some other parts of Mr. Elton's book, but we must not trespass on the patience of our readers; and we confess ourselves heartily tired of our irksome and painful task. From the respect we had always entertained for him on account of his talents, and the sacrifice he is said to have made in embracing and publicly professing Unitarian sentiments, we cannot but view his "secession" with regret. Our concern is infinitely increased when we behold the anger and the disdain with which he looks back on his late associates, and read the vituperative abuse, the coarse revilings, and the gratuitous calumnies, which he has unsparingly heaped upon their principles, their motives, and their character. Deeply as they may feel, but chiefly on his own account, the injuries which, with such intemperate zeal, he has endeavoured to inflict upon them, the Unitarians will greet him in return with no evil thought or word or wish. They will leave him to his own musings, with the sincere and earnest hope that he may derive from his new creed and profession all the peace, satisfaction and joy which religious principles, conscientiously embraced and honestly reduced to practice, are capable of imparting.

Mr. Elton "recognizes," it seems, "the PLAGUE SPOT on the walls of the Unitarian temple, and *therefore* he passes from its portal." * Such may possibly be the terrific aspect which, on a "second" view, it may present to his sickly imagination. To our eyes the edifice exhibits a more fair and attractive exterior, tempting our willing steps to tread its courts, to join the exercises and share the delights of those "who wear the pavement of the sanctuary." As they are displayed to our vision, its walls are "salvation, and its gates praise." †

MR. GILCHRIST'S pamphlet, although on many accounts an extraordinary production, will not require more than a brief notice. Indeed, were it not our wish to evince that we are alive to what is transacting in the religious world, we should pass it by in silence, rather than encourage the supposition that we attached importance to its contents, by inserting its title in the pages of our Review.

The author alleges (Preface, p. v.), that there is "internal evidence," in his work, "of his possessing sufficient fortitude to bear much severer criticism, with equanimity," than to be accused of *egotism*. We have no inclination to ascertain by experiment what may be his exact capacity of endurance. We much doubt, however, whether it were in the power of any censor, religious or literary, to pronounce upon him a judgment half so severe, and, to a sensible mind, half so agonizing, as he has in these pages passed upon himself.

Mr. Gilchrist, not being able to discover in his copious etymological vocabulary, a definition more true to history and to fact, states (p. iii.) Unitarianism to be, "the theological opinions of Dr. Priestley and Mr. Belsham." Of Dr. Priestley, in particular, he says, in a parody not distinguished certainly by correct feeling or good taste, that he was "the author and finisher of the Unitarian faith." Both these eminent men rank, indeed, deservedly high among Unitarians. Their theological opinions, however, it is no disrespect to them to state, are no more to be considered as the standard of Unitarianism, than are the theological sentiments of Mr. Gilchrist to be regarded as the authorized creed of the General Baptists.

At the head of his title-page Mr. Gilchrist has stamped in broad characters,

---

* "Second Thoughts," &c., p. 102. † Isaiah lx. 18.

"UNITARIANISM ABANDONED." This is the superscription which he has placed over the portal of his work to announce to the curious what may be found within. We think it right to apprize our readers, that the words are deceptive. They awaken expectations which must end in disappointment. He who may be drawn by them to enter the inclosure will find, indeed, Mr. Gilchrist's "reasons for ceasing to be connected with that description of religious professors who designate themselves Unitarians;" but he will also soon discover, from the author's own explicit declarations, that he never held the doctrines of Unitarianism, and, therefore, could not have "abandoned" them. He distinctly affirms (p. 19), that he "never was in unison" with Unitarians: he "was always a sort of Nonconformist in opinion among them, a heretic among heretics, and a disbeliever of those very things which are received by them almost with universal consent." The plain fact is, and he is not at all solicitous to conceal it, that through the greater part of life he has been more of an unbeliever than of a Christian of any class or denomination. Throughout his work he takes great pains to shew, that from an early period, when he read "Sandeman's Letters," his mind was painfully agitated by conflicting tendencies to orthodoxy and infidelity: not to the infidelity of the common herd of shallow reasoners, such as Hume, Gibbon, and Voltaire, (pp. 29, 30,) but to ATHEISM, the Atheism of that "intellectual Leviathan," Hobbes. His "great difficulty," the reader will observe, was not as to Trinitarianism and Unitarianism, but "concerning the divine origin of Christianity, or the credibility of the Gospel." "There was," he openly avers, "a considerable tendency to the rejection of Christianity in his habits of thinking and reasoning." "His mind was often so unsettled that he knew not what to think, and it was frequently so reckless that he cared not what he said or wrote." (Pp. 14, 15.) Thus wavering and, as he writes it, *skeptical*, was the state of his mind when he first assumed the *external profession* of Unitarianism, and became an Unitarian minister at Chatham! After this statement, the confession that follows, strange and humiliating as it is, need not, perhaps, excite surprise: "Chatham was the grave of my piety. It had been declining and dying before, but now it might be considered as dead and buried!" (P. 11.)

At Chatham he made no progress in the acquisition of Unitarian sentiments. The Unitarian books which he now read served only to inspire him with contempt for the authors, and to "shake his confidence yet more in the word of God." (P. 13.) Yet, with his faith thus tottering, and his piety entombed, he accepted an invitation to be the minister of the Unitarian Baptist congregation meeting in Worship Street! He had now "rejected Trinitarianism," but had not "*made up his mind to reject Christianity.*" (P. 14.) Being placed in the "focus of Unitarianism," he "could not but act with the Unitarians, *without taking a position for which he was not then prepared:*"—that is, we suppose, without acting upon his honest convictions, and ceasing to be the minister of a religion which he all but disbelieved. "His discourses and writing were," however, "for some time Unitarian," but "merely as Unitarianism is a system of negation." Up to this period, then, it is quite clear from his own account that he was not actually an Unitarian: and, though professedly an Unitarian minister, could preach Unitarianism no further than it was "a system of *negation*," or just as he might have preached Mahometanism, or his favourite Atheism of Hobbes.

In 1814, Mr. Gilchrist preached at Southampton, before the South of England Unitarian Society. The discourse delivered on that occasion is now before us. Were we to judge of his creed from its contents, we should

undoubtedly say that he was now an Unitarian. His aim in it is to demonstrate from reason and Scripture that Jesus was simply a man. He does not here deal in *negations* merely, but in direct proofs. This sermon was, besides, no hasty composition, got up on the spur of the moment. It had been first written, the author informs us, for the Lecture at St. Thomas's Chapel, and recomposed for the Southampton Meeting: it was printed after a further revision, and with the appendage of *notes*. It might, therefore, on the face of it, be fairly taken as conclusive evidence of the author's Unitarianism. But Mr. Gilchrist spurns the benefit his pamphlet would have derived from this inference, in giving to the title somewhat of the sanction of truth, and at one stroke, and a fearful stroke it is, demolishes the authority of the proof. The most austere and relentless critic that ever dipped his pen in gall would not dare, even in reference to the pamphlet now under our review, open and inviting as it is to the severest judicial censures, to say of the author what he affirms of himself by way of apology for printing and publishing this sermon:—"I preached said discourse" (he writes, p. 15) "in a state of mind bordering on distraction, with doubt and perplexity, (which was too frequently the case when called to preach Unitarian Lectures,) and when I wrote it out for the press, I may truly say, that *such was the desperation of my spirit that I neither feared God nor regarded man!*" Such language precludes all comment.

Mr. Gilchrist does not, however, leave us with this measure of evidence, that he never was an Unitarian, though sufficiently ample and decisive. A large part of his pamphlet consists of a kind of *Delectus Sententiarum*, or "Elegant Extracts" from sermons preached by him in the last ten years. These are not given merely as specimens of his pulpit eloquence, though they would as such be curiosities of their kind: they are avowedly selected for the purpose of shewing that, during this period, he did not preach Unitarianism, but something very different. Surely, then, nothing farther can be requisite to satisfy any reasonable mind, that whatever Mr. Gilchrist has "abandoned," he has not, himself being the judge, abandoned "UNITARIANISM."

That some "extraordinary change" (p. 76) has taken place in his opinions, we are bound on his own authority to believe. We will not assign this change to any "base motives," or "to mental weakness and aberration." (P. 76.) But we must leave it to Mr. Gilchrist to reconcile, as he may be able, to Christian simplicity and integrity, the course of his public labours as an avowed Unitarian minister and advocate, with his now declared disbelief of nearly all the peculiar tenets of Unitarianism, with his unsatisfied doubts as to the divine origin of Christianity, and with the admitted inclination of his mind to the principles of Atheism.

In the perusal of this tract, it is impossible not to be occasionally amused by the supercilious and disdainful style in which the author, with singular self-complacency, delivers his judgment upon those scholars and critics to whom the learned world had been used to give some credit for erudition and talents. Such pretenders to scholarship and criticism as Geddes and Wakefield, *et hoc genus omne*, merit only the writer's unqualified contempt! Indeed, biblical critics are his aversion. "The labours of the most learned critics," he writes, p. 3, "were as familiar to us as the pages of popular authors; and if we have long ceased to give our days and nights to them, the sole reason was that they did us more harm than good."

He does not, however, content himself with the contemptuous treatment of the dead. The living come in for their full share of his scorn and personal abuse. The eminent persons against whom these πικροι καλαμοι, these

"bitter shafts" are levelled, need not our feeble defence, and we are sure they will never condescend to repel attacks of this description. But how are we to account for all this morbid exacerbation and rancorous personal antipathy? Does Mr. Gilchrist conceive, is he vain and egotistic enough to fancy, that all mental and moral excellence are cooped up in the narrow circle of SELF? Is he impatient beneath the sound of praise which is wafted above his head to other men, who, by the superior vigour, or more successful application, of their intellectual faculties, have attained higher stations on the ascent to the temple of fame? Among the "popular authors" whom he states to be so "familiar" to him, might possibly have been included one Æsop; and he may remember an apologue of that acute and amusing writer headed in some school editions *De Ranâ et Bove*—the Frog and the Ox. We need not repeat it: but we shall quote, in conclusion, the caustic remark of an old Latin annotator, which he gives as the επιμυθιον, or moral of the tale:—

Noli te inflare, ne crepes.

ART. II.—*Catholicism in Austria; or an Epitome of the Austrian Ecclesiastical Law; with a Dissertation upon the Rights and Duties of the English Government with respect to the Catholics of Ireland.* By Count Ferdinand dal Pozzo, late Maître des Requêtes, and First President of the Imperial Court of Genoa.

WE have before observed, that though it has always suited the purposes of the No-Popery politicians to view a concession of the claims of the Catholics to equal privileges as citizens, as an abandonment of the rights of the state to ecclesiastical usurpation, these reasoners have not yet proved that in reality the resisting power of the state would, by any such measure, be at all materially weakened; that every government has not, and would not continue to have, abundant means of restraint upon any *actions* which could be detrimental to its existence; and, moreover, that even Catholics would consent, if left to themselves, to give way so far to the temporal authority of the papal court as in any formidable degree to interfere with the legitimate exercise of the administrative faculties of the state. We observed on the progress that had actually been making in all the principal Catholic states towards what may be called swearing the peace against their spiritual chief, and it appeared to us extremely difficult to conceive, that if a Catholic prince could, without breach of his spiritual allegiance, effectually curb those clerical propensities in his church, from which he apprehended practical mischief, a Protestant prince could not (when he had set himself right on the score of justice to his subjects, and had given them all equal rights and obligations) at least do as much in preventing any inconvenience from the connexions of a minority of his subjects, possessing no temporal power or patronage whatever.

Count dal Pozzo's book comes out very opportunely in connexion with this view of the subject. He is a Catholic, but of the school stoutly opposed to all the temporal pretensions of Rome. He has been brought up under a code which recognizes Catholicism as the state religion, yet tolerates others, and takes especial care to make its own particular favourite behave with propriety and courtesy towards other faiths. He wishes emancipation for the

Catholics of Ireland, but only on condition that their king shall take upon himself the same civil authority over their proceedings, so far as they could disturb civil order, as Catholic sovereigns make no scruple in exercising; and he proceeds to shew how unreasonable it would be, on their part, to object to this, when the regulations of the Court of Austria, which have been quietly acted upon half a century, are taken into consideration. The Emperor, he observes, is head of the temporal affairs of the churches in his dominions, whatever be their creed and whatever should be his own; and he sees no reason why the Protestant King of England, or any other king, should not be the same.

The Count, in considering the concessions which the Catholics of Ireland should make to the state, has involved himself in greater difficulty than was necessary, by not observing that the Austrian government goes much further than the English is asked to go, and that the latter consequently has still less occasion for apprehension of dissident creeds. The former not only tolerates, but recognizes as established and endowed, several religions in the same state. It conceives itself to be, *as a government*, properly speaking, of *no* religion, but to be bound to protect and keep fair play between all; and the co-existence of these establishments of course renders many regulations necessary, and creates many embarrassments, which can never arise where all that seceders venture to sue for is liberty of worship and an absence of proscriptions. Count Pozzo, in his reasonings with the Irish Catholics, (who, by the bye, have never shewn the slightest inclination to be of the *Curialist*, or high-temporal-pretension, party of the Church of Rome,) seems to be contemplating all those points of contact with the government which arise in his own country, where they form a powerful establishment, co-existent with one or two other less influential establishments, between which jealousy might reasonably be expected. In Ireland, the only possible interference which the government could want to exercise, would be to provide a few regulations against those actions which should have a tendency to interfere with its internal or external political relations, if any such should occur worthy of notice in the members of a body without power or institutions capable for an instant of rivalling those of a wealthy and influential establishment.

But the Count's book is a curious one, as developing the cunning, despotic policy of the Imperial Court, and displaying the mode in which it uses religion as a mere state engine, and the degree in which all this is quietly submitted to, and, in fact, rendered conducive to the quiet of society and its exemption at least from sectarian jealousies and priestly persecutions. We shall proceed to give, within as short a compass as we can, an outline of the Austrian code of law as it respects the state's connexion with ecclesiastical matters; a system founded, as it asserts, on ancient practice and the well-understood relative rights and duties of governments, and of the societies which unite for religious purposes within its sphere.

The Episcopal Chancellor of Lintz, George Richberg, composed a work, entitled "Enchiridion Juris Ecclesiastici Austriaci," for the use of the clergy and the civil functionaries of the empire, which had become the more necessary as the laws of Austria had almost altogether rejected what is commonly called the Canon Law, compiled with a complete subserviency, as was conceived, to the grasping purposes of the Papal court, and founded on pretensions which the Austrian court never conceded. This book became a text-book in the universities of Germany and in the Italian states under the Austrian dominion. An Italian translation was published at Venice, in

1819, by authority, and from this book Count Pozzo has published his abridged translation. "It contains," he observes, "a system of doctrine, in the formation of which, under the reigns of Maria Theresa, Joseph II., and Leopold II., the most learned German and Italian political writers, civilians and canonists, have co-operated, which has been maintained in practice a sufficient time to appreciate its effects, and which well deserves to fix the attention of other nations and of other governments. It is a far better system than that of the celebrated Gallican Liberties."

The work is divided into three books:—the first, treats of Ecclesiastical Law in General, and its divisions; the second, of Internal Public Ecclesiastical Law, as it regards the authorities constituted for the internal administration of the church, their mutual rights, duties, &c.; the third, of External Ecclesiastical Public Law, under which head are considered the relations between the church and the state.

The first of these books is of an abstract character; it defines the church to be a society, that is to say, a congregation of men connected by common laws or rules, having a settled object, which is in this life the fulfilment of religious duties, and in the life to come, eternal salvation. Into this church every person is free to enter or not to enter. No means of coercion are permitted on account of matters relating to this society, and the society itself is recognized as having and requiring no other powers than it is proper should be conceded to it as necessary for the internal regulation of *any* such an association of persons for a common object, sanctioned and approved by the state. Of course, excommunication or exclusion of members is the principal power of this sort which is allowed. Individuals are recognized to have the power of thus associating with a view to determinate objects, and a new social law is, to a certain extent, therefore introduced by the restrictions which such individuals impose on themselves. But this new social law is held to require the approbation of the civil power, and to be only valid on condition that it does not prejudice public liberty and the interests of civil society.

The sources of ecclesiastical common law are next considered. The suspected decisions or assumptions, in modern times of Papal encroachment, are not admitted as legitimate authorities. The decretals of the popes are confined to the limits fixed to their authority as heads of the church, which the Austrian ecclesiastical law confines within narrow limits; and an important division of the sources of ecclesiastical law is assigned to the internal laws, customs, and regulations, of different states, and the decrees of their rulers. The particular laws and customs of Austria for the regulation of the state's relations to the church, are enumerated under this head. It is stated, that all who in Austria are destined for ecclesiastical cures, or even for the administration of civil affairs, are obliged to study the maxims of the government with regard to ecclesiastical matters; and no person can be admitted into the higher orders of the church if he have not undergone an examination upon its canon law.

The second book contains a detailed exposition of the limits and nature of purely ecclesiastical power; of the officers instituted for the maintenance of the social system of the church, and their respective powers and duties. Bishops are recognized, as by regular succession, the principal administrators of ecclesiastical authority, the church having, however, no other means at its disposal of coercing its subjects than those which are requisite to instruct and exhort them, and to exclude the refractory or disobedient from all or a part of the ecclesiastical communion. If

peculiar occasions occur which involve matters of external order and interfere with the practice of virtue, "and the church is persuaded that external measures of coercion may with propriety be employed, they must be requested of the civil power, to which alone they belong, and not to the church."

No jurisdiction exists simultaneously with the bishop's in his own diocese. If new rules of discipline are introduced, each bishop should have the power of examining them to find whether they are suited or not to his particular church, and may refuse to receive them. The pope is recognized merely as the primate among bishops, as the successor, in the Church of Rome, of St. Peter, who is considered the first of the apostles. The Bishop of Rome is the centre of unity, with whom every bishop should keep up an epistolary intercourse. He presides in councils; and in the absence of councils is bound to administer matters according to their united intentions, and, as the vicar of all, to ordain, in a provisional manner, whatever is deemed to be necessary. The controverted questions of jurisdiction between the popes, councils, and bishops in their separate dioceses, are fully considered. The Austrian government regarding the bishop's oath of fidelity to the papal see as somewhat prejudicial to the civil authority, prescribed, in 1781, that no oath should be taken but on condition that the whole form should be understood in the just and original sense of an obedience purely canonical, and should be received so as not to clash either with the rights of the sovereign or the duties of the subject, both of which the bishops were, on that occasion, to recognize by an oath, to be taken in a form pointed out previous to the oath to the pope.

Appeals to Rome are prohibited, or are to be judged by a delegate residing in the country to which the parties belong. The powers of dispensation in marriages are required to be exercised by the bishops; the government permitting those bishops who had scruples as to exercising these powers to obtain *faculties* from Rome so to do, which that court readily compromised the matter by granting. All papal indulgencies are to be submitted previously to what is called the "Placet Royal," for the sanction of the state before announcement. The legatine authority is of course confined within the bounds of the pope's own authority; and the civil government has the power of examining these letters of legation, of not receiving legates, except under certain conditions, and of refusing to admit those against whom they may entertain just objections.

The powers of a bishop in his diocese for the regular administration of his church are strictly defined. They are, as before observed, exclusive and independent of every other jurisdiction, save always and excepted a pretty vigilant supervision which this despotic state takes great care to reserve to itself, while it keeps out all other intruders on the church's independence. For instance, no pastoral letter or charge, addressed to the clergy of a diocese, can be published without the approbation of government. By the ancient canons the bishops, however, are required to perform nothing of great importance without the advice of their presbytery, that is, of the priests of the diocese; from which arose diocesan synods, which the Austrian government, in some cases, restored, but probably saw fit to discourage as too popular in their character. All bishops are nominated by the emperor. By the Austrian laws it is prescribed, that all parochial benefices should be conferred on the more deserving candidate upon examination. The parish priests have the direction of the elementary schools; they admi-

nister, "*by the sovereign's concession,*" the property of their churches; "they ought to exhort the people to the observance of the laws; and it is especially enjoined that they should be present at the promulgation of the civil laws, and admonish the people to be also present." The care of orphans, the poor, and of illegitimate children, is confided to them. "They must either personally, or through the schoolmasters, *assist the military conscription*, and furnish whatever information is in their power to give from the parish books."

The third book proceeds to the consideration of the most delicate part of the subject, and discusses the general relations which the church bears to the state. Catholicism is generally treated as solving the questions which have been agitated on this head in a manner subversive of the dignity and interests of the state; but in this respect great difference has always existed in the degrees to which Catholic states have been inclined to give way to clerical pretensions, and even among Protestants the controversy has been by no means without extremes, which it would be equally difficult to reconcile with each other, and with the liberties of the community. Dr. Magee is now thundering against the theories of Warburton on this very point, and our contemporary, the British Critic, No. III., is doing his best to abet the former. The Court of Austria, in the midst of its Catholicism, has found the means of keeping church authority within quite as narrow limits as most Protestants would wish to prescribe, and much straiter than would suit either Dr. Magee or the great authority which he ventures to impugn.

The Austrian ecclesiastical system lays down that the church and civil society are two moral beings or states, essentially different as to their origin, objects, and means; but that they are not contrary to each other, and can even much assist each other. The church can by its precepts render citizens upright, tranquil, and obedient to civil authority, and the state can assist the church by protecting its worship, &c. The church, like any other legal association in the state, has its property, civil rights, &c., and is subject to civil authority, to its laws and burdens. The state, as a state, is not the subject matter of religion; it is not combined with any church; its compact of union with a church or churches is not grounded on the idea that its subjects should profess any one religion in preference to another. The sovereign, like his subjects, is at liberty to enter or not into the society of any church. A sovereign who is a Catholic, has, as a sovereign, neither more nor less rights than a sovereign who professes any other mode of worship.

The state has jurisdiction over all civil matters. The church has no power to do any thing mixed up with civil relations or not essential to its ends, which the civil power deems pernicious, and on that head the state is the sole judge. All temporal jurisdiction on the part of the church over the civil power is of course denied, and contended to be unwarranted by scriptural or other rational authority. No excommunication even is allowed in Austria without the sovereign's consent. Ecclesiastical immunities have also been destroyed, and the clergy are tried like all other citizens. The church is allowed to claim as rights—a right to liberty of action or free exercise of religion; a right to civil protection; and a right to prevent the civil power from obstructing the church's exercise of that obligation to promote religious salvation for which it is formed. But the church has no other power of redress, in case of invasion of its rights, than those of exhortation, prayer, patience, and constancy. The civil power must be predomi-

nant in actual force, for one of the two must prevail, and the church is in the state, and subject, therefore, to its laws; but the state is not in the church. Ecclesiastical censures can reach the sovereign only as a private man, and not as head of the state, since in that capacity he is not a member of *any* church.

The state is not held to have any direct right over what are strictly religious matters. In matters concerning conscience and religion, it is asserted that the citizens have neither the inclination nor the power to renounce their natural liberty. But the state asserts a right of superior *inspection* over all the societies within its jurisdiction. It claims a right of examination and prevention in the affairs of ecclesiastical societies as well as of other communities within its limits; and to be entitled to have an account of their proceedings and decrees, and to prohibit what it sees to be detrimental to its ends.

The state's right or mode of interference in religious matters is held to include principally the following subjects:—1. The right or duty of providing that its subjects be instructed in true principles of religion; but it does not claim the power of deciding on religious doctrines, though it obliges the ministers of religion to discharge their duties, and does not suffer principles to be inculcated contrary to the purity of the Christian doctrine as admitted by the universal church or to the rights of the state. 2. It inculcates the due observance of the canons of the church, and prevents abuses, and regulates the *accidental* rites of religion, as holidays, &c. 3. As to marriage, all legal determinations respecting the contract of marriage depend solely on civil authority; the religious sacrament is only accessary, the civil contract being the essential. 4. The state may repress or moderate religious controversies on disputed dogmas, as rarely attended with advantage, and often injurious to public order. The Austrian government, for instance, has forbidden all public disputations on the bull *Unigenitus*, and on the opinions of the Molinists and Jansenists. 5. The sovereign has the right of toleration, and of allowing to all his subjects of different persuasions the free exercise of their opinions, whatever inclination to the contrary a particular church might be inclined to shew. The regulation of the mode and extent of this civil toleration lies with the state. "Religion," it is laid down, "abstractedly considered, formed no part of the social compact, nor could the citizens renounce the natural liberty of exercising what form of worship they pleased, provided no detriment could then arise to the civil community. It may be admitted, moreover, that religion is a matter that cannot be forced, because as soon as restraint begins to operate, religion becomes an external hypocritical cloak to faith and piety." 6. The state has the power of regulating and restricting the number of ecclesiastical persons, of settling their qualifications, and of excluding from ecclesiastical offices persons of whom it entertains just apprehensions. It considers church property as similar in its nature to all other kinds of property which are commonly described as in a state of wardship, and regulates the due application of the proper portion for public purposes, charity, &c. "Aurum Ecclesia habet, non ut servet, sed ut eroget et subveniat in necessitatibus."—St. Ambrose.

A chapter is devoted to the reciprocal relations between the different religious persuasions in a state. It allows to the Catholic church no other mode of propagating its faith but instruction, and that instruction conveyed at a proper time and in a proper place. It forbids such attempts even at proselytism, which it judges to be injurious to public tranquillity, and it

especially denies the church's right to constrain the opinions of any one. In Austria a man may pass from one Christian sect to another, tolerated by law, with certain precautions, having in view to ascertain that he does so by free-will and full knowledge; and it is strictly recommended to the members of different faiths mutually to respect each other, and to live in peace and harmony. The schools are so regulated that youths of different persuasions have their appropriate instructions in religious matters, and have in common those branches which are independent of religious belief.

The religious concerns of the Protestants in Austria are managed by two consistories, constituted and approved by the sovereign, one for the confession of Augsburg, the other for the Reformed Churches of Germany and Bohemia. All pastors are confirmed by these consistories. Of these pastors, some, called elders, are superiors, and preside over the provincial assemblies. The Catholic church, being the most numerous, has greater and peculiar privileges, such as those of bells, steeples, and public entrances fronting squares and streets. The parochial registers are kept by them, to which the Protestant clergy send certificates of the marriages, &c. performed by them, for registration. Towards Catholic processions, &c., the Protestants must pay respect or withdraw; and the Catholic clergy, on the other hand, are bound to abstain from all insulting and satirical expressions. Protestant children attending Catholic schools are allowed to retire when the Catholic catechism is heard. Where the Protestants have no burying-ground they are to be buried in the Catholic grounds without any peculiar rites, and the nearest Protestant minister must be invited to accompany the corpse. The banns of marriage of Protestants are published both in the Catholic church and their own place of worship.

The Protestants are not compelled to contribute to the reparation or maintenance of the Catholic churches. Their pastors perform all rites for them, giving immediate notice to the Catholic priest of the district, that they may be duly registered. If there be no resident Protestant pastor, the Catholic priest baptizes, marries, &c. If the Protestants have schools of their own, they are then under no obligation to contribute to the Catholic schools. It is a duty incumbent on every Catholic parish-priest to be carefully vigilant that the laws of toleration be accurately observed; he is bound to conciliate differences if they arise; to prevent useless disputes; to report on proper occasions all contested matters to the public authorities for their decision, and, at the same time, to provide them with all the requisite proofs and documents.

Such is an outline of the singular system of Austrian regulation of ecclesiastical matters. It is obviously a code of despotic policy, in which the interests and views of the state are the basis of every thing; but it will have been seen that this policy bears with it a considerable portion of what is sensible and enlightened; that the government takes some pains to make every one do his duty, and confine himself to his proper sphere; and is in no way disposed to lend itself either to the bigotry of fanatics or the hypocritical zeal of a corrupt hierarchy.

ART. III.—*Hymns, written and adapted to the Weekly Church Service of the Year.* By the Right Rev. Reginald Heber, late Lord Bishop of Calcutta. London. John Murray, 1827.

As a collection of *Poems*, by the late lamented Bishop of Calcutta, this volume is interesting and valuable—as a selection of *Hymns* fitted for the public services of the Church, it surely cannot be held in high repute by any party. The want of simplicity in style, the jingling metres occasionally adopted, and the inattention to accuracy of measure in the several stanzas of the same Hymns, forbid the idea of their universal adoption. We have a better opinion of the taste and science of the Church of England. Even as poems, there is in some of Bishop Heber's pieces a vehemence, and in others an airy lightness, by no means consistent with the calm character of Sacred Poetry. But taken as Hymns, our objections would be much more serious.

However, there are some beautiful and striking specimens in the collection—more especially among those by the Bishop himself. His imagination was lively, his style bold and vigorous, often passing the bounds of perfect sobriety, but always forcible and original; and the devotion of his mind appears to have been tinctured with a romantic enthusiasm, which gives an appearance of freshness and sincerity to every thing he wrote. In all belonging to the services of that Church of which he was a member, he took an intense interest, and the present collection took its rise from the double desire of reviving a more particular observance of her days of solemn remembrance, and of rendering that observance efficacious in promoting the increase of devout feelings. By the attempt itself, and still more by his manner of executing it, it may be gathered that Bishop Heber held in some estimation the Catholic plan of dramatizing the whole year by connecting every day with the image of some event memorable in the Christian annals. The field of remark into which this propensity might lead, cannot be entered upon here; but let it be observed, that if some Christians have nearly lost sight of the plain duties of this world, by constantly contemplating the past and the future, we, on the other hand, are too apt to bring the spirit of a calculating selfishness into our religion. It is positively good to contemplate the glories of the Christian dispensation in the spirit of pious adoration. In dwelling on the touching passages of the gospel history, the matchless character of Jesus Christ, the labours of his primitive followers, in ascending with the beloved disciple in the spirit towards that "new heaven and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness," we forget for a time the *directness* at least of our selfishness. We acquire a taste for happiness, not exactly as it is opposed to our notions of pain and suffering and mortal infirmity, but as it is holiness and participation in the faith and love of those who are gone before. It is a compound feeling, made up of veneration, for virtue in its highest forms, mixed with a desire to be what we admire, and so,—and not merely because it is the possession of physical or intellectual enjoyment,—to be happy.

Many of bishop Heber's hymns are very devotional, but, of course, they will not meet with the approbation of Unitarians when they turn on such points as are considered contrary to the spirit and doctrine of the gospel. Of these is the following on Trinity Sunday, which we quote more as a specimen of his manner of dealing with a difficult theme, than for any other

reason. We say difficult, for the idea of addressing a Triune God seems to us to present an almost insuperable obstacle to the grandeur and dignity of sacred poetry.

" TRINITY SUNDAY.

" Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty!
Early in the morning our song shall rise to thee!
Holy, holy, holy, merciful and mighty!
God in three persons, blessed Trinity!

Holy, holy, holy, all thy saints adore thee!
Casting down their golden crowns around the glassy sea;
Cherubim and seraphim falling down before thee,
Which wert and art and evermore shalt be!

Holy, holy, holy! Though the darkness hide thee,
Though the eye of sinful man thy glory may not see,
Only Thou art holy, there is none beside thee
Perfect in power, in love, and purity!

Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty!
All thy works shall praise thy name, in earth and sky and sea;
Holy, holy, holy, merciful and mighty,
God in three persons, blessed Trinity."

The following is truly elegant, though much too light and airy for the purposes of worship:

" Lo! the lilies of the field,
How their leaves instruction yield!
Hark, to Nature's lesson given
By the blessed birds of Heaven!
Every bush and tufted tree
Warbles sweet philosophy;
'Mortal, fly from doubt and sorrow:
God provideth for the morrow!'

Say, with richer crimson glows
The kingly mantle than the rose?
Say, have kings more wholesome fare
Than we, poor citizens of air?
Barns nor hoarded grain have we,
Yet we carol merrily;
Mortal, fly from doubt and sorrow!
God provideth for the morrow!

One there lives whose guardian eye
Guides our humble destiny:
One there lives, who, Lord of all,
Keeps our feathers lest they fall.
Pass we blithely then the time,
Fearless of the snare and lime;
Free from doubt and faithless sorrow—
God provideth for the morrow!"

As a specimen of a totally different style we insert a very bold Hymn for the first Sunday after Trinity, and shall close our extracts by the beautiful and nearly perfect address, for Hymn it cannot be called, to Jerusalem:

"FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

" Room for the proud! Ye sons of clay,
From far his sweeping pomp survey,
Nor, rashly curious, clog the way
His chariot wheels before!

Lo! with what scorn his lofty eye
Glances o'er age and poverty,
And bids intruding conscience fly
Far from his palace-door!

Room for the proud! But slow the feet
That bear his coffin down the street:
And dismal seems his winding-sheet
Who purple lately wore!

Ah! where must now his spirit fly
In naked, trembling agony?
Or how shall he for mercy cry
Who show'd it not before!

Room for the proud! In ghastly state
The Lords of Hell his coming wait,
And flinging wide the dreadful gate
That shuts to ope no more,

'Lo here with us the seat,' they cry,
'For him who mocked at poverty,
And bade intruding conscience fly
Far from his palace-door.'"

"TENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

" Jerusalem, Jerusalem! enthroned once on high,
Thou favor'd home of God on earth, thou Heav'n below the sky!
Now brought to bondage with thy sons, a curse and grief to see,
Jerusalem, Jerusalem! our tears shall flow for thee.

Oh! hadst thou known thy day of Grace, and flock'd beneath the wing,
Of Him who call'd thee lovingly, thine own anointed King,
Then had the tribes of all the world gone up thy pomp to see,
And glory dwelt within thy gates, and all thy *sons* been free!

And who art thou that mournest me? replied the ruin grey,
And fear'st not rather that thyself may prove a cast away?
I am a dried and abject branch, my place is given to thee,
But woe to every barren graft of thy wild olive tree!

Our day of Grace is sunk in night, our time of Mercy spent,
For heavy was my children's crime, and strange their punishment;
Yet gaze not idly on our face, but, sinner, warned be,
Who spared not his chosen seed, may send his wrath on thee!

Our day of Grace is sunk in night, thy noon is in its prime,
Oh turn and seek thy Saviour's face, in this accepted time!
So, Gentile, may Jerusalem a lesson prove to thee,
And in the new Jerusalem thy home for ever be."

Y.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

ART. IV. — *Addresses, with Prayers and Original Hymns, for the Use of Families and Schools.* By a Lady, authoress of "Devotional Exercises for the Use of Young Persons." London. Hunter. 1826.

THIS is a praiseworthy attempt to supply a deficiency in our theological literature. All persons engaged in the religious education of the young must have felt the want of something more brief, intelligible and interesting than the majority of sermons for family reading. These Addresses, twelve in number, are not by any means all we want, but, as far as they go, they will serve a useful purpose, and, we hope, will open the way for further attempts in the same direction.

Among them the first, sixth, and seventh are particularly calculated to impress.— Here and there we have remarked a passage somewhat too speculative, as at p. 142, and rather too confident an assumption of a disputed and non-essential doctrine, as in the Address on "the Character of Christ;" but every family of young persons, where religious instruction is conducted on *general* Unitarian principles, will find this little book a valuable present. On the whole, it is perhaps superior to the Author's Devotional Exercises, which have been already favourably received by the public.

ART. V. — *Hints to Parents; with Exercises for exciting the attention and strengthening the thinking powers of Children, in the spirit of Pestalozzi's method.* Nos. I. II. III. IV. and. V. Darton and Harvey. Price 1*s.* each.

TWELVE years have now elapsed since Mrs. Hamilton, in a very sensible and strong appeal to the patrons and directors of *schools*,* endeavoured to shew how much the benefit of the Bell and Lancaster modes of teaching "might be increased by a partial adoption of the plan of Pestalozzi." That appeal, we are sorry to say, appears to have been made with little effect. It still continues too much the custom to teach children dogmatically, and to feed them with words without examination or development of the capacity for receiving them. It is yet too much our habit to deal in general ideas; we talk to children of right and wrong, of being good and being naughty; but if persons engaged in education would take the trouble to inquire, they would soon find that there is a most lamentable ignorance in their pupils with respect to *the limits* of good and evil, that while extreme and glaring vices which are of rarer occurrence, are, perhaps, marked out pretty distinctly in their minds as things to be avoided, the greatest confusion prevails with regard to the more common errors of human life. Mrs. Hamilton has well pointed out the absurdity of denominating elementary instruction in reading and writing, education: she shews that the improvement of moral perceptions is the point at which we ought to aim; she knew that it was necessary to arouse and cultivate the affections and faculties before this could be done; hence she recommends the Pestalozzian method in preference to any other.

In the same spirit is conceived the little work now under notice. It is an appeal to mothers, to whom alone the office of superintending the infant years of children belongs; and it aims at impressing upon them the importance of paying attention to the exercise and development of the faculties, from the very earliest period at which the eye and ear of the child are directed towards outward objects. It is no new attempt to burthen the minds of children with an oppressive load of learning, but a gradually strengthening process by which all their powers will be enabled to acquire energy, readiness, and correctness. According to the Pestalozzian principle, a child is early led to make accurate observations on external objects, their number, form, and properties. The name is early associated with the thing. When an instructor receives a child thus prepared, how different is *his* task from that of him who finds his pupil's mind

---

* Hints to the Patrons and Directors of Schools, by Mrs. Elizabeth Hamilton. Longman and Co.

not ignorant merely, but torpid—who discovers after a long and laboured lesson, to his utter despair, that the whole has been rendered incomprehensible by the child's having appended a totally different meaning to some one word with which he set out!

We know not the author of the "Hints to Parents," but they are evidently the productions of a person well informed on the subject of education, and deeply interested in the formation of the Christian character. In execution they are rather desultory and rambling—but valuable lessons may be learnt from them, and a reader who is really desirous of acquiring a knowledge of the author's aim, will find with a little exercise of patience that every lesson, exercise, or hint, however unconnected it may seem, has a bearing upon the same object. One grand good to be derived from examining such a little work as this, is, that it sets parents and teachers immediately *to work*. Many a mother, it is to be feared, conceives herself to be in a very satisfactory state, if she is holding herself in readiness to apply her moral and religious principles to the purpose of her child's instruction on what she deems fitting occasions.* Now, according to Pestalozzi, she is thus grievously wasting time: the more constantly, vigorously and justly she cultivates the powers of her child in every direction, the more she is superseding the necessity for dry, moral instruction; she is leading her pupils to feel and think aright upon all points; and while connecting every object, every fact, every discovery with some correspondent emotion of gratitude, faith, and love, to the Supreme Being, she is establishing a habit and laying a foundation which cannot be overthrown.

ART. VI.—*A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of London, at the Visitation in July,* 1826. By William, Lord Bishop of London. 8vo. pp. 40. Rivingtons.

EPISCOPAL Charges have descended from the stately quarto to the modest octavo; and this change has been accompanied by another of greater moment, namely, a lower tone in the assertion of ecclesiastical claims and the condemnation of dissent. The word *schism*, which used to stand forward in capitals in every page of a bishop's address to his clergy, is now rarely used, and never with its ancient offensiveness. It is perceived by our mitred orators that in the present state of society the Church of England can retain her hold of the people's affections solely by reason and charity; and certainly the use of these instruments of subjection are unspeakably more likely to retain the multitude in quiet submission, than fulminations against spiritual rebellion and woes on the heads of the abettors of heresy and separation.

The Bishop of London's Charge has suggested these reflections: it is sensible, temperate, and charitable. The greater part of it is taken up with matters belonging only to the diocesan and his clergy; on these we have no disposition to remark: but there are some passages relating to the Roman Catholics and the Protestant Dissenters which are interesting to the general reader, and which we point out with the more satisfaction because they indicate that improvement in the spirit of episcopal charges to which we have adverted.

The Right Rev. Prelate naturally refers to the controversy now in agitation between the Churches of Rome and England. He states fairly the points of difference between the two communions. He traces the Reformation to the conviction in the mind of the nation "of the necessity of separating from a communion which required the sacrifice of liberty and truth by the acknowledgment of an usurped power, and the profession of a corrupt faith." P. 11. He accounts for the silence so long maintained on the controversy; owing to which the people had become indifferent to the question and ignorant of its true grounds, and some were led to imagine that a change had been insensibly wrought in the religion of Rome, and that in fact it had become more humble in its pretensions and more catholic in its spirit. This conclusion, he says, is now proved to be erroneous, and the Romish Church is avowedly unchangeable and intolerant. For this reason the Bishop calls upon his clergy "to resist an usurpation which would despoil them at once of" their "faith," their "liberties," and their "sacred character." But this, he adds, is not to be done "by

---

* Selon Rousseau, il faut attendre et guetter le moment favorable pour placer l'instruction, pour inculquer la moralité—selon Pestalozzi, le moment est toujours là, ce moment embrasse tout la durée de l'enfance.

retaliating misstatements, invectives and calumnies, or *crudely asserting an unqualified right of private judgment*, but by reference to primitive antiquity" and the Holy Scriptures. (Pp. 17, 18.) We know not whether his Lordship means to concede that the Protestant ground of "the right of private judgment" cannot be maintained by the Church of England in controversy with the Church of Rome. Some of the Romanists have fought with signal success on this arena, and almost driven the Church-of-England men to occupy for a moment the Unitarian position. We must, however, give the Right Rev. author the benefit of his qualifying epithet "crudely," which in some degree saves his Protestantism. Against the pretensions of the Church of Rome, he maintains for himself and clergy a "mission from Christ" (p. 19); but the Nonconformist would remind the Bishop that he can prove his "mission" only through the Church of Rome, which stoutly denies that she has parted with the least drop of her holy unction to the apostate Church of England.

Of the Dissenters, his Lordship says, pp. 19, 20, that "the great body" (a bishop would not have used such a phrase in such a connexion in former times!) "shew no symptoms at present of particular acrimony against the church—that many are unsound in the faith, indisposed towards spiritual authority, and actuated by passionate zeal for their own tenets; but many there are who differ little from" the clergy "in doctrine, entertain a respect for the church, and have too much of real piety to thwart the views of the clergy, when they tend to the public good." We are glad to see this tenderness towards the *soi-disant* "orthodox" Dissenters; but even they, as far as they are Dissenters, must be unsound in the Bishop's faith, and opposed to all episcopal authority; though certainly neither they nor the "heterodox" Dissenters would as a body thwart the clergy in any honest scheme for the public good. Their complaint is, that the clergy give them so few opportunities of co-operation in such schemes.

We were a little alarmed when we found the Bishop recommending, p. 20, that the "motions" of infidels "should be jealously watched," fearing that he was about to appeal to the vigilance of the Attorney General, or the justice of peace or the constable; but our apprehensions were relieved by the explanation that infidel motions should be "repressed in their commencement by sound reason." By nothing else assuredly can unbelief be put down.

The Bishop indulges in the conclusion of his Charge, p. 39, in an anticipation of the ultimate triumph of his church over superstition, enthusiasm, and infidelity, and, as the consequence or the means, we suppose, of such triumph, of her "gradually throwing off *the dross which is generated by human corruption in her own bosom*"—to all which we, Dissenters as we are, cordially say, So Be It.

ART. VII.—*An Essay on the Perpetuity of Baptism, with an Appendix on Infant Dedication.* By R. Wright. 12mo. pp. 62. Liverpool, printed and sold by F. B. Wright; sold by D. Eaton, and Teulon and Fox, London. 1*s*.

MR. WRIGHT has been employing the leisure which he has obtained by his retirement from Missionary labours in scriptural investigations. Amongst other subjects he has examined the question of the Perpetuity of Baptism, lately raised with so much zeal and even eagerness by some of our Antipædobaptist brethren. He commenced his inquiries a Baptist; he has concluded them with the conviction that baptism is not a Christian institution. The following is the author's own "Summary View" of the argument:

"1. Baptism was not a new institution, first brought into practice, when John the Baptist came preaching in the wilderness of Judea, Matt. iii. 1, much less during the ministry of Jesus and his apostles; for Proselyte baptism already existed among the Jews, who received converts to their religion from among the Heathen by baptizing them.

"2. What John administered was Proselyte baptism; it was not a Christian ordinance, and was only intended, like the whole of John's ministry, to prepare the way for the ministry of Christ, and the introduction of the gospel dispensation: consequently, John's ministry and baptism were alike in their duration, both temporary.

"3. No proof can be produced from the New Testament that baptism was instituted by Jesus Christ, during his personal ministry. It was evidently Proselyte baptism, such as previously existed among the Jews, that was adminis-

tered by the disciples of Jesus at that time; and, being previously practised both by the Jews and by John the Baptist, it could not be regarded as a new institution. The adoption of baptism at that time no more proves it to be a gospel ordinance, than the conformity of our Lord, or of his disciples, to any other Jewish rite,—for instance, to the Jewish passover,—proves such Jewish rite to be a gospel ordinance.

"4. There is no proof that our Lord, after his resurrection from the dead, instituted baptism as an ordinance to be practised by his church, after that church should be completely formed and established. The direction which he gave to the apostles of the circumcision, to continue to baptize the Proselytes they made, related to the plan they were to adopt in collecting converts to form into churches, not to what was to be done in those churches when actually formed. The commission which includes baptism related to what was to be done in introducing the gospel dispensation, not to what was to be done after it was fully introduced.

"5. It was Proselyte baptism only that was practised by the apostles during their ministry. All the persons of whose baptism we have any account in the New Testament were Proselytes, from either Judaism or Heathenism, to Christianity, and chiefly the former. Not a single instance can be found of the baptism of a person who had been brought up in the profession of Christianity, and lived in the previous enjoyment of its privileges; nor can a precept or direction, any more than precedent, be found for the baptizing of such persons.

"6. It appears an undeniable fact, that Paul had no commission to baptize, and that the gospel of the uncircumcision committed to him, to preach to the Gentiles, did not include baptism; though he received that gospel by revelation from Jesus Christ, Gal. i. 12. Had baptism been properly an ordinance of the gospel, of universal and perpetual obligation among Christians, surely Paul would have been commissioned to baptize, baptism would have been included in the gospel as committed to him, and he would not have thanked God that he had baptized so few persons, giving as the reason, that Jesus Christ sent him not to baptize, but to preach the gospel, separating the preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles from the Jewish mode of receiving Proselytes by baptism.

"7. The writer of this Essay entered on the examination, an old Baptist, expecting to find that baptism was instituted by Jesus Christ, though some doubts had forced themselves upon him as to its perpetuity, and he was anxious to have those doubts removed, either by finding proof of its designed perpetuity, or by being convinced that it was not intended to continue beyond the apostolic age; he is not aware of any thing in the New Testament, which has a bearing upon the subject, that he has not carefully examined; and he closes the examination with a full conviction that baptism was never instituted by our revered and honoured Lord and Master; but merely adopted by him as a proper mode of receiving proselytes during his personal ministry, and that of the apostles of the circumcision, and that we have no authority from the New Testament to baptize those who have been brought up in the profession of the gospel, nor any other persons in the present day. Thus by the force of what appears to him to be clear and decisive Scripture proof, he is constrained to relinquish what he has for many years regarded as an ordinance of the gospel, and to avow a change of opinion on a subject which he was ever ready to defend, on all proper occasions, so long as it appeared to him consistent with truth and duty to do it; and he hopes never to be too old to subject all his views in religion to the test of Scripture, and honestly to avow what he believes to be consistent with the New Testament."—Pp. 50—54.

Such of our readers as feel interested in this question will of course read this little Essay; and we venture to say that whatever be their judgment upon the question at issue, they will be pleased with Mr. Wright's frankness and Christian integrity, and with the simplicity and kind-heartedness in which this recantation is written,—so different from the manner of some other recantations, and also of some other writings upon the subject of baptism, which are fresh in our memory.

OBITUARY.

The Right Hon. GEORGE CANNING.

DURING the early part of the last month the public mind was greatly agitated by intelligence of the severe and alarming illness, and subsequently of the death, of Mr. Canning, who had recently been raised to the high office of Prime Minister of Great Britain. His disorder terminated fatally, at the Duke of Devonshire's house, Chiswick, at ten minutes before four o'clock on the morning of Wednesday, the 8th of August. The following statement will be found to comprise the chief facts of his private and public history.

"Mr. George Canning, the father of the subject of the present memoir, was an Irish barrister of respectability, who was related to the family of Garvagh (for the present representative of which, the late Prime Minister, a short time since, procured an Irish peerage); and having displeased his wealthier relatives at an early age, by what they considered an imprudent marriage, he came over to this country, where he lived in great poverty, and died, leaving his widow and family entirely destitute of provision. While in Ireland, and when he was first at the bar, Mr. Canning the elder had produced some poetical pieces; these, however, though not devoid of taste and merit, met with no material success. In London he changed his course, and attempted to carry on the business of a wine-merchant; but this effort was not prosperous, and it is generally believed that he died of dejected spirits and a broken heart, brought on by the loss of all his early prospects and the subsequent miscarriage of several endeavours at ameliorating his condition. After her husband's death, Mrs. Canning attempted the profession of the stage, and performed *Jane Shore*, in in Rowe's tragedy of that name, to Garrick's *Lord Hastings;* but her talent was not sufficient to command a London engagement. She afterwards acted in various provincial companies, and eventually married a person in the same pursuit, of the name of Hunn. The Garvagh family, though deeply displeased with Mr. Canning's marriage, relented so far, at his death, as to take care of his son George's education, and the future Prime Minister was placed at Eton, where, while yet a boy, he exhibited considerable indications of genius, and contributed several papers to a periodical publication called *The Microcosm*, the first number of which was published in 1786. The essays signed "B." are those written by Mr. Canning in this work, and the poem, *The Slavery of Greece*, may be quoted as a fair example of their general merit.* From Eton Mr. Canning went to Oxford, where he studied at Christ Church, and distinguished himself principally as a Latin scholar, gaining several prizes. And, from thence, coming to London, he entered himself a member of Lincoln's Inn, and proceeded in due course, with a view to being called to the bar. At this time, however, the friendship of Sheridan, who was then in his zenith, suggested another career to him—the career of politics; and at three-and-twenty years of age, he took his seat in Parliament, as member for the borough of Newport, in the Isle of Wight. Prior to the commencement of his political prospects, and while he was studying for the bar, Mr. Canning, at several private societies, had acquired considerable reputation as a speaker; so much

---

[* This periodical paper was projected by a few of the senior scholars at Eton, in 1786. The first number was published, as stated above, on Monday, the 6th of November, in that year; and the subsequent numbers followed in succession, every week, till Monday, July 30, 1787. The fictitious editor was Gregory Griffin, Esq.; the real conductor is understood to have been Mr. Canning. The other principal writers were, Mr. John Smith, afterwards of King's College, Cambridge; Mr. Robert Smith, Mr. John Frere, and Mr. Joseph Mellish. Other occasional contributors were, Mr. B. Way, Mr. Littlehales, and Lord Henry Spencer. In the concluding paper, the Editor, under the form of a last will and testament, assigns to each writer the papers composed by him. Mr. Canning's are, Nos. 2, 7, 11, 12, 18, 22, 26, 30, 32, 39. Appended to one of these is the poem on the "Slavery of Greece," which late circumstances have brought into public notice. Considering his age, the papers in the Microcosm did Mr. Canning great credit, and gave indications of the superior talents he afterwards displayed as a lively and elegant writer. EDIT.]

so, indeed, as to induce Mr. Pitt, who probably could have little other very cogent motive for befriending him, to offer him the post of Under Secretaryship of State, which he accepted in 1796, and was accordingly returned for the Treasury borough of Wendover. But he was some time in the House before he assumed courage to speak, although so strongly supported; for he was returned to Parliament in 1793, and his first effort was the speech in favour of the subsidy proposed to be granted in 1794 to the King of Sardinia, which was not at all in his best style, and met with a reception more favourable than its intrinsic merits, perhaps, deserved. About five years afterwards, in 1799, the young orator married Miss Scott, the sister of the Duchess of Portland, with whom he obtained such a fortune as gave him more standing in the country than he had heretofore possessed; and he continued a vehement supporter, and occasionally an *ultra* one, of Mr. Pitt and his measures, until the latter went out of office in the year 1803. The short administration of Mr. Addington and his colleagues was determinately opposed during its whole existence by Mr. Canning, whose talent for ridicule exhausted itself upon the Premier's person, while the political measures of the Ministry were assailed by his logic and his oratory. At this time he sat for the borough of Tralee; and as he had gone out of office with Mr. Pitt, so he returned with that Minister in the new situation of Treasurer of the Navy, which office he continued to hold until Mr. Pitt's death in 1806. On the death of Mr. Pitt, Mr. Canning went into opposition again; but his talents rendered him invaluable to any Ministry which could obtain his assistance; and it was not long before he found himself again in power with an accession of rank, having joined the Duke of Portland, as Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. It was in this capacity that he made his famous speeches upon the bombardment of Copenhagen and the seizure of the Danish fleet. And he also fought a duel, upon a dispute arising out of the conduct of the Walcheren expedition, with the late Marquis of Londonderry, then Lord Castlereagh, who was the Secretary for War and Colonies, which terminated in Mr. Canning's being wounded, and in both parties going out of office. It was Lord Castlereagh who gave the challenge; and at six o'clock on the morning of the 21st of September, 1809, the parties met near the telegraph, Putney-heath. Lord Castlereagh was attended by the present Marquis of Hertford, and Mr. Canning by Mr. Ellis. After taking their ground, they fired by signal, and missed; but no explanation taking place, they fired a second time, when Mr. Canning received his adversary's ball in his thigh. He did not fall from the wound, nor was it known by the seconds that he was wounded, and both parties stood ready to give or receive further satisfaction, when Mr. Ellis, perceiving blood on Mr. Canning's leg, the seconds interfered. Mr. Canning was conveyed to his house, Glocester-lodge, at Brompton, where he was for some time confined; but as the bone of the thigh was not fractured, he recovered sufficiently to attend the levee on the 11th of October, and resign his seals of office, as did Lord Castlereagh also.

"The quarrel excited a considerable sensation among the friends of both parties at the time; and it was understood that his late Majesty expressed his strong disapprobation of the practice of settling ministerial disputes by sword or pistol. Mr. Canning addressed two letters to Earl Camden (which were published), defending the part which he had taken in the affair; but the result was, his separation from the party with which he had acted; and not long after he made that which may be considered as his first demonstration in favour of popular principles, by offering himself as a candidate for the representation of Liverpool, for which place he was elected in 1812. Mr. Canning stood four times for Liverpool, and was each time elected, but never without a strong opposition. On the first occasion he had four antagonists, and his majority was 500; the numbers being for Mr. Canning, 1,631; for General Gascoyne (the second member), 1,532; for Mr. Brougham, 1,131; for Mr. Creevey, 1,068; and for General Tarleton, 11. The second election took place after Mr. Canning's embassy to Lisbon, and very great exertions indeed were made to throw him out; but he was nevertheless returned after a struggle of three days, by the retirement of his opponent, Mr. Leyland; whose name, indeed, had been set up by the hostile party, in spite of his personal declaration that he was desirous not to serve. The third election, of 1818, was distinguished by an extraordinary quantity of electioneering manœuvre, eighteen *nominal* candidates having been set up, on one side and the other, in addition to the four real ones; the majority, however, of Mr. Canning, was greater than on any occasion be-

fore. The last election of 1820 was less warmly contested, his chief opponent being a gentleman of the name of Crompton, who succeeded only in obtaining 345 votes. During the latter years of his life, the termination of Mr. Canning's political career seemed problematical, though few persons, even but a short time since, would have anticipated its coming so early to a close. In 1818 he came into office as President of the Board of Control; but left England and abandoned his place, in preference to taking part in the proceedings against her Majesty the late Queen. Subsequently, in 1822, he was named Governor of India; and was on the point of again quitting the country, having actually taken leave of his constituents at Liverpool, for the purpose of proceeding to Bengal. At that very moment, however, the death of the Marquis of Londonderry suddenly opened the situation of Secretary for Foreign Affairs to him, a post which he accepted, and held until the change consequent upon the recent illness of the Earl of Liverpool, when it was his fortune to attain that high station to which his talents pre-eminently entitled him, and in which a long list of valuable services to his country have, we feel little doubt, been cut short by his premature and regretted death. It is a curious circumstance, that Mr. Canning died in the same house in which Mr. Fox breathed his last; and, like that distinguished statesman, but a few months only after his last acceptance of office. He has left two sons alive, and a daughter. The latter is the present Marchioness of Clanricarde; the elder son is a captain in the navy; the younger a lad still at school, who was brought from York during his father's illness. As Mr. Canning has been repeatedly attacked upon the subject of the pensions granted to other members of his family—to his mother and sisters—it becomes fair to add what he has said in his defence. His answer to this charge was, that when he first retired, in 1803, from the office of Under Secretary of State, he was entitled to a pension of 500*l.* a year; and that, instead of taking that sum himself, he requested to have it settled upon his relations."

"Mr. Canning evinced over the companions of his boyhood a superiority of quick intelligence, to which there could not be fairly applied the usual term 'precocious.' There was nothing premature in his early talent — nothing fallacious, forced, or disappointing. The lead which he took when a child, he maintained through the intellectual tilts of youth, and through the sterner struggles of ambitious and unyielding manhood, until, after some partial defeats and vicissitudes, for which he was more to blame than fortune, he reached the *ne plus ultra* of a British subject, and fell while the civilized world still cheered him with shouts of applause and felicitation.

"To the prompt and sensitive excitability of Mr. Canning may be traced the impediments which retarded his final success, and which more than once threatened to frustrate his most aspiring efforts. If Mr. Canning could have subdued for a while the indignation under which he wrought against Lord Castlereagh, by means which afforded his personal enemies a pretext for representing him, though falsely, as an intriguer, the feelings of other members of the Portland Cabinet would have co-operated with him and with the public voice, and have expelled, with something like contempt, from office, the incompetent author and director of the ruinous Walcheren expedition. The issue of this indiscreet quarrel with Lord Castlereagh was, their simultaneous loss of office, and Mr. Canning's long exclusion. The more plausible and measured temperament of Mr. Canning's adversary introduced him again to power under Mr. Perceval, in the department of Foreign Affairs, in which situation he had the good fortune to inflict on Mr. Canning the deep disgrace of an overpaid and unnecessary embassy to Lisbon. This was the real blot on Mr. Canning's political emblazonment—one, indeed, which we are ready to acknowledge that a series of illustrious services have long since compensated and redeemed, if they have not entirely obliterated; but which the faith and moral use of history impose upon us the reluctant duty of here affixing to the name of Mr. Canning.

"That the earlier portions of this statesman's life exhibited no evidence compared with that which has flowed from every week and hour of its more recent progress, on which could be established any of Mr. Canning's now indefeasible claims to the reputation of a friend of human liberty, may be accounted for by the subaltern order of those duties which, until within these three years, and since the overthrow of Buonaparte, he had been called upon to discharge. An exception of course will be made for the time during which he filled a Cabinet office under Mr. Pitt and the Duke of Portland; but then the

great interests of the war swallowed up all questions on which might hinge the fame of a statesman for his free or despotic principles; so that it was not until his acceptance of the post of Foreign Minister, after the self-destruction of Lord Londonderry, that Mr. Canning had at once the forces wherewith to act, and a field on which to display them.

"Try the departed statesman by a test like this, and then let every Englishman determine how much he gained by Lord Londonderry's death, and what he has lost in Mr. Canning!

"England was disengaged from the trammels of the Holy Alliance, almost before the familiars of that body could look round them and discover the hand which set her free.

"An invasion of Spain, which no reasoning could palliate, was rendered, by Mr. Canning's dexterity and spirit, little more noxious in its result than it was defensible in its origin; and the world saw contrasted an outrage by France upon the Spaniards, which will bring about its own termination and punishment, with a blessing conferred by England on the Americans, which is at once its own guarantee and reward.

"Constitutional Portugal has been upheld against the invasions of the House of Bourbon, by diplomatic skill and military energy, so directed, disposed, and justified, as to protect, according to all reasonable calculation, the civil rights of the people of that kingdom, through the same means and on the same political and international obligations which Mr. Canning has made subservient to the independence of King Pedro's crown.

"The spirit through which the whole south of Europe must one day vindicate the liberties which belong to man, has been, though not ostentatiously encouraged, kept alive, and ready for seasonable exercise, by the mere notoriety that Mr. Canning was Minister of Great Britain.

"At home, whatever has been attempted by his Government has been attempted well, though, thanks to his enemies and those of the people of England, it has not been so well accomplished. The principles which he would have realized, had life and power been granted, were those under which the poor man's food would have been increased, and the national expenses economized.

"Of the ornaments and accessories of the deceased Minister, whether as a member of the senate or of society, it is not strictly our design to speak. His eloquence—that much and dangerously overvalued art in England—his eloquence was perfect in its peculiar kind; but that kind was not the most admirable. Grace and elegance, wit and spirit, copiousness and harmony, were all comprehended in it; they formed its distinctions and its attractions; but they are characteristics of a secondary rank. In our minds Mr. Canning was not the foremost, though among the foremost, of contemporary speakers. Brougham is more sarcastic, more impetuous, more friutful and discursive—Plunkett more logical, more original, more forcible, and impressive. Nowhere does there now exist the profound, the terrible, or sublime.

"In private life, and its endearing and sacred relations, Mr. Canning bears the repute of having been an estimable and exemplary person. The friends of his youth seem to be attached and devoted to him, while he is said to have been gaining rapidly on his friends of more recent acquisition.

"Sooner or later, even in this world, justice is rendered to most of us before we die. Let the respective partisans of Canning and Londonderry now meditate for a moment the place which each of these Ministers of the same kingdom fills in the heart of the people. Let, we say, the lesson be studied, and sink deep. The memory of the one is embalmed by his countrymen in unaffected sorrow: the remains of the other were loaded with execrations, and pelted with ordure at the grave." *(Times.)*

We add the following paragraph from another public journal.

"Mr. Canning had assumed almost a Tory mania; and, in 1798, in conjunction with Mr. Frere and Mr. Ellis, he became the conductor of *The Anti-Jacobin; or, Weekly Examiner*—a work which administered to the virulence of party, and to which nothing but the wit and elegance of Mr. Canning, and the ardent spirit of the times, could have given currency or a temporary fame. In this celebrated vehicle of party animosity, wit, sarcasm, irony, vituperation, and every possible weapon, were used to degrade and misrepresent the French leaders, and to render the liberal party in England ridiculous, if not odious, in the eyes of the country.

"In this also he published his 'New Morality,' a severe satire on the reigning follies and vices, in the style of the Imitations of Horace, or rather of Juvenal, which had so well succeeded with Gifford and others.

"A sense of humiliation marked his Parliamentary demeanour to the death of Lord Londonderry. All his speeches

during that interval are tinctured with a degree of morbid impatience, and a sort of personality in his political hostility, which rendered him more an unpleasant than a formidable adversary. He did not either see or take heed of the impressions which the arrows of his satire would make upon others, although no one appeared to be so poignantly sensitive to such attacks as himself. He has been repeatedly accused of alluding to human suffering with a levity inconsistent either with a proper degree of sympathy for the misfortunes of his fellow-creatures, or a decent respect for the feelings of the public. The supposed expression which he made use of, in allusion to an unhappy sufferer under the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, has been made the theme of many a violent attack on Mr. Canning, and the "revered and ruptured Ogden," has been more than once thrown in the teeth of the Right Hon. Gentleman. The author of an anonymous Letter to Mr. Canning, which has been ascribed to Mr. Hobhouse, and which, as a specimen of forcible writing, would not shame the pen of Junius, accuses the speaker of having in this instance committed a monstrous outrage upon his audience; adding, 'that the stupid alliteration was one of the ill-tempered weapons coolly selected from his oratorical armoury.' However, there is some doubt that the epithets in question had been ever used by Mr. Canning. The letter of which we have just spoken, excited a very strong sensation throughout the country. It probed Mr. Canning to the quick, for he dispatched a short letter and a friend to the publisher's, inviting his literary antagonist to a contest with more serious weapons than those of pen and paper. Several years afterwards the arrow still rankled in Mr. Canning's heart—he took all opportunities of insulting Mr. Hobhouse in Parliament, and one night had the rashness to allude to him, and his colleague, as 'the Hon. Baronet and his man.' For these offences Mr. Hobhouse, on a subsequent occasion, introduced, into a speech on the question of Reform, a very elaborate portrait of the Right Hon. Gentleman, which more than revenged the previous insults."

In copying from the public journals the preceding account of Mr. Canning, we must not be understood as pledging ourselves to the opinions of the writers on every part of his character. There are some points on which we decidedly differ from them: they need not be specified. In respect to religious liberty, the chief evidence we possess of Mr. Canning's sentiments is his advocacy of the cause of Catholic Emancipation. This he had latterly supported on very broad principles. The case of Protestant Dissenters he seems never to have understood, and when brought under his notice, to have treated with very unbecoming levity or contempt. He had expressed his opinion, that since the passing of the Annual Indemnity Bills, the Dissenters had no cause of complaint in consequence of the stigmas and proscriptions of the Corporation and Test Acts. It is, however, pleasing to add, that his mind was daily liberalizing in relation to religious as well as to civil freedom.—His speech on the Unitarian Marriage Bill (see above, p. 549), did him great honour. And his declaration as to the late application to Parliament for the repeal of the Sacramental Test, was probably forced from him by a momentary irritation. His threat of hostility, as subsequently explained, was meant to apply to the present time, and not to future, and, in his view, more eligible opportunities.

Rev. David Davis.

Lately, at *Llwyn-rhyd Owen, Cardiganshire,* in the 83rd year of his age, the Rev. David Davis, for nearly sixty years one of the most eminent and popular of the Dissenting ministers, in the Presbyterian connexion, in South Wales. His father was a respectable farmer residing at Goetre-issa, near Lampeter, where Mr. Davis was born on the 14th of February, 1745, O. S. The first elements of his education he received at the village schools of the neighbourhood. For about a year and a half he was placed under the instruction of his relation, the Rev. Josiah Thomas, of Leominster, the father of the late Rev. Timothy Thomas, of Islington. On his return to Wales he went to Llanybydder, to Mr. David Jones, who had been educated at the Carmarthen Academy, and was deemed a man of excellent abilities and a good classical scholar. From hence he was removed to Llangeler, to Mr. Thomas Lloyd, a clergyman of the Establishment, who was considered a sound scholar, a very exact and critical teacher, and a severe disciplinarian.

Mr. Davis being intended for the Dissenting ministry, was sent, in 1763, to Carmarthen to the grammar school, kept by Mr., afterwards Dr., Jenkins, who was also assistant tutor at the Academy. Mr. Davis remained here only a quarter of a year, being admitted a student on the foundation after the Christmas vacation of 1763. At this time the excellent and learned Mr. Samuel Thomas held the

office of Divinity Tutor. His age and growing infirmities compelling him to resign in the summer following, Dr. Jenkins was appointed by the Presbyterian Board to succeed him as sole tutor. Previously to his removal to Carmarthen Dr. Jenkins had kept a school at Llanfyllyn, in North Wales, where the late Dr. Abraham Rees was his scholar. The Carmarthen Academy was at this time in high reputation. Among Mr. Davis's contemporaries were many ministers who afterwards held very respectable situations both in Wales and in England, besides many who have acquired eminence as clergymen in the Establishment; for it was then customary to educate in this institution young men designed for orders in the church. In the number of the Dissenting ministers may be named the late Rev. Matthew Anstis, of Bridport; Rev. W. Howell, for some time tutor of the same Academy at Swansea; the Rev. Abel Edwards; Mr. John Philipps, brother of the late Mr. Philipps, of Clapham, who went to the bar, and was one of Mr. Fox's counsel in his celebrated Westminster contest; and the Rev. Josiah Rees, of Gelligron, in Glamorganshire. These all preceded him to the grave. Three survive of his Dissenting fellow-students, the Rev. John Davies, of London, the Rev. Theophilus Edwards, of Taunton, and the Rev. John Evans, of Stockton-upon-Tees. Among the survivors of his clerical fellow-students may be enumerated the Rev. Mr. Jones, the estimable clergyman of Lewisham, in Kent, and the venerable Archdeacon Beynon, of Golden Grove, in Carmarthenshire, who has been his intimate and steady friend through life.

Soon after completing his studies at the Academy, Mr. Davis accepted (on the 1st of January, 1769,) an unanimous invitation from the congregations under his care, to be the co-pastor of the late Rev. David Lloyd, father of Dr. Charles Lloyd, of London, a man of pre-eminent talents, and in his day the most distinguished of the Presbyterian ministers of South Wales. Mr. Lloyd died on the 4th of February, 1779, universally respected, leaving behind him a professional reputation, which yet survives in the churches of the Principality.

Some years afterwards, Mr. Richard Lloyd, a son of Mr. David Lloyd, was associated with Mr. Davis as his colleague. He inherited his father's talents and popularity.* Mr. Davis united to the laborious duties of a Welsh Dissenting minister, officiating to three or four distant congregations, the occupation of a schoolmaster. From early life he had accustomed himself to tuition, having been for some time assistant in Dr. Jenkins's school whilst he was a student at Carmarthen. He was deemed a very correct and sound Greek and Latin scholar, and an excellent and successful teacher. It may probably be said of him with great truth, that no other individual in the Principality ever made more good scholars. His pupils were not confined to the Dissenters. A considerable number of the most learned and respectable among the Welsh clergy owed their eminence in a great degree to his instructions. For many years a large proportion of the candidates for orders in the diocese of St. David's were young men from his school. Dr. Horsley, after coming to that see, was soon apprized of this fact. The candidates were universally found to pass creditably through their examination; but it was not to be longer endured that the clergy should be indebted to Dissenters for their education. His Lordship apprehended that pupils coming from such quarters would be tainted with theological heresy as well as political disaffection. He consequently established a rule, since rigidly acted upon, that no candidate from a Dissenting school should receive ordination. Certain clerical schools were *licensed*, as those alone from which candidates should be *eligible*. And these licensed schools are now likely to merge, as to this privilege at least, in the new College at Lampeter, which owed its foundation to the pious zeal of the present Bishop of Salisbury.

The Presbyterian Board were once desirous of engaging Mr. Davis's services as the tutor of the Carmarthen Academy. But he declined the appointment. His brother, Mr: Benjamin Davis, afterwards of Evesham, had before held the situation of assistant tutor in that institution under Mr. Gentleman.

At an Association of Dissenting Ministers, held at Llechryd, in Cardiganshire, in 1791, soon after the disgraceful Birmingham riots, Mr. Davis moved a series of resolutions, expressive of their

---

* Another son of Mr. David Lloyd's was Mr. Thomas Lloyd, a learned and amiable man, who was for some time classical tutor at the Swansea Academy. He died of a consumption at an early age.

abhorrence of such outrages, and of their condolence with Dr. Priestley in his sufferings and losses. These resolutions were afterwards transmitted to Dr. Priestley by the late Rev. Josiah Rees, of Gelligron. The proceeding was highly creditable to the parties engaged in it. For they consisted of Trinitarians and Arians, there not being present probably more than one Unitarian at most. Many of them were strongly prejudiced against Dr. Priestley on account of his religious sentiments; but they acted on public grounds.

Mr. Davis was warmly attached to the principles of civil as well as religious liberty. His principles were, however, those of the British constitution, considering that to be the best adapted to the state of society in this country. Being with many other excellent men of the time, friendly to the French Revolution, whilst it promised to issue in the establishment of rational liberty, he was soon reported by some political bigots to the higher authorities as a man to be marked and watched. The hint was taken, and the surveyor of taxes for the district was instructed by the Treasury to keep an eye upon his proceedings. The surveyor having mentioned his instructions to a respectable clergyman to whom Mr. Davis was well known, was informed that he might be perfectly easy on this subject, the clergyman assuring him that he would pledge himself for the constitutional loyalty of his principles and the correctness of his political conduct—and here the matter ended!

As a preacher Mr. Davis possessed uncommon powers. His mind was clear and capacious; he usually took a comprehensive view of his subject, and he was generally very happy in the arrangement of his thoughts. When he took pains in the study and delivery of his sermons, his pulpit eloquence was remarkably striking and effective. His appeals to the understandings, to the consciences, and to the feelings of his auditory were at such times resistless. These excellencies were, however, mingled with some defects. His composition and delivery frequently wanted the correction and polish of a cultivated taste. The character of his auditors, who were for the most part small farmers and labourers, and his confidence in his extemporaneous command of language, rendered him too often careless in the preparation of his public discourses. His pathos, which was among his chief excellencies, and acquired great power from the rich and deep tones of his fine voice, was sometimes pushed to an extreme which greatly weakened its effect. His favourite topic was the love of God to his creatures. And this was a theme on which he displayed his eloquence to the greatest advantage.

He was distinguished by great sensibility and warmth of feeling. This gave elevation and fervour to his devotional addresses, which rendered them peculiarly interesting and animating to his hearers.

Mr. Davis possessed a very happy talent for conversation. His rich humour, his ready wit, and his exhaustless store of anecdotes, caused his company to be much sought. His own delight in society, and the pleasure he imparted to every circle, sometimes led to a dissipation of his time, which prudence and a regard to more serious duties could hardly justify; but it is due to him to say, that his morals were always pure and irreproachable.

The attention demanded by his duties as a minister and a schoolmaster left him little leisure for literary composition. In early life he published a translation, in Welsh, of Scougal's treatise on "The Life of God in the Soul of Man." At the request of Mr. Archdeacon Beynon he began a translation of Dr. Taylor's Key to the Epistle to the Romans, but he made little progress in the work. He frequently employed his pen in the composition of short poetical pieces in the Welsh language, and wrote many excellent hymns. He also translated some favourite English poems. His principal poetical pieces were lately collected and published in one volume duodecimo, under the title of *Telyn Dewi*, or "David's Harp;" to which there is prefixed a portrait of the author. He was esteemed a very good Welsh poet and critic. In the Analytical Review, Vol. VII. pp. 295, &c., is an article by him on the Welsh Poems of Davydd ap Gwilym. Mr. Archdeacon Beynon lately said of him at a public meeting at Carmarthen: "Mr. Davis', of Castle Howel, is the nearest approach, in my opinion, to good poetry of any in the language. Some of his poems are exquisitely beautiful, particularly his translation of Gray's Elegy. This is equal to any thing in any language whatever. If that extraordinary man had been introduced in early life into polished society, and had enjoyed the advantages of an University education, he would, doubtless have proved one of its brightest ornaments."

The following little piece, in one of the Welsh metres, was composedon an ami-

able young lady, who died after the birth of her first child:

Sopor Mariam cepit; in lectum
A luctu recessit:
Ast tuba hanc excitabit,
Ut Maria salva sit.

Soon after the publication of Dr. Priestley's work on Materialism, Mr. Davis wrote the following *jeu d'esprit*, which Dr. Price afterwards read to Dr. Priestley, who was much pleased with it:

Here lie at rest,
In oaken chest,
Together packed most nicely,
The bones and brains,
Flesh, blood and veins,
And *soul* of Dr. Priestley.

Mr. Davis was buried in the ground attached to the chapel of Llwynrhyd Owen. The funeral was accompanied by an immense concourse of people, anxious to testify their respect for the memory of the departed. There were present sixteen Dissenting ministers and seven clergymen. Mr. Jones, the classical tutor at the Carmarthen College, officiated on the occasion, and delivered an excellent and appropriate discourse from 1 Peter i. 8, 9. Mr. Davis educated three sons for the ministry, two of whom survive him; viz. Mr. D. Davis, late of Neath, and Mr. Timothy Davis, of Evesham. He has also left a widow, his faithful and affectionate companion for fifty-two years.

Rev. John Hugh Worthington.

July 4, in the 23rd year of his age, the Rev. John Hugh Worthington, one of the ministers of Cross Street Chapel, Manchester. In our next number we shall give some further account of this very estimable young minister.

Henry Wansey, Esq.

Lately, in his 76th year, Henry Wansey, Esq., of Warminster, F. A. S. He was a man of cheerful piety, of warm and active benevolence, and a sincere friend to civil and religious liberty. Enjoying always a large share of health and spirits; possessed of great vigour of body and mind, being always a very early riser, and making diligent use of his time, he succeeded in obtaining a large stock of general knowledge, and rendered himself a very useful man in his generation, always actively engaged in devising and promoting schemes of general utility and private good. He was of a social disposition, mixed much with the world, and enjoyed an extensive acquaintance among men of eminence in various walks of science. Though ever ready with his pen and in his conversation to advocate his own religious opinions, as his tracts and the publications of the day evince, he maintained friendly intercourse with many of different and opposite persuasions, and with some of the highest rank in the Establishment; and he had many friends whose attachment to him continued unabated through the whole of his long life.

He took an active part in most public works in his neighbourhood, was zealous and useful in the conduct of charitable institutions, for which he frequently received well-merited thanks. He was a frequent writer in the periodical publications of the day, and published several works himself. His work on America, written at a time when that country was much less familiar to us than it is at present, possesses much merit, and was well received.

His frequent journeys to foreign countries, and familiar intercourse with strangers, imparted to his mind something of a romantic character; and he often spoke of the pleasure he experienced at Rome in receiving, in common with other Englishmen, the thanks of those who were redeemed from Algerine slavery, in whose liberation he had been instrumental.

He was the first to propose, and the principal contributor to, the establishment in his native place, of a Dissenters' burial-ground for the use of all denominations,—an advantage to Nonconformists, that relieves them from the necessity of conducting that service in a manner and form at variance with their opinions, and from a reluctant submission to an expense which they often find burdensome.

Mr. Wansey was a devout and a sincere Christian, and a conscientious Unitarian Dissenter; possessed of cheerful views of the Divine providence, and a firm believer in a future state. His end was as tranquil as constant health and spirits had made his life generally happy. He had a paralytic stroke on the 10th July, and died on the 19th, gradually sinking under his disorder, and calmly resigning his breath, without apparent pain.

Mrs. Sarah Higgingson.

August 10, in the 46th year of her age, after a long and painful affliction, which she sustained with the fortitude, resignation, and hope of a Christian, Sarah, the wife of the Rev. Edward Higginson, of Derby.

INTELLIGENCE.

Unitarian Marriage Bill.

We resume our account of the proceedings on this Bill. By some means, alterations have been made in the preamble and in the addition of the last clause for which we are unable to account. Nothing was said on the subject in the debate. The public will readily *guess* whence they come, and will only learn still more to appreciate the cunning which, where it cannot prevent, strives to mar every thing that does not square with its own bigotry. Of course such a clause as the last is not one which will be tamely submitted to, and several other alterations (made either in ignorance or in a desire to render the measure as troublesome as well could be) will have to be revised in another session.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, June 28th.

The House having, on the motion of the Marquis of Lansdowne, resolved itself into a Committee, the Bishop of Chester proceeded to move several amendments, relating to minor points of detail.

On his moving that a justice "being a clerk in holy orders" should not be required to act, Lord Kenyon proposed to move a similar exception of "peers." He saw no reason why they should not have their feelings respected as well as the clergy.

Lord Eldon said, he had always held that a lay magistrate had as much right to be regarded as a clergyman.

The Bishop of Chester said, if these sort of amendments were to be attempted, they had better at once move to throw out the Bill altogether.

Lord Lansdowne contended that it was a benefit to the community, not to these Dissenters, to provide securities. It never could answer to turn them adrift.

Lord Kenyon only meant to contend, that a peer who was a justice had as good right to have his feelings consulted as a clergyman. He thought it very unchristian to call on a Christian magistrate to perform such acts.

Lord Ellenborough concurred with Lord Kenyon that the feelings of a layman were as much entitled to favour as a clergyman's. If there was degradation, it was as much so to one as another. He confessed he did not like this dispensing with all religious ceremony; he liked the former plan better of leaving marriage to the Unitarian ministers, and he thought it would perhaps be better now to require that the parties should first go through some religious ceremony and bring a certificate of it to the magistrate.

The Bishop of Chester reminded the House that a Dissenting minister was in their view only a layman, and therefore a marriage by him was in their eyes marriage by a layman. There was the same objection, therefore, to registering a marriage by an Unitarian minister as one had before a magistrate. He saw no difference in principle.

A Noble Lord (we believe Lord Redesdale) observed, that a great deal of the inconvenience of the machinery of this Bill seemed to him to arise from an anxiety somewhere to retain the fees. He did not approve the plan at all, and thought if they did any thing they should only do as they did with the Jews and Quakers. He for one should feel no scruples as a magistrate if the State ordered it, but he could easily conceive that others might, and if they were relieving one man's conscience, they had no business to load another's. He thought that these persons ought to be excepted as the Jews and Quakers were, providing, however, that they should in some way celebrate the marriages in their own congregations. He did not think the present Bill adapted even to their own wishes and feelings. They were not adverse, as he understood, to a religious ceremony, but rather desired it.

Lord Malmesbury thought they were committing themselves by thus discussing minor amendments in this clause, where he for one should oppose it altogether in every way. Was it considered that if the Bill received these amendments it was to go forth as sanctioned in that state by the House, or was this only *pro formâ?*

Lord Holland. The question before them was on the amendment for excepting *clerks*, to which it had been proposed to add *peers*. The amendment of the Bishop of Chester was only to meet Lord Eldon's objection against the clergyman's being required to do as a justice what was not imposed on him as a clergyman. Then came the question whether it was expedient to receive all the amendments, in order that the sense of

the House might be taken after it was seen what the friends of the measure proposed. He must be allowed to give a brief history of the machinery of the Bill. The first method proposed was to omit part of the liturgy; this was the most simple plan, and was sanctioned by Lord Liverpool. But the Archbishop of Canterbury opposed it, and his arguments convinced him (Lord Holland) that the plan was not desirable nor reasonable to expect; but the Archbishop then conceded the principle of relief. Then came a bill proceeding on the principle of the law of Ireland, allowing the Dissenting ministers to marry. To this it was objected, Where are these marriages to be registered? There were also other difficulties raised, and considerable pathos was shewn in lamentations that the clergy would lose their fees. Well, the framers of the Bill, having no wish to degrade or injure the clergy, wishing only to learn the objections in order to try to remove them, devised another plan, that of legalizing their own marriages, and carrying a certificate to the Church to be registered. Then again the same objectors (who, after all, are in reality opposers of the measure *in toto*) cry out, "Oh! this is making the Church the handmaid of Dissent." Well, then it is suggested to these Dissenters that they should make the marriage a civil act before a magistrate, and that the clergyman cannot then have any difficulty in registering the magistrate's acts. What is the consequence? Why, the very persons who set them upon this, make it the ground of a new opposition. Really he could not conceive how this Bill, or the plan of it, was after all of the consequence that was attached to it. But he was so desirous of yielding to the conscientious scruples of such a body of men as these, and of ceasing thus to trifle with them, that he hardly cared how it was done. He must say he very much preferred the former plan, but he gave way to the objections raised to it; and it was too much now for men who were, in their hearts, against the thing altogether, to make this very yielding to their objections the ground of a new opposition. The measure was analogous to the law of Ireland and Scotland, to the ancient law of England, and to the present law regarding Jews and Quakers. It was a convenient course (if not strictly a formal one) to amend the Bill according to the views of its friends, that all parties may know what is proposed. The Rev. Prelate had kindly offered to do this without the House being called on to pledge itself to the measure which it might afterwards reject. It became them to take some such course after thus defeating the parties three or four times on these cavils about details. If four plans were all rejected, let a fifth be brought forward; but justice to an honoured and respected branch of their fellow-subjects required that they should not thus go on trifling with them by acknowledging the principle, and yet perpetually turning them round on minor points.

Lord ELDON concurred that it would be better, as the House had for *that* Session sanctioned the principle, to leave the friends of the measure to add their amendments,—print the Bill, and come to the consideration of it next Session; no one being to be considered as committed by it. He solemnly in the face of the country declared, that he would no longer continue a magistrate in a country where he should be required to do the acts imposed by this Bill.

Lord MALMESBURY observed, that if the clergy were justified in objecting to act in this matter as magistrates, he saw no reason why he as a magistrate was not to be allowed the same scruple against doing the clergyman's duty in marrying people.

Lord LANSDOWNE. The necessity of regulations on marriages was a matter purely civil. It was undoubtedly further desirable to give the marriage tie the sanction of a religious ceremony. The parties had themselves asked to be allowed to do so, and it had been objected to.

Lord ELLENBOROUGH mentioned the great difficulties which the general Committee on the law of marriage had found in devising any plan for giving relief to Dissenters. He was rather disposed, if they could, to unite the principle of the former Bill with this, by requiring a previous religious ceremony before going to the justice.

The Bishop of CHESTER. The intervention of two parties in that way would only occasion great inconvenience, and he could not help suspecting that the object of so many objections was to throw difficulties in the way of the measure altogether. What was the use of passing a law to compel Dissenters to adopt a religious ceremony? The petitioners, whose petition (a very improper one he thought it) the Noble and Learned Lord read on Tuesday, made it the ground of *their* objection that marriage was made a religious ceremony at all. It seemed quite ridiculous to pass a law to compel them to make it a religious rite. If they wished it to be so, there was nothing in this Bill to prevent their

so celebrating it, and it might be safely left to their own feelings on that head. With the present countless variety of Dissenters it was next to impossible to leave the matter entirely to them, or to have any hope that they would duly attend to registration. But if any plan could be devised providing for regularity in registration, through a notary or otherwise, he saw no objection to leaving all Dissenters to celebrate their own marriages.

Lord TENTERDEN (the Lord Chief Justice) was one of those who voted in the minority against this Bill. He at any rate should suggest an amendment in the declaration requiring it to be shewn that the parties were actually members of a Unitarian congregation. He also objected to making it imperative on the magistrate. He thought he should only be authorized, not required. In populous places there would be no difficulty in finding a magistrate who would act.

Lord ROSSLYN. If the parties were previously married at their own places, they need only *declare* before the magistrate that they *had* so been, which would take away all appearance of his performing the ceremony. He was friendly to the Bill in any way.

Lord REDESDALE thought that making the office optional with the magistrate would remove many difficulties. He still objected to the form as not being, even according to the parties' own views, of a binding character.

The LORD CHANCELLOR referred to the clause which made it binding. He read the Irish statute permitting Dissenters to celebrate marriage. All the principles objected to in this Bill had been recognized, and were the law of Ireland without any complaint. No religious ceremonial was by our own law considered necessary. The consent of the parties gave marriages validity. In some countries of Europe where it was acknowledged that no religious ceremony was necessary, yet marriage was binding, as it would be declared to be by this act. The question was not what the parties *considered* binding.

Lord REDESDALE explained that his observations were only addressed to the supposed desirableness of giving such a sanction to marriage, as, according to the religious views of the parties, was likely to have that effect.

The Bishop of CHESTER's amendment as to "Clerks in holy orders," was then agreed to, and several others proposed by him. At the clause as to payment of fees he observed, that he had not expected to hear the observations which had been made. In many cases they constituted a considerable source of the minister's income. It was their sacred duty to provide for the interests of these persons, and not the less so because they themselves were silent on the subject.

Lord ELLENBOROUGH and Lord TENTERDEN made some observations as to the possibility of improving and rendering more certain the transmission of the magistrate's certificate, by his sending it himself, or by some person authorized by him.

Lord REDESDALE observed, that some better and more general register was very desirable; perhaps nothing more required attention. Greater publicity was very desirable. The parochial returns to the bishops were he believed very imperfect. It was of great importance to consider whether a better general register of marriages, baptisms, and burials, could not be established.

The Report was then ordered to be taken into consideration the next day.

FRIDAY, JUNE 29th.

The Report of the Committee was taken into consideration. Lord TENTERDEN made his proposed amendment in the declaration, and the Bill was ordered to be printed and read a third time that day fortnight. By which means it goes over to next Session, according to the arrangement of the day before.

We subjoin the Bill as amended by the Lords. We refer to our observations at the commencement of our Report of the proceedings, and would only add, that any practical suggestions upon it may be usefully addressed to the Solicitor of the Association.

A Bill [as Amended] by the Lords' Committee, intituled an Act for granting Relief to certain Persons dissenting from the Church England, in respect of the Mode of celebrating Marriage.

The words printed in 'Italics' were added by the Lords' Committee; and the Words at the Bottom of the Pages, are those which stood in the Bill as passed by the Commons, but were left out by the Lords' Committee.

Whereas* *it is expedient to make Pro-

* in the Nineteenth Year of the Reign of His late Majesty King George the Third an Act was passed, intituled 'An Act for the further Relief of Protestant Dissenting Ministers and Schoolmasters;' and in the Fifty-third Year of His said late Majesty an Act was passed, inti-

vision for the Marriage of the Members of certain Congregations of Protestent Dissenters, usually assembling for Divine Worship in certain Chapels or Places duly entered and registered according to Law, who deny the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as it is declared in the Articles of Religion mentioned in the Statute made in the Thirteenth Year of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, and who therefore scruple to be married according to the Office of Matrimony in the Book of Common Prayer: Be it therefore enacted by the King's most excellent Majesty, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the Authority of the same, That at any Time after the passing of this Act, whenever the Banns of Marriage shall have been duly published Three several Sundays in the proper Parish Church or Churches, Chapel or Chapels, as required by Law, between any Two Persons being* *Members of any such Congregation as aforesaid*, who shall be desirous of having the Benefit of this Act, without just Cause or Impediment having been declared against such Marriage, it shall be lawful for the Rector, Vicar, Curate, or Officiating Minister of each and every Parish or Chapelry in which such Banns of Marriage shall have been published, and he is hereby directed and required, to give a Certificate in Writing under his Hand, certifying the due Publication of such Banns, and that no Cause or just Impediment had been declared why the Parties should not be joined together in Matrimony, such Certificate being in the Form specified in the Schedule to this Act marked (B.), with such Variations as Circumstances shall require: Provided nevertheless, that both the Parties shall previously sign a Declaration in Writing, in the Form specified in the Schedule to this Act marked (A.), with such Variations as Circumstances may require; *and such Declaration shall be also certified and attested, in the Form specified in the said Schedule, by the Officiating Minister of such Congregation, if any such there be; and also by Two Elders of the same Congregation, being Housekeepers; and in case there be no Officiating Minister, then by Three Elders of the same Congregations, being Housekeepers; and in which Declaration and Certificate the Place of Abode, and also the State, Profession, or Trade of every Person signing the same, or therein mentioned, shall be truly set forth:* Provided also, that previously to giving such Certificate as aforesaid, the Rector, Vicar, Curate, or Officiating Minister and Clerk of the Parish or Chapelry in which the Woman intending to be married shall be resident, shall be entitled to and shall receive from the Party applying for such Certificate, such and the same Fees, Duties, and Emoluments as might by Law or Custom be demanded for *publishing such Banns and* solemnizing such Marriage in the Parish Church or Chapel of such Parish or Chapelry.

And be it further enacted, That it shall and may be lawful to and for such Persons so proposing to intermarry as aforesaid, or any Person on their Behalf, to carry such Certificate or Certificates of the Publication of Banns, or their Licence, in case the Marriage shall be had by Licence, and to leave the same, together with the said Declaration, *and Certificate thereto subscribed*, or another Declaration *and Certificate*, in the same Form, and signed as aforesaid, with any Justice of the Peace, Mayor, Alderman, or Magistrate, authorized by Law to act as a Justice of the Peace within the * Division, City, Borough, or Corporate Town or Place wherein the said Parties or either of them reside; and such Justice, Mayor, Alderman, or Magistrate, *not being a Clerk in Holy Orders*, shall and is hereby required thereupon to name and appoint a Time, within the Hours appointed by Law for the Celebration of Marriages, and not at a less Distance than the Second Day thereafter, nor a greater Distance than Four Days from the Receipt of such Certificate or Licence and Declaration, *and Certificate thereto subscribed*, at which Time, and at some suitable and convenient Place to be also appointed by such Justice, Mayor, Alderman, or Magistrate, the Parties so proposing to intermarry shall and may appear; and such Justice, Mayor, Alderman, or Ma-

---

tuled 'An Act to relieve Persons who impugn the Doctrine of the Trinity from certain Penalties:' And whereas several of His Majesty's Subjects, being Protestant Dissenters from the Church of England, entertaining conscientious scruples with respect to Belief in the Doctrine of the Trinity, and commonly called Unitarians, regard the Necessity of solemnizing Matrimony according to the Office of Matrimony in the Book of Common Prayer as a Grievance repugnant to their Religious feelings, and have at various Times petitioned Parliament to be relieved therefrom: And whereas it is expedient to grant some Ease to scrupulous Consciences in this respect, without infringing on the general Policy of the Law relative to Marriages:

* Protestant Dissenters of the Unitarian Persuasion,

* County,

gistrate is hereby required and authorized thereupon to attend and take the Declaration of the contracting of Marriage, and to permit such Parties to intermarry before him in the Presence of such Witnesses as are required by Law for the Celebration of Marriages; which Marriage, as the Form thereof, shall be had and declared in Manner and according to the Form following; the Man to be married, taking the Woman to be married by the Hand, shall plainly and distinctly pronounce these Words,—

"I, A. B., do take *and acknowledge* thee C. D. for my wedded Wife* before these Witnesses."†

And then the Woman, taking the Man by the Hand, shall plainly and distinctly pronounce these Words,—

"I, C. D., do take *and acknowledge* thee A. B. for my wedded Husband‡ before these Witnesses."§

Which said Words and Acknowledgment of Marriage shall be fairly written or printed at the Foot of or indorsed upon the Certificate of the Publication of Banns or Licence, as the Case may be, and shall be signed by the Parties married, and attested by the Justice and other Witnesses present thereat, according to the Form following:

"Parish of the Day of in the Year

"We, L. M., One of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace of the County, Division, or other Place, and usually acting in the said Parish as such Justice, do hereby attest that the before-mentioned Words were pronounced and signed by the said A. B. and C. D. in our Presence, at the Time and Place before-mentioned.

"N. O. of
"P. Q. of

And such Marriage, so to be had and declared, shall thereupon be as valid and effectual in the Law to all Intents and Purposes as if the same had been solemnized in the usual Manner in a Church or Chapel by a Minister of the Church of England, and according to the Office of Matrimony in the Book of Common Prayer, and no further or otherwise; and it shall not be necessary thereafter to give in Evidence the Delivery of such written Declaration or Declarations, Certificate or Certificates, *or Attestation*, or to prove that the Parties were Protestant Dissenters of the Persuasion aforesaid, in support of the Validity of the said Marriage upon any Occasion whatever, nor shall any Evidence be received to prove the contrary in any Suit touching the Validity of the said Marriage: Provided always, that no such Justice, Mayor, Alderman, or Magistrate shall proceed upon Certificate of Banns to the Marriage of any Two Persons, both or one of whom shall be under the Age of Twenty-one Years, not being a Widower or Widow, when and in case he shall have Notice of the Dissent of the Parents or Guardians of the Party under Age; neither shall such Justice, Mayor, Alderman or Magistrate, in any Case where a Marriage shall not be had within Three Months after the complete Publication of Banns, proceed to the Marriage of the Parties, until the Banns shall have been republished on Three several Sundays, in due Course of Law, or unless by Licence duly obtained.

And be it further enacted, That Two other Copies of the said Acknowledgment of Marriage and Attestation shall be made and signed immediately after such Marriage, One whereof shall be delivered to each of the said married Parties.

And be it further enacted, That no Licence for a Marriage to be had according to this Act shall be granted without the Production of such Declaration and Certificate thereto subscribed as are herein required to be delivered to the Person granting a Certificate of the Publication of Banns, and that a Copy thereof shall be indorsed on such Licence, and certified to be a true Copy by the Person granting such Licence.

And be it further enacted, That a Fee of Two Shillings and Sixpence shall be paid to the Justice before whom such Marriage shall be had, or his Clerk.

And whereas it is expedient to provide for the regular Registration of such Marriages, and for facilitating the Means of Proof thereof; be it therefore further enacted, That the Justice or other Person as aforesaid, before whom any such Marriage shall be so had, shall immediately thereafter * *return the Acknowledg-*

---

* and do here, in the presence of God, and

† promise to be unto thee a loving and faithful Husband.

‡ and do here, in the Presence of God, and

§ promise to be unto thee a loving, faithful, and obedient Wife.

* make out, sign, and deliver to such Parties a Certificate of such Marriage being had, for which a Fee of Two Shillings and Sixpence and no more shall be paid, and which shall be subscribed by the said Parties, and by at least Two of the Witnesses present thereat, and shall be in the Form specified in Schedule (C.) to this Act, with such Alterations as Circumstances may require, in which Certificate shall be expressed that the Marriage was celebrated by Banns or Licence, and in case of the Marriage being by Licence, if both or either of the Parties so married by Licence be under Age, (not

ment of Marriage and Attestation thereof, herein-before required to be made on the said Certificate of the Publication of Banns or Licence, to some one of the Witnesses present at such Marriage, to be by such Witness delivered to the Parson, Vicar, Minister, or Curate of the Parish in which the Woman shall be resident, shall, at the Request of the Parties, or either of them, or of any One of the subscribing Witnesses, on Production and Delivery of such * *Acknowledgment of Marriage and Certificate,* (which shall be deposited and kept in the Parish Chest or Registry,) and the Fees usual and customary to be paid on Marriages having been duly paid on granting the Certificate of Banns as herein-before mentioned, or being paid † *before* the Registration in the Case of Marriages by Licence, forthwith ‡ cause § *a true Copy of such Acknowledgment and Certificate to be made and entered* in the Register Book of Marriages provided and kept by Law, which Entry shall specify the Names of the Magistrate; and ‖ such Entry * of such Marriage shall be as effectual and valid for all Purposes of Proof of the said Marriage, as the Entry of any Marriage duly had and solemnized, and registered, according to the Usages of the Church *of England*, and according to the Provisions of the Laws now in force relative thereto.

Provided always, and it is hereby enacted and declared, That † *the Person entrusted with such acknowledgment and Attestation* shall procure such Entry or Registration to be made of such Marriage within the Space of ‡ *Three Days* thereafter, but that the Neglect thereof shall not be construed to affect or invalidate the said Marriage; and that in case of Default in § *procuring* such ‖ *Entry* within the Space aforesaid, ¶ the Man so ** *entrusted* shall be liable to forfeit and pay the Sum of Twenty Pounds, one Half whereof shall be paid to the Informer, and the other Half to the Overseers of the Poor of the Parish in which the said Marriage ought to have been registered, and shall be recoverable by Conviction on Information and Summons before any Justice of the Peace having Jurisdiction within such Parish, who shall have Authority to mitigate the said Penalty, nevertheless, to any Sum not less than Five Pounds, and to levy the same, by Warrant under his Hand and Seal, on the Goods and Chattels of the Offender, who shall be at liberty to appeal against such Conviction to the next General Quarter Sessions of the Peace, on entering into a Recognizance, with a sufficient Surety, to prosecute such Appeal and pay such costs as shall be awarded by the Justices at such General Quarter Sessions, who shall also have Power to mitigate the said Penalty: Provided always, that no such Conviction shall take place, or such Penalty be recoverable or inflicted, after the Expiration of Six Calendar Months from the Commission of any such Offence.

Provided nevertheless, and be it further enacted, That nothing herein-before contained shall operate or be construed so as to annul, defeat, or alter the Provisions of any existing Law relative to the previous Publication of Banns, or the obtaining of Licences, or any other Qualifications, Ceremonies, Forms, or Proceed-

---

being a Widower or Widow,) such Certificate shall state the Marriage to be by Consent of the Parents or Guardians, as shall appear by such Licence; and

* Certificate as last mentioned,

† on ‡ make or

§ to be made from the said Certificate, an Entry of such Marriage in the usual consecutive Order

‖ of the Witnesses subscribing the said Certificate, shall be signed and attested by such Minister with his proper Addition, and shall be made in the Form or to the Effect following, with such Variations as Circumstances may require, that is to say,

" A B. of {the / this} Parish and C. D.
" of {the / this} Parish were married
" by {Banns, / Licence,} with Consent of
" {Parents, / Guardians,} the Day of
" in the Year 18 , according to the
" Statute Eighth George Fourth,
" By
L. M. {Justice of the Peace. / Mayor. / Alderman, &c.}
" In the Presence of
E. F.
and G. H.
Registered by me,
L. S. Rector, &c.

And the said Minister in every such Case is hereby directed, empowered, and required to make such Alterations in the printed Forms required by Law for the Registrations of Marriages as are specified and authorized by this Act; and

* of the Registration

† the said Parties so intermarrying

‡ One Week § delivering

‖ Certificate

¶ for the Purpose of procuring such Registration,

** intermarrying

ings, whatsoever requisite for Marriages, except so far as the same are expressly altered or dispensed with in this Act.

Provided always, and be it further enacted, That in case the Parties propose to intermarry by Licence, and not by Banns, it shall and may be lawful for them, on Presentment of the same Declaration *and Certificate*, signed by the said Parties, as is mentioned in the Schedule marked (A.) to this Act, to sue out a Licence in the usual Manner, and under the Restrictions provided by Law in such Cases, which Licence shall and may (with such Alterations of the Form thereof as shall be required for the Purpose or the Circumstances of the Case) express that the same is for the Purpose of authorizing the Minister, Parson, Vicar, or Curate, to register, instead of to solemnize the said Marriage, on Production of the proper * *Acknowledgment* of the said Marriage, *and Attestation subscribed thereto*, and such Licence shall and may, within the Time limited by Law for such Licences remaining in force, be produced and delivered by the Parties to the Magistrate before whom such Marriage is to be contracted, instead of the Certificate of Banns. †

And be it further enacted, That all and every the Penalties appointed and declared by Law for or against the making of false Entries, or the forging or counterfeiting of any Entry in Registers, or of any Licence for Marriage, or for destroying any Register, shall and are hereby declared to extend and be applicable to the falsely making, altering, forging, counterfeiting, or destroying any Entry, Licence, or Register of any Marriage,‡ *or any Declaration, Certificate, Acknowledgment, or Attestation*, to be made, signed, given, or granted under the Provisions thereof, or any signature thereto, or to acting or assisting therein, or knowingly uttering or publishing the same, or any Copy thereof, as true.

Provided also, and be it further enacted, That this Act shall extend to England and Wales, and to the Town of Berwick-upon-Tweed.

And be it further enacted, That Two printed Copies of this Act shall, as soon as conveniently may be after the passing thereof, be provided by His Majesty's Printer, and transmitted to the Officiating Ministers of the several Parishes and Chapelries of England and Wales, and the Town of Berwick-upon-Tweed respectively, One of which Copies shall be deposited and kept, with the Book containing the Marriage Register of such Parish or Chapelry, in the Chest or Box provided for the Custody of the same.

Provided also, and be it further enacted, That nothing in this Act contained shall be deemed or taken to alter or abrogate any Law now in force relating to the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

SCHEDULES TO WHICH THIS ACT REFERS.

Schedule (A.)

WE, the undersigned A. B. *of* , and C. D. *of* , do hereby declare, That we are *Members of a Congregation of* Protestant Dissenters * *who deny the Doctrine of the Trinity, and who usually assemble for Divine Worship in a certain Chapel or Place situate at in the Parish of , and duly entered and registered acccording to Law*, and that we are desirous of taking the Benefit of a certain Act passed in the Eighth Year of the Reign of King George the Fourth, intituled "An Act for granting Relief to certain Persons Dissenting from the Church of England, in respect of the Mode of celebrating Marriage."

As witness our Hands,

A. B.
C. D.

We do hereby certify and declare the Truth of the above-written Declaration, and that the same was signed by the said A. B. and C. D. in our Presence.

As witness our Hands.

E. F. of { *Officiating Minister, or one of the Elders of the above-mentioned Congregation.*

G. H. of
I. K. of { *Two of the Elders of the same Congregation.*

Schedule (B)

I, [Rector, Vicar, Curate, or Officiating Minister,] of the Parish or Chapelry of in the County of do certify, That the Banns of Marriage have been duly published Three several Times between of [or of this Parish,] and of [or of this Parish,] the last of such Publications being made on the Day of One thousand eight hundred

---

* Certificate of the Celebration

† and shall, after the contracting of the said Marriage, be re-delivered by the said Magistrate to the Parties, with the Certificate of the Marriage, and shall be produced and delivered, together with such Certificate, to the Parson, Minister, Vicar, or Curate, on the Registration of the Marriage.

‡ under the Provisions of this Act, or any Certificate

* from the Church of England, of the Unitarian Persuasion,

and that no Cause or just Impediment has been declared why such Parties should not be married according to Law. Dated this Day of One thousand eight hundred

* I. K.

NOTICES.

THE next Half-yearly Meeting of the *Somerset and Dorset Unitarian Association* will be held at Dorchester, on Wednesday, Sept. 5. The Rev. S. W. Brown, of Bridgewater, has consented to preach on the occasion, and it is expected that there will be an evening service.

Ilminster, Aug. 10, 1827.

THE next Session of *Manchester College, York*, will begin on Friday, Sept. 21, by the evening of which day ALL the Students are required to be present.

THE Subscribers and Friends to the *British and Foreign Unitarian Association* are informed, that the *Second Annual Report* is just published, and will be forwarded for general distribution. It may also be had at the Office of the Association, 3, Walbrook Buildings; or of Mr. R. Hunter, 72, St. Paul's Churchyard; of Mr. D. Eaton, 187, High Holborn; and of Messrs. Teulon and Fox, 67, Whitechapel, London.

IRELAND.

Synod of Ulster.

[WE shall here present our readers with a pretty full report of the proceedings of the reverend body named above, which may, we think, be ranked among the most extraordinary that have taken place in any association of ecclesiastics for the last century and a half. The zealous pleaders for the purgation of the Synod of its corrupt and corrupting Arian members, must no longer complain of the persecuting spirit of the Church of Rome, nor accuse it of arrogance and bigotry in confining salvation to those who are within its own pale. It is curious to observe, in some of the speeches on this occasion, the pious concern for orthodoxy, mixed up with a prudent anxiety about the opinion and the feelings *of the Government!* What proportion of the zeal so ostentatiously displayed was occasioned by "the Royal Bounty"? After the termination of the discussion here reported, an animated debate followed, on the question of adopting a test in the Synod, as to the belief of the members in the doctrine of the Trinity. Want of room obliges us to postpone an account of it to a future number.]

The Annual Meeting of the Synod of Ulster, for 1827, was held at Strabane, (County Tyrone,) on Tuesday, June 26th, and following days.

The Rev. Dr. WRIGHT, of Annahilt, Moderator for the preceding twelve months, preached from Col. iii. 14: "*Above all things put on charity;*" and constituted the Synod by prayer.

The Rev. JAMES SEATON REID, of Carrickfergus, was chosen Moderator for the ensuing year, and expressed his intention of enforcing the standing orders of the Synod.

When Mr. ORR, who was assisting the clerk, proposed to read the usual entry, "That Mr. Porter be continued clerk,"

Mr. MAGILL, of Antrim, advanced into the body of the Meeting-house, and placing himself in the aisle, in front of the Moderator, proceeded to address the assembly on a motion he was about to make. He held in his hand a copy of The Fourth Report of the Commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry; and, in the first place, inquired from Mr. Porter, whether the report of his evidenee before the Commissioners of Inquiry, was correct?

Mr. PORTER replied, "The evidence is correctly given, so far as my recollection will bear me out."

Mr. MAGILL was about to read the particular parts of Mr. Porter's evidence, on which his motion was to be founded, when,

Mr. PORTER said, that he hoped the entire minutes of his examination would be read, and no garbled statement made to the Synod.

Mr. MAGILL then read the whole of Mr. Porter's examination, which may be

---

* SCHEDULE (C.)

A. B. of in the County of and C. D. of in the County of were married by { Banns, / Licence, } with consent of { Parents, / Guardians, } this Day of in the Year One thousand eight hundred , according to the Statute Eighth George Fourth,

Before me, L. M. Justice of the Peace for { Mayor, / Alderman, / or, Magistrate, } of

This Marriage was had between us,

A. B.
C. D.

In the Presence of us,

E. F.
G. H.

found at page 136 of the Fourth Report. He complimented Mr. Porter for his readiness in giving his evidence; and expressed his anxiety that the mind of man should be left "free as the wind;" but regretted that this body should have been wounded through the effects of Mr. Porter's evidence. He said he was the sincere friend of the Belfast institution; and regretted that it had been wounded through the Arianism of the Synod; and not by Arianism in itself. "It would appear," said he, "that we have Arians in this body, more real than professed ones. In the name of Christ, let us see who are these masked characters, who hide themselves in the waters of infidelity. (Hear, hear.) It had been said, 'they were few in number;' the 'thinking few.' He trusted they would be few indeed — like some poisonous plants, which, though placed at the distance of a thousand miles from each other, yet withered and destroyed all around them." Mr. Magill then inquired for the Arian creed: and compared a High Arian and a Low Arian to a high-way and a low-way robber—for they robbed the Son of the Eternal God of his crown of glory. He contrasted the minutes of the Synod of 1824, with the assertion that Arian principles had been progressive since 1726; and proceeded to inquire by what spiritual freemasonry these Arians knew each other? For, it appeared, their clerk was their grand master. (Hear.) After stating, that unless he were to raise up his voice in the cause of the holy gospel of the Lord Jesus, he could not enjoy the repose of his pillow; and that this being the first time an Arian had avowed himself to be such in that assembly, they should view it like the fabled Salamander, and crush it. He made some allusion to the people of India, Africa, and the South Seas, fixing their eyes on the Synod of Ulster, and proceeded to move, that "Mr. Porter, having avowed himself an Arian before the Commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry, be no longer continued clerk to the body."

The motion was seconded without comment, by the Rev. Mr. Simpson, of Dublin.

Mr. R. Dill, Sen., supported the motion in a speech of considerable length.

Dr. Wright, of Annahilt, expressed his sorrow that the motion had been made; protested against Arian principles; eulogised Mr. Porter's fidelity as a clerk to that body; expressed his regret that Mr. Porter had been compelled to give evidence; advocated the propriety and honesty of his telling the truth, when he was on his oath, and concluded by moving, "That although this Synod as a body highly disapproves of Arianism, yet that Mr. Porter, having always discharged his duties as clerk with ability and fidelity, be continued in his office."

Mr. Henry Montgomery rose, and avowed himself an Arian, and expressed his willingness that any one should take up his avowal, and deal with him as might be deemed right. Until some one had procured a patent of infallibility, he had as good a right to maintain his opinions, as others had to state theirs. Whilst some ministers of that body thought it right to join the clergy of the Established Church, and were assisting them in their labours of conversion; and whilst ministers of both sects were constantly urging on their Roman Catholic brethren the right of free inquiry—surely it would be only common honesty to grant him what they were offering to others. The measures, now proposed, were calculated to lead to absolute Popery in the Presbyterian Church. He spoke with the highest respect of his Roman Catholic brethren,—no one could mistake his meaning, but it was the principle he referred to. He then read from the Synod's code an extract:—"it is the right and duty of every man to read and examine the Scriptures," and contended, that even the Jews were invited by Christ and his apostles to read and examine the Scriptures. We had but one Lord and Master, even Jesus Christ; and should the Synod of Ulster usurp his place, and deprive them of what Christ freely gave to the unbelievers of his day? If ever the instructions or example of Christ were to be regarded, he could see no grounds for the Synod adopting the motion. He spoke of Mr. Porter's talents, honesty, purity of heart, and uprightness of life; and asked, what crime he had been guilty of? "We are not," said Mr. Montgomery, "charging him with any dereliction of duty as our Clerk, but we are about to punish him for having, when on his oath before a parliamentary commission, honestly confessed what he believed to be the truth. We are about to injure a man for his honesty! Oh, fathers and brethren, is this the conduct of the followers of Christ? Pause before you so commit yourselves, as preachers of Christian mercy and peace among men." He felt no personal anxiety about the issue of the question; it was for the character of the Synod he was alarmed. He referred to secret measures which had been adopted against Mr. Porter; condemned the vulgar and low humour exhibited on this occasion, and asked, would any member of this body use his common servant in this way?—would he turn him out of doors without an hour's

notice? Surely the Synod would not use a brother minister worse than they would a common servant. The manner of the thing proved the malignity of the spirit in which it was engendered.—No notice had been given to Mr. P. of the intended motion.

Mr. MAGILL observed, that he had received the Commissioner's report so very shortly before the meeting of Synod, that he had not time to write. [Mr. Montgomery then put some questions to Mr. Magill, regarding his having consulted with Lord Ferrard on this subject; and it appeared that Mr. Magill had obtained of him a copy of Mr. Porter's evidence on the second Tuesday of May.] Mr. Montgomery then went on to observe, that it would be well if the clergymen and members of the Established Church would purify themselves, before they cast a stigma on them. He lamented the aspect of affairs in that Synod, and asked why Mr. Porter should be punished for doing what Mr. Cooke had done?—[He then read an extract from Mr. Cooke's evidence, in 1825, in which he had said, that "very few of the Arian members of the Synod were willing to avow it."] "You accuse Mr. Porter of bringing a charge of hypocrisy against you, and yet Mr. Cooke had done the same thing twelve months before without remark. In the name of consistency, what do you mean? It is now a century and a year since you drove out one portion of your body; and you are now about to place a moral stigma on your character, which ages cannot remove." Mr. Porter was a civil officer, paid by Government; and that body had no right to interfere in an ecclesiastical manner, and punish such officer for matters of opinion. On these grounds he opposed the motion.

Mr. PORTER said, that his personal feelings dictated that he should have remained silent, but this might be construed into disrespect. He denied that the present motion had been rashly made, and said that for many years it had been in a state of concoction. He said that these were not random assertions, for there were two gentlemen in the house who had been solicited to join in the cabal against him. Still, however, as the season drew near, their courage began to fail. It was found that no effective strength had been collected. The good work was of course necessarily delayed till a more convenient season; and the mortification of seeing Mordecai the Jew seated at the king's gate, had to be a little longer endured. He said the season for the attack had at length arrived: and although some were dissatisfied with him on account of religion, and some on account of politics, yet he felt satisfied, the whole of the present proceedings had their origin in personal hostility. Mr. Magill and Mr. Simpson were mere tools in the hands of designing men. Mr. Porter felt assured that his political feelings had their share in producing the present procedure; and that his advocacy of Roman Catholic Emancipation had been partly instrumental in producing the present motion; and entered his protest against the unjust and ungenerous principle, that he was to be held accountable, as their clerk, for any thing not illegal or dishonourable, which he might conceive himself called on to say or do, as a free-born Irishman. He declared himself favourable to Catholic Emancipation: and protested against being made a victim to party for having merely avowed himself friendly to a measure which had on three several occasions received the stamp of the Synod's approbation. The present procedure against him could hardly originate in that; and as to the prejudice which might exist against him on account of his religious sentiments, he had Mr. Cooke's authority for stating that he held those sentiments with between thirty and forty members of the body.—Differences of opinion had long existed; and he would not insult the body by supposing, that so long as it retained Arians in communion, it would exclude them from offices of ecclesiastical emolument. The Synod had chosen for its Moderators, Dr. Campbell, Dr. Crawford, Dr. Nelson, Dr. Dickson, Mr. Cuming, (who was Mr. Porter's immediate predecessor in the Clerkship,) Mr. Shaw, Mr. Bankhead, Mr. Dunlop, Dr. William Nelson, and Dr. Malcolm, who were all deceased; he would not name the living man, of new-light sentiments, who had been chosen to fill their chair, as it might be considered invidious; but as the Moderatorship was a spiritual or ecclesiastical office, and as men of those sentiments had been chosen to that office, without detriment to the religious character of the body, surely their admission to the secular office of clerk could not be injurious. But the salary, the money to be derived from the situation, that was the rub against the grain, which had set on end ministers' sanctimonious bristles. They admitted men of openly acknowledged new-light principles to ministerial communion and places of spiritual trust, but were quite horrified at the idea of appointing a person of that description to a civil situation, if it happened to be lucrative. Mr. Porter contended that the situation of clerk was always held during life or good behaviour; and although the words, "Mr. such a-one

continued clerk," were annually printed, yet he challenged any one to shew that they were not words of mere form. On this consideration he had been appointed to the office, and if fidelity had hitherto been regarded as the tenure by which the situation was to be held; and if the adoption of a different principle were now contemplated, then, Mr. Porter contended, the Synod were bound, as men of honour and fairness, to give him timely warning of the intended innovation. Even those who had brought forward the motion, had not the candour or manliness to apprize him of the meditated attack; and he called on persons present to say whether the Synod had not been secretly searched for support—but he had solicited no man's vote; he relied on the honour of the Synod of Ulster. Should he be removed from the office, the loss would fall on him and his family; but the disgrace would remain with the body. He had done nothing of which he should be ashamed; his religious opinions were as well known to his brethren the day they appointed him to office, as they were at the present moment. He had practised no deception, he had betrayed no trust, nor would he bend his body to one *unmanly stoop, nor his spirit to one unworthy* concession. Should the Synod's confidence be now withdrawn from him, he should ever regret the privation; for their confidence was a possession which he prized most highly; but he had no retractation to make; no time-serving apology to offer. For eleven years he had officiated as their clerk; with what ability, it was not for him to determine; but he would say, that with greater fidelity those duties never had been, and never would be discharged.

Mr. Brown, of Aghadowey, urged, that Mr. Porter's feelings were warm, that he had made an incorrect report of the proceedings of the Synod, that he had a body of men of certain known religious principles always about him reporting the proceedings. He should, therefore, be removed from the clerkship.

Mr. Elder, Sen., said, that he had voted for Mr. Porter to be appointed clerk; but he did not then know he was an Arian. From the time he saw the minutes of the Education Commission he had changed his opinion. He said he could not look on an Arian as a brother; because the Arian denied that the Lord Jesus was God over all. Mr. Elder then quoted a long list of texts of Scripture in support of his opinions; and went on to lament the present state of the Synod; imploring it to consider in what light it must be looked on by government. They were, he observed, a body of non-subscribers; and whilst subscription had waned, Arianism had been gaining ground. Dr. Bruce had said it was gaining ground in the Synod: Mr. Porter had avowed the same; and, therefore, he (Mr. E.) must join in voting him out of the clerkship. He had been forty seven years a member; he might never again be heard in the assembly; and he would, therefore, now raise up his warning voice, and implore them to purge Arianism out of the Synod; for as the cause of Arianism increased, the cause of the Lord Jesus declined. He lamented to hear two members of that body declare themselves Arians; and deplored the state of their congregations. If the Synod allowed them longer to remain in it, they would infect the whole body; and they could never expect to enjoy the glorious blessings of eternal joy through the Everlasting Head of their Church. For, should they remain as they were, how dreadful must be their situation, at the great day of judgment, before the throne of the Most High, and in the congregation of saints and angels!

Mr. R. Dill would have supported a motion to separate the Arians from them, as a body; but would not sanction a *measure which went to punish their clerk*, on account of the peculiar features presented by that body. He would vote for the amendment.

Mr. Morell supported the amendment on the same grounds.

Mr. Magill would hereafter move for the expulsion of the two avowed Arians; meanwhile the Synod must choose a clerk.

Mr. Bleckley (of Monaghan) had intended to give a silent vote; but he felt compelled publicly to state that he most sincerely wished for the expulsion of Arians from the body; yet, he could not bring himself to vote against Mr. Porter being continued clerk, because he had given his evidence conscientiously on his oath. He wished Arianism driven from the Synod, for it had withered up the best interests of the Christian Church.

Mr. Carlisle (of Dublin) expressed his firm belief in the Trinitarian doctrines; condemned the causes which were the foundation for Mr. Porter's giving his evidence; opposed subscription as having never purified any church; would have every man tried by the Bible alone; expressed his belief that Arianism was on the decline; inquired what opinion the world would form of the Synod if it dismissed Mr. Porter from being clerk, and yet kept him a member of its body; spoke of the injury which would be done to Mr. Porter in his congregation by this measure; and felt

convinced, that, by exciting the sympathy of the people, on account of the harshness of the case, they would give the doctrines of Arianism a firm hold. He saw nothing but mischief in the measure.

Mr. PARK (of Ballymoney) could not agree with either the motion or the amendment. His doctrinal opinions were well known to be opposed to Arianism; and he could not conscientiously support the amendment, because it went to keep Mr. Porter in the clerkship; but he could not bring himself to believe, that it would be acting like one Christian to another—"for I will call Mr. Porter a Christian."

Mr. PORTER. "I am much obliged to you."

Mr. PARK. If they were to dismiss him from his situation, without sufficient notice, he suggested the propriety of both motion and amendment being withdrawn; and wished a declaration to be entered in the Minutes, that the Synod would next year proceed to the election of another clerk. He hoped before the Synod closed its sittings, to find a plan adopted which would enable them at the next Synod to know more correctly each other's opinions on this subject. He was anxious that an active canvas should be set on foot, and that they should be prepared to meet the question next year.

Mr. HAY trusted that Mr. Park's view was not the view of the Synod. He wished rather that the question should be met in the spirit of Christian charity at the present session, and that Mr. Porter and his family should not be kept in suspense. Mr. Porter's principles were pretty generally known at the time of his election. He (Mr. H.) was his opponent, and a candidate for the situation of clerk; but it was not fifteen minutes after Mr. P.'s appointment when he assisted him in the duties of his office. He could, therefore, speak pretty accurately of the conditions on which he received it, and he felt the understanding to be, that unless he was guilty of a breach of duty, he should not be removed for life. He did not think Mr. Porter guilty of a breach of *duty;* and, if there were Arians in the Synod, (which had been sworn to by more than Mr. P.,) it would be hard to visit the crime on him. Mr. Hay put it to the feelings of the body whether Mr. Porter should be sent home, with feelings deeply wounded, after eleven years' faithful and useful services.

Mr. COOKE felt it his duty not to give a silent vote. He was in the habit of receiving from Mr. Carlisle much Christian instruction; and if he (Mr. Carlisle) could convince him of one thing, he (Mr. Cooke) would have nothing more to say. Mr. Carlisle had observed that the Bible was sufficiently powerful to purify a man before he entered into the door of the church. If it would effect this at the door, why not inside the house? If they found that an enemy's army had, under false colours and assumed clothing, entered into a garrison, would they not use all their exertions to have them driven out, lest they conquered and overthrew the citadel? If they plotted, should they not counterplot? If they mined, should they not undermine? If they found that men had come into the church without passing through the Bible at the door, should they not drive them out as an enemy that had come into the garrison under false colours? Let those persons be tried by the Bible, and let them see who were the enemies. Let Mr. Carlisle convince him that the enemy should be retained, and he (Mr. Cooke) would yield to him. If a wolf had gotten into the fold, in sheep's clothing, should the shepherds not drive him out? Should he be allowed to remain and destroy the flocks and the young lambs? Surely not. Let them then try the flock, carefully inquire who were the wolves that had crept into the folds of Christ's flock, that they might drive them out; or, if they were too strong for them, that they might withdraw from them, and take their flocks with them. He had heard much about the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. Before God, he could not silently stand by and contemplate a unity of the spirit between men who assert Christ to be a mere man, or a little more than a mere man, and those who believe him to be the Eternal Son of God, the Supreme God over all. What unity could there be between the man who looked on Jesus Christ as an exalted angel, and he who worshiped him as the Supreme and Divine Head of the Christian Church, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace? Could persons who held such different opinions about the means of eternal salvation, hold the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace? No, never. Let them withdraw from them; that they might, in sincerity and in truth, give unto their Lord and Master, even the Lord Jesus, that divine homage without which there could be no unity of the Spirit. They had been told that they had been in the habit of choosing moderators and clerks who were Arians. But if they had been wrong in doing so in past times, should they continue to do so? Should they retain in their household physicians whose skill could not cure their own diseases? Physicians, heal yourselves:

preachers, preach unto yourselves; and when you have purified yourselves, then will your preaching unto others be pure, even as was the preaching of the Lord Jesus. The conduct of the Established Church towards this body had been forced into their debates. The Established Church had indeed of late taken great interest in their concerns; and the numerous conversions it had made, through the outpouring of the glorious Gospel of God, had cast a stigma on them and their labours, as servants of their Divine Master. But there had been no interference, except through motives of personal kindness. More had been done, within the last twenty or twenty-five years, to make the reformed churches better known to each other, than for centuries before. This body as a church had also become better known, through the labours of their missionaries in the South of Ireland, and their preachers in England and Scotland; and the circulation of the Bible had made them all better known to each other, and enabled Christ's children to know each other. They were to be known, also, by their public officers. If they had an officer, therefore, who had publicly avowed himself an Arian, should they, knowing it, retain him in office? Now that their eyes were opened, let them separate the wolves from the sheep. Let them divide, and let Lot's flock take the right bank of the Jordan, and Abraham's the left; but, in God's name, let them divide their flocks. He wished the clerkship to be held in abeyance; and he would, next day, propose a measure for the separation of this Synod. He illustrated his arguments by referring to an ambassador at a foreign court, who openly avowed his disloyalty to George IV., and inquired if this rebel would still be retained as the king's ambassador? How much more necessary was it, therefore, to dismiss an ambassador who had openly avowed himself the enemy of their Heavenly King? He thanked his God he was not of the "thinking few" who would rob the Lord Jesus of his eternal glory; and called on the Synod, in the name of God, and of his holy Son, and by all the terrors of the day of judgment, to rouse themselves from their slumber of death, to renew their faculties, and to become "the thinking many."

Wednesday, June 27th, 10 o'clock.

Mr. Hogg said, that he wished to explain his reasons for not voting on the present question. Mr. Porter was an upright and honest man; and though he (Mr. H.) was satisfied that these secret Arians should be dragged into the light and exposed to the eye of government, yet he would not support a measure which would sacrifice Mr. Porter to atone for the errors of others.

Mr. S. Dill said he should deem himself unworthy of the character of a preacher of the word of his Divine Master, if he did not stand forward and bear testimony to certain doctrines of the Christian religion. Though he felt no desire to tyrannize over the mind of men—for opinion should be free as the wind—yet great care should be taken of the religious qualifications of the members of that body. Liberality had too long been the watch-word of scepticism; and he much doubted whether the liberality now contended for, did not partake of that character. He contended, that Calvinism and Arianism could not both be the doctrine of the Scriptures; for the poles could not be more opposite than they were. Therefore, Arians and Calvinists should neither worship in the same temple nor give each other the right hand of fellowship. In fact, they did not worship the same God; for, if any doctrine were more clearly revealed in the Scriptures than another, it was, that Christ is God. Christ was the corner-stone of their religion; remove it, and the entire fabric tumbled into ruin. Mr. Dill then entered into a lengthened investigation of the scriptural proofs of Christ's divinity; and observed, that Arianism led to the principles of Atheism. (Order, order.)

Mr. Stewart defended Mr. Dill as being in order; and Mr. Montgomery trusted that if Mr. Dill were allowed to pursue this train of argument, gentlemen on the opposite side would be granted a similar privilege.

Mr. Dill said, that if these were speculative principles, then he should be sorry to adopt this course; but so far from being speculative, they were the vital principle from which all religious practice must proceed. The Scriptures placed principle as the very ground-work of practice; salvation depended on principle, and on the very single principle now under discussion. "He that believeth, shall be saved; and he that believeth not, shall be damned." "If (said Mr. Dill) what I have now said have any foundation in the Scriptures, Arians and Calvinists cannot live in the bond of fellowship." He then proceeded to eulogize the labours of the Established Church, in the works of which he saw the outpouring of the Spirit. He also saw something of the same kind kindling in that body. Not long since there was a death-like silence in the South of Ireland; at present they perceived the

workings of divine influence in that quarter. He referred to the allusion made to the peace and calmness of the Synod for many years, and said, that that peace was the silence of death, and not the peace of God. That peace might be compared to the peace which prevailed in the cave of Æolus, when the winds were striving for mastery; but the hour had at length arrived when they must be loosened from their confinement. There must be now no neutrality—the cause they contended for was the cause of their heavenly Father; and as one portion of that body believed Christ to be God, and another, that he was a mere man, there could not now be a neutrality between them, nor could they give each other the right hand of fellowship.

Mr. Dill bore testimony to the manliness of character and purity of motive which characterized Mr. Porter; but there were some circumstances connected with the publication of the minutes of that body, independent of Mr. Porter being an avowed Arian, which should not pass unnoticed.

Mr. Porter was supported by Mr. Reid, of Rathmelton, in the correctness of his minutes.

Mr. PORTER then appealed to the meeting, whether these were the grave charges for which he was to be removed from his situation; and said, that such conduct would shew to the world the nature of the present proceedings.

Dr. HANNA begged to remind the Synod of the length to which the discussion had gone. He was well pleased with Mr. Dill's address as an able *exposé* of their doctrines; but he (Dr. H.) was anxious that they should come to the merits of the question. He had yesterday breathed a sigh to think, that of late that Synod could never meet without a constant recurrence of such unpleasant and distracting discussions; and it should be borne in mind, that when Mr. Porter gave his evidence, he was on his oath. Mr. Porter was a man of whom all who knew him had the highest opinion, and they must give him the fullest credit for his talents as a clerk to that body, and for his best intentions to do his duty faithfully. But it appeared that the present charge was not on account of his incorrectness as a clerk, but because he had avowed himself to be an Arian. In such circumstances it might be well that a measure were brought forward to clear that body of the charge of Arianism; and this he would not object to. Allusions had also been made to dividing the Synod; he deprecated all such attempts, as calculated to increase the very thing they wished to destroy. Drive the Arians from amongst them, or withdraw from them, and they would be adopting the very way of establishing and confirming Arianism. Gentlemen who wanted to purify the body, should recollect that division was not the way. He was satisfied that Arianism was dying a natural death, and he wished for some measure to be adopted, more agreeable to him than the motion or amendment, which would clear the Synod from the charge made against it of countenancing Arian principles.

Mr. N. ALEXANDER said, that it appeared to him to be a most injudicious measure to encourage any view which would go to effect a division of the Synod of Ulster. In regard to the opinions of the gentlemen who had indulged themselves in such virulent attacks on those persons who differed from them on doctrinal points, he must say, that he totally differed from them when they asserted that Calvinists and Arians do not worship the same God. They worship the same God, but they were divided in opinion on the subject of the attributes of Christ. For his part, he had examined the Scriptures most carefully, and he could not discover that one universal belief, with regard to the nature and substance of Christ, was essential to salvation (hear, hear); but he had found in the sacred writings that he who loveth not his brother, is not in the way of salvation. Mr. Alexander then proceeded to speak of the manly virtues of Mr. Porter, and observed, that he was about to be punished, not on the ground that he had thought for himself, but because he did not perjure himself and conceal his real sentiments.

Mr. M'ALDIN was strongly inclined to coincide with the opinions of Dr. Hanna. Mr. M'A. avowed himself opposed to the Arian doctrines, but condemned the contemplated separation of the Synod. He would exhort the meeting to treat their brethren who differed from them with a spirit of kindness and forbearance, and to melt down all asperities in the crucible of charity and concord!

Mr. —— DILL felt assured, that unless they had a clear understanding with one another, it would be impossible that they could spread abroad the true principles of the Gospel. They should not fear differences of opinion arising amongst them. There was a division took place amongst the apostles. Peter was separated from his brethren, and Paul withstood him to the teeth. He denied that high Arianism approximated to Calvinism, and insisted that those two bodies in the Synod hung like a dead weight about the necks of each other. They had, to be sure, long agreed on minor matters; but they had kept the doctrines out

of sight, lest they should bring shame on themselves. He spoke in the highest terms of Mr. Porter's character and uprightness as a man, and felt opposed to making a sacrifice of Mr. Porter, on account of the divided state of that body; but he would hold no union with his fathers and brethren if they differed from him regarding the unity of the spirit in Christ Jesus. The time was now come when they must separate from them. They had brought shame upon themselves by putting up these men in the high places of the synagogue. They had published sermons to the disgrace of that body, shewing them forth to the people of England and Scotland as a body of Arians. Now was the time for them to shew forth to the world, that they were not men arrayed in hostility against their Lord and Saviour. Let them go forth from them with the banner, "Christ and him crucified." Those "thinking few" in the South, who were sent there to preach the Arian doctrines, had been scattered to the winds by the word of the Lord.

Mr. PORTER rose to complain of his principles being misrepresented by several of the speakers. He then read an extract from a sermon, which he had preached on a sacramental occasion, when some persons then in the Synod were present, containing a statement of his opinions on the subject of the Trinity, and which represented Christ in the most exalted station in which he is held by High Arianism.

Mr. —— DILL (in continuation) did not look upon Mr. Porter as at all the object which they had now in view. The eyes of all the world were upon them, and they should at once come to a decision on the subject. [Some other members also disclaimed any intention of misrepresenting Mr. Porter, or involving him in the great question at issue.]

Mr. DILL said, that if the Arian preachers of that body were expelled, their pulpits would for ever be hermetically sealed against the introduction of Calvinism. As he believed Arianism was on the decline, he would prefer to see it expire by a natural death.

Mr. MORELL said, that the question had assumed a new aspect; the business relative to the clerkship was altogether laid aside, and they had now entered on the subject of doctrine. He therefore felt desirous that they should proceed to business in a regular manner, by appointing a clerk; and, before they separated, they could pass such a resolution, as would express their disapprobation of Arian principles. He accordingly read a proposition to that effect; when

Mr. STEWART (of Broughshane) rose, and read a resolution which he said had been prepared on the preceding evening by a number of elderly clergymen, assembled for the purpose. The motion was to the effect that the Synod deny the correctness of Mr. Porter's evidence, that there are more real than avowed Arians in the Synod, but that they do not think it expedient to dismiss him from the clerkship, in consequence of the faithful manner in which he discharged the duties of his office. He, (Mr. S.,) however, differed from those persons who wished to have the motion passed; and would rather see the original motion adopted. He viewed the question in the same light as Mr. Bleckley—they ought not to discharge their clerk, because he had fearlessly and manfully told the truth; but they should change him, when they found that a person holding his opinions, and acting as their clerk, was injurious to their interests. It was nonsense to say, that because a clerk was continued from year to year, such a practice should become law. He next argued that Mr. Porter should not be viewed as the minister of Newtownlimavady, but as the clerk of the Synod; and adduced in confirmation of this argument the dismissal of Mr. Cuming;* he denied that he had joined any party to effect Mr. Porter's removal; but he had as good a right to ask his friends to vote against Mr. Porter, as he (Mr. P.) had to solicit his friends to support him in his situation. It was the first time he had ever heard of a body dead to its reputation and character; for they ought to use their best endeavours to stand well in the opinion of government, from which they received so great support. Indeed, of late years government had paid more than ordinary attention to that body; and perhaps the very examination of their clerk was in consequence of its anxiety to become better acquainted with them. He then instanced the case of a faithless ambassador, who had misrepresented the ministers and the government which sent him to a foreign court; and asked, would that ambassador be retained in his situation, after his faithlessness had become known? They had heard it stated, that a certain church had become very friendly to them of late, and there were some who had been kind enough to tell them, that there was a time when the members of that body were more united in the bond of peace. Perhaps this calm of peace was in 1726; perhaps it was in the golden

---

* *Mr. Cuming never was dismissed.* He was clerk of the Synod from the hour of his election to that of his death. —*Note of the Christian Moderator.*

age. But the stillness to which they had referred, was the stillness of death. They found that more than one hundred seceding congregations had started into existence, independent of this Synod; had the members of this body done their duty, this might have not been the case; they might now be double their present number.

Mr. HAY read the Minutes relative to the case of Mr. Cuming, and contended that the case was irrelevant.

The MODERATOR observed, that the Synod had gone into a charge not contained in the motion; and hoped the discussion would soon draw to a close.

Mr. PORTER defended his motives, when he said there were "more real than professed Arians" in the body. He did not mean to charge the members of the Synod with hypocrisy; but to state that they kept back from avowing their entire sentiments on this point of doctrine.

Mr. R. DILL rose and said, that every additional circumstance which came forward, went to serve Mr. Porter. His (Mr. Dill's) opinions on the doctrine of Arianism and Calvinism were well known: he had often preached against the Arian hypothesis, because it was subversive of the best and dearest principles of Christianity; but what had these things to do with the office of clerk? The clerk held a civil situation; his opinions could not be brought to bear on his duties. He filled a mechanical station—to take down the proceedings of the body—to preserve their papers. Had he been faithful in all these things? Had his religious sentiments infused themselves into their records? No, their *Clerk* was a nonconducting substance. Under these circumstances, it would appear, in the eyes of the world, a species of persecution to dismiss him for the expression of his opinions. As to a declaration on the subject of Arianism, he would unite with his brethren in their expressions on that subject, but never would give his consent to the motion now levelled against Mr. Porter. He therefore would vote for the amendment.

Mr. DENHAM, Sen., approved of giving Mr. Porter due notice of the intentions of the framers of the motion. He would support the amendment which had been put into Mr. Stewart's hands by some of his elder brethren. The clerk read Mr. Stewart's amendment, which was in substance,—

"That the Synod had heard with deep regret, from the printed evidence of the Rev. William Porter, their clerk, given before the commissioners of Education Inquiry, on the 17th of October last, that although he set out in life with orthodox sentiments he had become what was commonly called an Arian; that he should have felt himself called upon to state, as his opinion, that there were more real than avowed Arians in the Synod; thus widely disseminating a charge of deception and hypocrisy against several of the brethren; that Arianism was gaining ground among the thinking few; and that a comparison of the new code of laws with the sentiments of the Synod in the year 1726, the period when the members of the Presbytery of Antrim were expelled, shewed that new-light principles had been progressively advancing among them, and that the prevalence of orthodox sentiments, among the young men reared in the Institution, was owing to the popularity of those sentiments among the laity;—the Synod feel it to be their duty to express their warmest indignation against those statements of opinion, and declared their conviction that they were not founded in fact; yet, as the removal of their clerk from office on this account, might be construed into persecution for the sake of opinion, and in consideration of the able manner in which he had generally discharged the duties of his office, they did not consider it expedient to remove him from it."

Mr. PORTER again rose and said, that any trifling error, or supposed error, which had been made in publishing the Minutes was commented on with scrupulous severity, but not a word was said of the great improvements he had made in their arrangement and publication. It was a common remark that the good men did lived not after them; but his was likewise to be buried before him. The amendment proposed by Mr. Stewart was calculated to crush him to the dust; and the moment it passed he would resign the clerkship. So long as the Synod confined itself to an expression of dissent from him on disputed points, giving him credit for sincerity, he could not complain. But the proposed amendment was calculated to wound his feelings and injure his character. It was an insult; and to an insult he would not submit. The evidence he had given before the commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry had been made the pretext for removing him from his situation; but insinuations had been made, and whispers had gone abroad, about twelve months ago, that such a measure was contemplated.

Another discussion ensued, which it is unnecessary to detail; at the close of which the following amendment passed by a majority of 32, chiefly ministers.

"Resolved, That this Synod has heard with the deepest regret, from the printed evidence of the Rev. W. Porter, their

clerk, *given on oath before the Commissioners of Education Inquiry, on the 17th of October, 1825, that though he set out in life with orthodox principles, he is now what is usually called an Arian :—that he should have stated it as his opinion in that evidence, that there are more real Arians than professed ones in this body; and should have farther expressed his opinion, that a comparison of the New Code of laws with the proceedings in 1726, when the members of the Presbytery of Antrim were expelled, shews that new-light principles have been progressive amongst us; and that Arianism is gaining ground among the thinking few; and that the prevalence of orthodox sentiments among the students reared in the Institution is owing to the popularity of those sentiments amongst the laity. The Synod feel it their duty, while they admit the honesty and sincerity of Mr. Porter, to express their high disapprobation of those statements of opinion, and to declare their decided conviction that they are not founded in fact. Yet as the removal of their clerk from office on this account might be construed into persecution for the sake of opinion, and in consideration of the able manner in which he has discharged the duties of his office, they do not consider it expedient to remove him from it."*

Thursday, June 28th.

After some routine business had been gone through, Mr. Cooke gave in a protest signed by 48 members against Mr. Porter's appointment to the clerkship, and moved that it be entered in the minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dill. After some discussion, and the substitution of the words "continuance in office," for "appointment," it was carried by a majority of ten, a number of members not voting. The protest was as follows :—

"We the undersigned members of the General Synod of Ulster, do most solemnly and decidedly, yet respectfully, protest against the foregoing decision, and beg leave to assign the following reasons :

"1. Because we conceive it to be inconsistent with the original constitution, and injurious to the religious interests, of this Church, that Arians should be members of its courts, much more that they should be appointed its chief and most confidential officers.

"2. Because public bodies being judged chiefly by the character of their official members, and Mr. Porter's character as an Arian being matter of notoriety and record, we conceive his continuance in the office of clerk to be deeply injurious to the religious character of this body.

"3. Because, while we are fully convinced of the sincerity with which the great majority of this body have expressed their abhorrence of the principles of Arianism, yet we conceive Mr. Porter's continuance in office calculated to neutralize the influence of these distinctions, and to support the cause of Arianism in this body."

[We congratulate Mr. Porter and his friends, that the worst crime which his adversaries could prefer against him was his honest and manly avowal and defence of his religious opinions.]

CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from Crediton, from Mr. Alexander, Mr. G. Dyer, J. C. M., &c.

Some articles of Intelligence are unavoidably postponed.

The following Notices arrived too late for insertion in their proper places :

"Part of the congregation, late under the pastoral care of the Rev. Mr. Horsey, of NORTHAMPTON, have seceded from the old Presbyterian Chapel, on account of the introduction into it of Trinitarian worship and Calvinistic preaching, and have taken the lease of a chapel late in the occupation of the Wesleyan Methodists. This Chapel has been fitted up anew, and will be opened for Unitarian worship on *Friday, the 21st of September*, when a sermon will be preached in the morning, at the usual time, by the Rev. ROBERT ASPLAND, of Hackney. There will be a religious service also, in the evening. A Plain Dinner will be provided. On the following Lord's-day, Mr. Aspland is expected to conduct the services of the Chapel."

"The Southern Unitarian Fund Society will hold its Annual Meeting at Portsmouth, on Thursday, the 20th of September. The service in the morning will be at the General Baptist Chapel in St. Thomas's Street, at Twelve o'clock; after which the business of the Society will be transacted. The Sermon addressed to the Society will be delivered in the High-street Chapel, in the Evening, the service to begin at a quarter before Seven o'clock. The Rev. T. W. Horsfield, of Lewes, has kindly engaged to be the Society's preacher this year."

It is stated that there was an error in the Report of the Manchester College Examination inserted in the last Number, the Prize for Classical proficiency in the second year having been awarded to Mr. Charles Davidson.