

# THE MONTHLY REPOSITORY

AND

## REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, No. X.

---

OCTOBER, 1827.

---

### BAVARIAN CATHOLICISM AND CLERICAL EDUCATION.

WE have lately noticed the restraints imposed by several Catholic governments upon ecclesiastical tendencies to interfere with the interests of the State, and we may perhaps usefully follow up the same subject with some particulars as to the regulations imposed by the Bavarian Government on the education and qualifications of the clergy of its establishment, for which we are indebted to an article in the *Revue Encyclopédique* for May, 1827.\*

The education of the clergy has always been a subject of considerable solicitude among the German princes. The Austrian reforms under Maria Theresa, Joseph II., and the present Emperor, are generally known. The grand duchy of Baden, Wurtemberg, and Bavaria, have followed the example. In Bavaria, in particular, a regularly organized system has been established in accordance with the fundamental principles in ecclesiastical matters recognized by the constitution, and with the concordat of 1817.

It should, in the first instance, be observed what are the general principles which in Bavaria regulate the relations between the Church and the State.

In the first place, the Catholic religion is declared to be the religion of the State, but all other modes of faith and worship are free. Every citizen, whatever be his creed, has the same rights, civil and political, and is equally admissible to all public employments and privileges.

In the second place, the articles of the concordat concluded with the See of Rome, are in their application declared to be subordinate to the regulations and principles of the fundamental law on which the constitution is founded, and especially to the edict concerning matters of religion which forms part of that law.

Thirdly, every thing which concerns public instruction and study is considered in Bavaria as forming part of the higher administrative police under the controul of the government. The ecclesiastical authorities cannot interfere except when the introduction of a new catechism or other manual of religion is under consideration; but they have not even the right of publishing a new catechism without the special approbation of the king.

---

\* [The following communication has in part been anticipated by a note in our last, p. 633, but as the subject is interesting, and our readers may wish further details, we have thought it best to give the additional statement. EDIT.]

Fourthly, the ecclesiastical authorities cannot of themselves proscribe any work as hostile or injurious to religion. It is the government which must decide on such matters, after having examined and declared the book which the clergy have denounced to be really dangerous.

Fifthly, the ecclesiastical authorities have no concern with, or jurisdiction over, any matters but what are purely religious; for instance, such as concern the modes and rites of public worship, the administration of the sacraments and of matrimonial affairs *between Catholics*. But even in these things they can *execute* none of their decisions, without obtaining the *placet royal*.

On all these points an excellent "Manual of Ecclesiastical Law" was, in 1823, compiled by M. Brendel, Professor of Law in the University of Wurtzburg. It is one of the most important works which Germany has produced of late, and is particularly directed (like the works of the Austrian writers on similar subjects) to combating ultra-montanism and the false pretensions by which the Papal Court has sought to make religion subservient to political or pecuniary views.

The theological studies by which pupils are gradually prepared for and admitted into the ranks of the pastoral clergy, are arranged as follows:

1. Those young men who intend to devote themselves to the clerical state, must begin by following the preparatory courses of study in the public schools of the kingdom, exactly as those who are destined for other professions. They must, therefore, have successively passed through all the classes of a royal gymnasium, and have obtained, after the usual examination, an authority to pass to a university. Those who have gone through their preparatory studies in a foreign country, must also be examined and have the proper certificate. At the university the candidates for theology must frequent the courses of philosophy and literature, the same as other students. These courses comprise logic, metaphysics, mathematics, physics, universal history, and Greek and Latin literature. After terminating each course, the pupil passes an examination and obtains a diploma which attests his diligence and points out the degree of his proficiency.

2. It is only after having acquired this general instruction that students can pass on to the peculiar study of theology. The faculty of theology then comprises the following courses: 1. What is called the Encyclopædia of Theological Studies. 2. The interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, or Exegetic Theology. 3. Ecclesiastical History. 4. Ecclesiastical and Canon Law. 5. Morals. 6. Dogmatical Theology. 7. Oriental Philology.

The students must also frequent the pædagogic and esthetic classes. There is no positive order of study laid down, but they must remain in the faculty of theology at least during six academic half-yearly courses. They must be examined by the professor of each science which they cultivate, and obtain a certificate. Those who aspire to the degree of Doctor in Theology have a much more rigorous course of preparation and qualification.

The faculty of theology in the universities ranks equally with others. The ecclesiastical authorities have nothing to do with the appointment of the professors, and the latter owe neither to them nor to the bishops nor vicars-general any account of their teaching or doctrines. If the latter think the doctrines of any of the professors heterodox, they may complain to the government, furnishing the grounds and proofs of their denunciation.

3. Those theological students who have terminated their academic pursuits can alone be admitted into the episcopal seminaries. These last are not in general organized in Bavaria according to the direction of the Council

of Trent. They are establishments in which the young theologian prepares himself for the exercise of the functions and duties of the priesthood. He there learns what is called pastoral theology; he exercises himself in preaching, in catechizing; in short, he learns the practical duties of a pastor. In general the students pay for their maintenance in these establishments; but there is a fixed number of gratuitous admissions.

The number of students which can be received into these seminaries for the formation of the pastoral character being limited, their reception is subjected to strict regulations. Once a year a meeting takes place for the admission of candidates. An inquiry is there held before a Committee composed of the professors of theology, the ruler of the seminary, and a counsellor appointed by the government, who presides. The certificates received in passing from the gymnasia upwards, to the completion of the academic courses, are here produced. Certificates are also required of irreproachable moral conduct, and (if gratuitous admission be sought) of the insufficiency of the student's means. An examination takes place in all the branches of study, and the Committee reports to the bishop and chapter on the merits of the candidates. The bishop names those whom he sees fit to admit, but the admission is complete only on the assent of the minister of the interior. Immediately on their reception, the theologians assume the clerical habit.

4. The heads of the seminaries are named by the bishop, but must be approved by the king. The young ecclesiastics must remain there two years. Those who have not previously finished their course of theology, complete it by continuing to frequent the university.

The rector and sub-rector themselves teach pastoral theology, &c. The young men pursue the necessary branches of study, and have discussions in the different branches of theology and pulpit exercises, in which the bishop often takes part. The royal edict requires that they should during six months attend lectures on the arts of teaching and elementary instruction. They leave the seminary on taking holy orders.

5. The young priests must exercise the functions of vicar eight years (or at least six, when they get a dispensation from the longer service) before they can aspire to a *cure*. They are every three years examined by the vicariat. Cures are only bestowed on those who have shewn their merit in an open session of meeting, which lasts three or four days, and is held under the direction of the government. The judges at this session are the counsellor of the circle, and the professors of theology who are specially summoned. The government commissioner presides; and the bishop is invited to send a delegate. Each commissioner reports his own ideas of the merits of the candidates, and all the reports are thus collected and forwarded to the minister of the interior, who distributes the young priests into six classes of merit, the three first of which give a title to cures. As occupiers of cures they are charged with the school belonging to their cure, of which they are also inspectors, and are responsible to government as public functionaries.

Such are the principal details of the education which the Bavarian clergy receive, from which some idea may be formed of the general line of policy adopted by the government in matters of religion, resembling in fact, in all important particulars, that adopted by the Austrian administration.

## MR. CAISSON'S APPEAL.

*To the Editor.*

SIR,

I HAVE read with great interest the little address of Mr. Caisson to his brethren, which is briefly reviewed in your August Number. Allow me room for a few observations upon the same subject.

There have been, and in our day still are, enthusiastic interpreters of the Scripture prophecies respecting the Jews, who would really seem to intimate that the salvation of that one particular nation is the primary object of the Divine Mind; that, instead of its being the chosen instrument by which Providence began and will perhaps complete its grand designs towards the whole world, the whole world and all its complicated interests are to be subordinated to the single purpose of teaching, guiding, and restoring the lost sheep of the house of Israel.

While protesting against this narrow view of the Divine counsels, it is impossible not to allow that the conversion of the Jews to a belief in "him whom they have pierced," is held out in the sacred books as an event of no trivial importance to the world. A spirit of affectionate interest in the welfare of these our elder brethren must, if we are attentive readers of the Bible, be the result of our meditations upon those many beautiful passages in which the compassion and solicitude of God for his people are portrayed. There we find it hinted, and in no obscure terms, that to the Gentiles will one day be committed the grateful task of restoring her through whose "diminishing" they have obtained "riches," to the possession of more than her former blessings. It is said that the Gentile hand and heart shall not be slow in this work of righteous retribution. How careful should we be then to cherish in our hearts such feelings towards this interesting portion of the human race as may be in conformity with the prophetic declarations, in conformity with the spirit of affection which Christ himself displayed, when he beheld the devoted city and wept over it!

A Christian will even be disposed to look with some tenderness on every effort, however mistaken, which bears upon its general aspect an appearance and profession friendly to the peace of Jerusalem; but this will not blind his eyes, nor deaden his understanding. He will not throw the darts of ridicule among any men or sets of men who may be associated together for the purpose, as they think, of performing the duties enjoined on them towards this people, nor will their failures excite either triumph or merriment, but they will dispose him to inquire fairly what the nature of the case demands from him.

Nothing that I have read from the pen of any member of the Jewish nation seems to me more calculated to do good both to Christians and Jews than Mr. Caisson's little tract. It is the production of one who is both Jew and Christian, one who is most anxious to convert his brethren to a belief in Jesus as the Messiah, but stoutly maintains (why may he not?) the necessity of remaining steadfast in the observance of the law in which he was born. He contends for the superiority of a form of worship of confessedly divine origin over any of mere human institution so strongly, and puts the case as it applies to himself and his brethren so forcibly, that I cannot see how it is easy for some of those sects of Christians which lay a great stress upon mere ritual observances to withstand his arguments. The only tenable ground for Gentile believers, when disputing with a Jewish Christian, seems to be *that* which the language of our Saviour to the woman of Sa-



maria would authorize us to take: "Woman, believe me the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain nor yet at Jerusalem worship the Father. \* \* \* But, the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth." Against a system of rites and ceremonies it is of little use to oppose other rites and ceremonies as matters of necessity. These the Jew well knows can claim no authority or antiquity of origin comparable to his own; the only question is, whether Christ came to substitute a spiritual for a ceremonial religion, or whether, while insisting on the former, he meant also to require a continuance of the latter. That he at least meant to *permit* its continuance, I cannot but think very evident.

E.

---

ON THE USE OF THE TERM UNITARIAN.

*To the Editor.*

SIR,

IN your last Number (August) are some remarks by "A Unitarian" on a previous communication by T. F. B. respecting the use of that appellation, which appear to me more harsh than the occasion required. The objections of T. F. B. seem to have originated in an amiable desire of doing more good by removing a supposed obstacle to the attendance of many on worship which he thought calculated for their improvement, and should not therefore have been treated as "striking at the root of fair and honest dealing." Christian practice is of more consequence than Unitarian or any other profession, and it should be our object to bring as many as possible to righteousness. At the same time I agree with "A Unitarian" in much that he has said. It is now too late to inquire "whether it was good policy or consistent with just principle to adopt a name assuming for the basis of a religious denomination a decision of a great theological question." I for one should have been glad if some denomination had been fixed on which, without implying offence to others, and without expressing decision on any point of controversy, would have simply denoted *freedom of inquiry* as our distinguishing principle, and would have pointed us out as Christians who seek the truth in the Holy Scriptures without respect for persons, acknowledging no mere human teacher as a guide, but looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith. But whatever I might desire, I do not see the possibility of change; the term Unitarian is stamped upon us in characters which cannot be erased. If the use of it was objectionable, the evil has been done, and we have now only to use our efforts that, with the Divine blessing on our labours, this evil, like others, may be productive of good. If we must, indeed, be distinguished by an *ism*, I do not know any less objectionable than Unitarianism, if properly understood. The terms Arianism and Socinianism which were previously used, were not only less comprehensive, but were inaccurate, because they referred to sects or individuals who had many opinions in which those to whom the name was applied could not concur. We should object on the same grounds to be denominated from Clarke, or Priestley, or Belsham, or any other eminent writer, however much we might esteem the individual; and we conceive that we have just cause of complaint against many of our opponents, because they try to connect with Unitarianism the opinions of individuals who have exercised their

right of free inquiry, but were neither authorized nor even professed to speak for others. Our opponents have connected what they deem most valuable in religion with the doctrine of the Trinity, and all who receive Jesus Christ as the eternal God associate together as brethren, however they may differ in other points. This should be a lesson to us, and the term Unitarian applied to our places of worship should be understood as denoting nothing more than that all prayers are strictly addressed to the One God and Father of all, admitting a difference of opinion respecting the doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ, the atonement, and other subjects. Those who reject the equality of Jesus with his Father and our Father, with his God and our God, and who at the same time receive him as their Master, and the Scriptures as the rule of their faith, should be connected together by the term Unitarian; but if it be applied to Humanitarians alone, as some have proposed, it may be so far descriptive of those to whom it is applied, but it will convey the erroneous notion of being descriptive of them alone, when equally applicable to other worshipers of *One God*.

As to the term *Philadelphian*, proposed by T. F. B., I think there are more serious objections to it than to *Unitarian*, because it would either be no distinction, and therefore would want the use of a name, or it would intimate that brotherly love was confined to our party. This divine quality may, however, be found in Christians of every varying denomination, as I fear it will also be found wanting in some of every sect, not even excluding Unitarians. I conclude with observing, that though we are called Unitarians, we enter into no pledge to continue so. We pretend not to infallibility, and if convinced that Unitarianism is an error, we will renounce it; but whilst we believe it to be the doctrine of the gospel, we need not shrink from the denomination.

Δ.

---

SONNET.

O NOT to other worlds, poor child of earth !  
 Alone for comfort and for peace repair :  
 Believe it, heav'nly bliss must here have birth,  
 And that must bud below which blossoms there.  
 True—fitter soils, and more delicious air,  
 And brighter suns, above, may impulse give ;  
 But thou, the while, must inward strength prepare,  
 That future life, even now, begin to live.  
 And look for heav'nly peace ! since happiness,  
 Shed from above, is free for all—for thee ;  
 And, if thine inmost heart delights to bless  
 And commune with the God of Purity,  
 Earth has no bonds thy spirit to retain,  
 And Heav'n no bars thine entrance to restrain.

E.

JOURNAL OF A RESIDENCE OF TEN WEEKS AMONG THE WALDENSES,  
IN THE MONTHS OF OCTOBER, NOVEMBER, AND DECEMBER, 1826.  
BY G. KENRICK.

(Continued from p. 569.)

*Valleys of San Martino and Peyrousa.*

NOVEMBER 8th. San Martino and La Peyrousa are often spoken of as only one Valley, the second being a continuation of the first, in a somewhat different direction. In this excursion, I had for my guide, for the first day, a young man from La Tour, with whom I had some conversation respecting a circumstance which had lately occurred to one of his companions, and had excited much interest in the Valleys. *Pierre Chenonon*, aged 18, a youth brought up entirely in the higher mountains, where he tended cattle, had come down to the village of La Tour to purchase some articles at a shop opposite the house of M. Bert. While he was standing in the shop, near the door, a *procession*, consisting only of a priest and two or three boys, passed by, bearing the host to a sick person. Not observing that it was the host, and, he says, not knowing that he was *obliged* to take off his hat, (as the laws of Piedmont require all persons to do, *within thirty yards' distance*, I think,) the covered head of the rustic heretic caught the zealous eye of the priest. The mistress of the shop snatched off the hat which endangered the head that wore it, but the young man put it on again. The consequence was, that as he was on his way back to the cottage of his parents, he was *arrested* by the gens d'armes, whom the priest had not failed to inform, and he was shortly afterwards conveyed to Fenestrelles to prison, for the term of *three months*. Here he would have to remain during the depth of winter, without any fire or provisions, but such as his friends, at thirty miles distance, might furnish him with the means of purchasing. My companion wept as he spoke of this, but did not make any reflections against the priest or the government, only lamenting the "misfortune" of his friend. The accuracy of his statement was afterwards confirmed by M. Bert, who added, that he himself had written to the intendant of the district, to ask pardon in behalf of the young man, for an offence committed through ignorance or thoughtlessness, but without any success; and he remained imprisoned at the time of my leaving La Tour, seven weeks afterwards.—I spent a day at La Peyrousa, the principal village in the Valley of the same name. This being on the *eastern* bank of the Clusone which traverses this vale, contains no Protestant inhabitants, they being limited by law to the *western* side, which is next to the mountains, and less fertile than the eastern. I had here an opportunity of hearing a Catholic Missionary preach, it being a festival day, and on this and other occasions was much struck with the contrast between the manner of delivery and style of preaching of the Vaudois and those of their Catholic neighbours. The *latter* declaim with loud vociferation and almost frantic vehemence. The *former* are generally animated, but employ only mild persuasion. On Friday afternoon, November 10th, the younger nephew of the late moderator, Peyrani or Peyran, as the name is usually called, came to see me at the inn, and to propose my accompanying him on a visit to M. Vinçon, of Pramole, which I accepted, and had much pleasure in M. Peyran's conversation. He is quite a young man and of strong constitution, yet even he finds the duty of the two churches of Manelli and Macelli, in the Valley of San Martino, to be exceedingly arduous. After

preaching at Manelli, he is obliged to proceed immediately to Macelli, four miles of craggy and often dangerous mountain road, choked up with deep snow nine months in the year. In order to reach Pramole, which is on the side of a glen forming part of the Valley of La Peyrousa, we had to mount up into the snow. From the 2d to the 6th of November we had had constant rain at La Tour, but it had fallen in snow on all the high grounds, and I was told the winter might be considered as set in, although the ten days which succeed the 7th or 10th of November are almost uniformly so fine in the Valleys, that it is called (partly by way of humour) the summer of Saint Martin.

On our way to Pramole I informed M. Peyran that I was an Unitarian Christian, i. e. that I believed in the strict personal Unity of the Deity, and that Jesus Christ was the Messiah, highly excelling in office, powers, and honourable distinction, all the former messengers of God, but in *nature* resembling them. The doctrine did not appear at all new to him. The Vaudois, he said, had only one object of worship, and did not address any prayers to Christ. He said, "the Liturgy of Neuchâtel was used at Macelli, that of Bâle at Pralli, that of Lausanne," I think, "at Pomaretto." "I have heard the Geneva Liturgy read," I remarked, "and heard no prayers addressed to Christ; but are there none in the other Liturgies you have mentioned?" "None," he replied, "*in any of the Liturgies used in the Valleys.*" The diversity of Liturgies," he added, "arose, not from any diversity in religious opinions in the pastors or people; but in the year 1630, when the plague had swept away nearly all the native Vaudois ministers, they were obliged to have recourse to the Swiss Universities to supply the vacant cures. Each pastor brought with him the respective Liturgy of his own church, and the book becoming the property of the parish, the use of it was continued from that time to the present."

Arrived at Pramole, which we reached with some difficulty, owing to the depth of the snow, we had a cordial welcome from the warm-hearted pastor, who told me nothing occasioned them greater pleasure in the Valleys than the visit of a stranger from England. During my stay I was lodged at the house of a Catholic curé, who is a very worthy and liberal man, and lives on terms of intimate friendship with M. Vinçon,—I believe the only instance of the kind in the Valleys, a formal acquaintance being the *ne plus ultra* of social intercourse between the opposing parties in other parishes. Before I went away, the good old curé told me, that as there was no inn at Pramole he was always glad to see any stranger at his house. He added, that we had the same Master, and ought to take every opportunity of shewing kindness to one another, that Catholic and Protestant were both Christians, but *they were not Christians* who did not fulfil the law of charity. In conversation with M. Vinçon, he remarked, that the denomination to which I belonged approached the nearest to the Vaudois of any English sect. He informed me, that on the Saturday evening in particular, the Vaudois always read the Scriptures together, and that many *stables* were then full of readers and eager listeners, who, having no apartments sufficiently large, got together in any place that could contain them. The next morning, hearing some voices, he said, "Hark! they are *reading the Scriptures in the sun!*" "May it not be some other book?" said I. "No, no," was his reply; "*les notres ne lisent rien d'autre*, our people read nothing but the Scriptures." While I was present the post brought a letter for M. Vinçon. On reading it, he clasped his hands and looking upwards, exclaimed, "Thank Heaven! *our schools*

can now be kept open a fortnight longer." I found that the occasion of the good man's heart-felt delight was the unexpected arrival of a donation of ninety francs for charitable uses. "This I shall economize," said he; "all the masters must keep their schools open a fortnight longer. Had this been for myself it would have given me far less pleasure, for it must have gone there," pointing to his kitchen; "whereas *this* remains." The simple-hearted disinterestedness of this worthy and laborious pastor, who has the charge of a parish of twelve hundred persons, and is "passing rich with forty pounds a year," made a lasting impression on my mind. Nor was I less affected with the kind-heartedness of one of his rustic parishioners. While M. Vinçon was preparing his sermon, which the Vaudois pastors always commit to memory, I took a stroll along the mountain side until I came to a place where there was no track in the snow to enable me to proceed any further, and stopped a few minutes at the door of a solitary house, the owner of which, an old man, took my visit to be intended expressly for himself. The tears came into his eyes as he spoke: "He was rejoiced to see a stranger from England, because they were the *brethren* of the Vaudois, who did them good. He was sorry he had nothing but potatoes to offer me, but he would dress me some immediately." I offered him some money, but he declined it in so decided a manner, that I was unwilling to wound his feelings by repeating the offer.

On Sunday M. Vinçon's church was well filled, and as he passed to the pulpit the whole congregation who were already *seated*, and not standing at the door as at La Tour, bowed to him, some rising a little from their benches, and others not, but each awaiting the moment of his passing nearest to *their* part of the church. The text was from Luke x. 41, 42, "Thou art troubled about many things, but *one thing is needful*." The preacher began by observing, that the grand design with which the "word of God became flesh and dwelt amongst us," was, that he might set us an example of every virtue which he recommended. The application he made of his text was, that Christians, in the present day, were troubled about *many* things, some eagerly maintaining one set of notions and some another, each party uncharitably condemning the other, and all wasting their time in unprofitable debates; whereas *one thing was needful*, to obey the commands and copy the life of our Master. In concluding his discourse, in speaking of Christ, he said, "*To whom, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, be all honour. Amen.*" This was the *only* occasion on which I heard *any* orthodox form of words employed by the Vaudois pastors. He assured me, in conversation, that he considered the Father to be the only object of worship to Christians, agreeably to what I heard from other ministers.—Being apprehensive that any additional fall of snow might render my way impassable, and wishing to sleep at the foot of the mountain on the other side, where I was to enter on the Valley of San Martino, I took my leave in the afternoon. There is only one service at Pramole on Sunday. In most of the churches there are afternoon prayers; or, if the church be too far distant from the greater part of the parish, prayers are read in the several schools of the Quarters by their respective schoolmasters. It being the *northern* side of the mountain which I had to cross, in order to descend into the Valley of San Martino, the snow lay there very deep. An elder of the church, and two other members, volunteered their services to go before me and track the path well, that our "*blenfaiteur Anglois*," as they were pleased to call me, might not be incommoded by it. I accepted an offer which I was told I should have offended them by de-



climbing. Surmounting the higher part of the Col, as it is called, by a quarter before five o'clock in the evening, the most stupendous prospect opened before me towards the Valley of *San Martino*, which lay lost in gloomy night beneath my feet, while the setting sun was still shining with the intensest brilliancy on the summits of the mountains above my head. All around me was the pure white of newly fallen snow, except the dark vale, which presented the appearance rather of a *gorge* or *defile* among the rocks, suited to the habitation of wild beasts, than a *valley* inhabited by the human race. The deep black colour, the majestic forms and threatening aspect of these rocks, rendered this by far the wildest and most singular of the scenes I had yet contemplated in the territory of the ancient Vaudois. Is it credible, thought I, that the fire and sword of the persecutor have ever penetrated even into such hidden recesses as this? When we arrived at the hamlet of *Clos*, in the centre of the Valley, my companions recommended me to proceed half an hour's walk further, and to take up my quarters with the pastor of *Villa Secca*. I proposed that we should, at any rate, rest ourselves, and take a little wine at the small inn at *Clos*, and then I could determine whether it would be a sufficiently comfortable place to sleep at or not. Our little party consulted together, and then one of them said to me, "*Why should we go to the inn when we have none of us any desire to drink? We will accompany Monsieur wherever he pleases, but we do not want to drink.*" I, however, persuaded them, with considerable difficulty, to enter the inn, and to accept of some roasted chesnuts and a tumbler of wine each. But when I offered a trifle to the lad who had carried my knapsack, he *steadily* refused it, saying, "*No, no, it was not for that he accompanied Monsieur.*" The landlady, however, interposed and told him, he had better accept it as I wished him to do so. I mention these little traits of Vaudois character, because mountaineers in general have (along with many overbalancing good qualities) the failing of being great drinkers; and as they see but few strangers, they often appear to consider much too eagerly how to make the greatest advantage of them. In these Valleys, however, I uniformly found that a stranger had at his command, without the hope of remuneration being at all entertained, whatever the poor inhabitants had to give, their time and attention, their poor thin wine, their bread and cheese, or, if they had nothing else, their chesnuts. I sometimes accepted to avoid further importunity, but very often declined offers of this kind. I found that there was truth as well as poetry in the invitation which Virgil represents Tityrus as giving to his friend, of the *first* part of which, however, I had fortunately never any occasion to avail myself, "*Hic tamen hanc mœcum poteris requiescere noctem,*

*"Fronde super viridi: sunt nobis mitia poma,  
Castaneæ molles, et pressi copia lactis:  
Et jam summa procul villarum culmina fumant,  
Majoresque cadunt altis de montibus umbræ."*

*Virg. Ecl. i. l. 80—85.*

I determined *not* to encroach on the hospitality of the pastor of *Villa Secca*, and taking up my quarters at the little inn at *Clos*, I found that the room in which I slept contained (not pictures of the Virgin, crucifixes, and a small vessel to contain holy water, as at the inn at *La Peyrousa*, but) the stock of the *district Vaudois Bible Society*, comprising not only Bibles, but a large quantity of tracts on the *Divinity of Christ*, and other translations in French, from the most orthodox English writers, sent as presents by Mr.

Cunningham, Mr. Lowther, and other evangelical gentlemen, who have strangely taken it into their heads, that the Waldenses, although generally allowed to be the most ancient Christian church now existing, are even, at the present day, *unconverted*. I have heard an Englishman, of evangelical sentiments, and a Vaudois "*Momier*," uniting to deplore what they called the "coldness of the Valleys." "If the Lord," said they, "would be pleased to take compassion upon them, and to shed forth his spirit in the Valleys as he is now doing at Geneva, at Lausanne, at Nice! Human means can do little for them, but the *distribution of tracts* must not be neglected." Well meaning, but mistaken enthusiasts! In which of the "*fruits of the spirit*" do not the objects of your pity already excel the majority of their Christian brethren? One of its distinguishing characters, that of a "*sound mind*," I fear they will be in much danger of losing under their new instructors in the gospel. In one of the translations I alluded to, texts are put together in a very ingenious manner from the Old and New Testament in one paragraph, to make it appear that Jesus Christ and Jehovah are the same being, e. g. "By the WORD of the Lord were the heavens made. And the WORD was with God, and the WORD was God. And this WORD was Christ." Another tract, intended for the instruction of children, opens with an account of a little girl receiving from her mamma the intelligence that her father had been shot in the battle of Waterloo, and being asked by her "*if she did not thank God for having taken him to himself*." Her mother being ill at the same time, the infant disciple was asked by a zealous relative, "*If God should take away your mother, too, would you not love him still more on this account?*" Thus are the sentiments of piety exaggerated and distorted by the writers of the tracts which now issue from the teeming presses of the "*Reformed Church*" of Geneva, for the conversion of the Vaudois.

On Monday morning, Nov. 13th, I had a call from the pastor of Villa Secca, the moderator "*adjoint*." His appearance, I am sorry to say, was that of great poverty, which it was highly painful to observe in a very worthy man. Though poor in wealth he is rich in cures, having *five* villages under his charge. He kindly invited me to accompany him to one of these, called Rioclaretto, where he was that morning to hold an *examination* of the state of religion in that portion of his flock. This invitation I accepted with the greatest pleasure. The village stands pretty high up the mountain, on the south side of the glen of San Martino, and the snows lay deep all around us. We conversed on the subject of religion, chiefly on the person of Christ. I told him at the first (as I always did in my conversations on religious subjects) that I was an *Unitarian Christian*, that I considered our Saviour to have been only the Messiah, and not superior in nature as well as in office to the other ambassadors of the Deity, and to have had no existence before he appeared in the world; adding, that I regarded the Father as the sole Deity of Christians, and the exclusive object of their worship. He remarked that the Vaudois also addressed their prayers to One God, in the name of Jesus Christ, but that there were many passages which were considered to justify the worship of Christ. For instance, "*Before Abraham was, I am*." I remarked that our Saviour *was before Abraham*, inasmuch as he took greatly the precedence of him in point of importance, authority, and the design for which he lived, and that, things being said in Scripture language to exist or to have taken place which God had *destined* to do so, our Saviour might be said to have had an eternal existence, inasmuch as he

so existed in the counsels of the Deity. "Very true," observed M. Rostaing; "he was prophesied of before Abraham *was*, at the beginning of the world, when it was said, 'The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head.' And why," he added, "suppose miracles where there is no occasion? Our professor of theology, M. Marian, of Bâle, used to tell us it was a general rule in the interpretation of Scripture, not to multiply miracles when all the appearances could be accounted for without them." I understood that this was M. Rostaing's own application of a general maxim laid down by the professor. I replied, I thought the maxim a perfectly sound one, and inquired in what way the professor himself employed it. "An instance occurred to his recollection," he said, "in the passage where ravens are represented as coming to feed the prophet Elijah in the desert. 1 Kings xvii. 6. The word translated *ravens* signifies also *Arabians*; there is no difference in the letters, and only a slight one in the Masoretic punctuation. It seems more probable," said our professor, "that *Arabians* should have been prompted by the Deity, through a feeling of compassion, to provide food for the prophet, than that a *bird of the air* should have done so. God does not perform his wonderful works except where the ordinary means would not answer the purpose."

On our arrival at Rioclarretto we found the congregation, which was but small, assembled on the outside of the church, standing in the snow, awaiting the arrival of their pastor. He greeted all and each singly, and was received with great respect and with countenances full of satisfaction. One of them called him aside, and, I suppose, told him of some injury he had suffered from the Catholics, (in a whisper,) for the pastor immediately began to talk to the people about their sufferings for conscience' sake. He observed, it had always been so from the first, and gave a short account of the persecutions endured by the early Christians under the Roman emperors, adding, that our Saviour, like a brave general, led the way, and that the common soldier could not reasonably complain of the fatigues and dangers of the war when he saw his commander partaking the same lot with the common men. After this we all entered the little church, a very poor building, with only one window, in which *paper* supplied the want of *glass*. After a short prayer, and reciting the Apostle's Creed, the pastor took up Ostervald's Catechism, and calling on a venerable old man with white hair, on his right, to stand up, he asked him, "What is the most essential thing of all?" "*Religion*," replied the old man. "In what does religion consist?" "*In knowing and serving God.*" Here the pastor entered into a short explanation of what was intended by the term God, that he was the Author of all things we behold, and that as when we saw a watch with all its curious mechanism, we concluded that it must have had a maker; so also with respect to the world, which was a wonderful machine of which God was the Maker. After a few minutes' address to the old man, he called on the *rest* to stand up, until he had gone through the whole congregation, male and female, explaining in a familiar manner to each some important point in religion. He spoke at large of the mission of Christ, his death, &c.; but I discovered no marks of the peculiarities of orthodoxy.

## DEFENCE OF MR. EVANSON.

*To the Editor.*

SIR,

*Yarmouth, August 10, 1827.*

It is to be regretted that the correspondent who ingeniously occupies the first pages of your Number for August, should not only consider the late Mr. EVANSON unworthy the appellation of Christian, but even undeserving of respectful notice.

The words of T. F. B., in reference to that excellent man, are, "even by such semi-deists as EVANSON."

With the merit or consistency of Mr. ELTON, I have at present nothing to do. But it would have been well if that gentleman's censor had not assumed a "domineering and intolerant tone," nor have been so "strong" and "unguarded" in his language, when speaking of such a man as the late EDWARD EVANSON.

His insinuation is neither candid nor just; and I speak the words of "truth and soberness" when I assert, that Mr. EVANSON was, during a long life, and, literally, till life's last hour, a firm, decided, consistent and unwavering believer in the *authenticity* and *truth* of DIVINE REVELATION. "The sincere love of truth and laborious discharge of duty which distinguish many Unitarians," *most eminently* distinguished him.

Your correspondent, however well prepared to give *Mr. Elton's* publication "an attentive and impartial consideration," was evidently not so in regard to *Mr. EVANSON's* theological writings; and, I think, judging from his letter, could know nothing of him personally. I will, nevertheless, presume that T. F. B., appearing, as he does, a voluntary advocate in the cause of UNITARIANISM, cannot be entirely unacquainted with the character of its modern apostle, THEOPHILUS LINDSEY, or that of his associate and fellow-labourer in the same great cause, the enlightened and philosophic PRIESTLEY. But even these *veterans* were not more decided and confirmed Christians than "EVANSON."

Before I had the benefit or enjoyed the pleasure of a personal acquaintance with this gentleman, I well recollect having heard Mr. Lindsey speak of him in terms of high commendation, as a *sincere* and pious Christian.\*

I speak, Sir, of my own knowledge, from a long and friendly intercourse with both these Christian worthies.

Somewhat advanced in years, and these friends of my younger days long since removed from this first state of human being, I now see, and have long seen, that the advantages of a free and confidential intercourse with such men, in early life, can never be adequately appreciated; and, therefore, deeply feeling my obligations, I should consider myself both unjust and ungrateful were I to remain a *silent* observer of a gratuitous attack on the

---

\* "A Letter to Bishop Hurd on the Prophecies of the New Testament and the Nature of the Grand Apostacy, by Edward EVANSON, A. M.," was once in the Catalogue of the UNITARIAN SOCIETY, and was sold at 1s. 6d. It has been long out of print. In his "Historical View," &c., Mr. Lindsey gives an extract from this letter; "which," he says, "deserves nothing less than the serious consideration of the whole Christian world, while, at the same time, it shews the rare abilities and strong method of reasoning of the writer." *Historical View*, p. 500.

Were I permitted to add a word to the commendations of my venerated friend, I should say, Mr. EVANSON's Letter to Bishop Hurd may be considered a preservative from both infidelity and orthodoxy.



character of one so highly estimated, and who possessed so much intellectual and sterling moral worth, as Mr. Evanson.

With not a particle of unfriendly feeling towards your correspondent T. F. B., and trusting that he will not, in the present instance, have to complain of "a want of fair and open dealing," I am, Mr. Editor, faithfully, yours, &c.,

WILLIAM ALEXANDER.

#### PAST TIMES AND PRESENT TIMES. AN ADDRESS.

IT was the remark of an ancient poet (Virgil), that virtue herself is better accepted when she comes in a pleasing form; and the same remark may be made of religion, which is the handmaid of virtue, or, according to some, it is virtue herself in her most dignified form and most becoming dress. The success of many a scheme and the spread of many an opinion have been owing to a respectable and often to an imposing appearance. The prejudices of mankind seem to favour that which is clothed in external charms; and, although real excellence of any sort will obtain among the wise and good its meed of praise, and even among sinners will not pass without a share of commendation, yet it more surely commands respect, and exalts itself in the eyes of the multitude, when it is accompanied by personal attractions, or obtains the recommendation of fashion or the public approbation: while the contrary maxim is true; for we have seen in the history of many nations, that pure truth and Christian virtue have struggled hard and laboured long to little purpose, when they have been destitute of these recommendations. Show and pomp and ceremony have, during many centuries of the Christian era, been given to the support of the grossest errors and the rankest superstition that ever disgraced civilized society; and they have been received with willing minds and supported by loud acclamations, because they have indulged the strong propensities of human nature and let loose the human passions. In many instances indeed they have maintained systems which were hostile to the propensities of man, and have involved numerous votaries in pain, distress, and even in self-destruction.

Ostentation and parade will ever impose upon weak and shallow minds, that think but little and penetrate no deeper than the surface—of which description a large portion of every community is composed; and, therefore, we have seen that, in the ancient pagan rituals, genius has been taxed to add to their splendour and give them charms, and that a considerable part of that splendour and of those charms which upheld idolatrous worship, was afterwards adopted by the professors of Christianity in order to increase the influence which its teachers might possess, and rivet the spiritual chains with which they bound the minds of the disciples at large. Wherever the preachers of the gospel have assumed an authority in the church, and have published statutes and appointed ordinances, which the society have nothing to do with but to receive and observe, there it has been seen that splendid rites, rich vestments, and lofty temples, have been employed to maintain the dignity which the priests of the altar have assumed, and to repress every inclination that might rise to assert the individual liberty of the worshiper of God.



These facts serve to shew how natural it is for our race to admire that which pleases the senses, to receive gratifying impressions from what they behold, and to make use of those means which either nature has taught or art and fashion have invented, to arrest the public eye and fix the attention. It might then be asked, whether that man would not act on a principle which human nature abhors, who would scorn all external show, and expect to excite a universal or even a general approbation by a shapeless figure of virtue or a mean, uninteresting form and plan of public religious worship?

We cannot but acknowledge the mistaken principle which was followed by some of the early Reformers of the Church, the Puritans of their day, who, shocked beyond measure at the gross impositions of the Romish ritual, appeared to think they would do wrong in retaining any single mark of peculiarity that it possessed. Accordingly, they abandoned all outward marks of dignity, every thing that distinguished one man among them from another, every thing that gave their houses of worship a different appearance from other habitations, rejecting in scorn all forms of devotion, in some instances refusing to make use of the Lord's Prayer because it was in the formularies of the ancient church, excluding all instrumental music from their devotional services, because it savours of sensuality, and abandoning even the delightful work of psalmody, because there is in it an affectation of skill and a correspondence with loose and sensual gratifications. Even within the period of my own remembrance, there has been one society of Dissenters\* in which the Lord's Prayer was not permitted to be made use of, nor psalms to be sung, and another† in which neither psalms nor hymns were ever sung at all.

It should, indeed, be borne in mind, that for many centuries the societies which dissented from the established religion were subject to much embarrassment, severe proscriptions, reproach and obloquy, and often to persecution of either a direct or an indirect nature. Under these circumstances, it was natural for them to carry on their worship in a manner as inoffensive as possible, to seek for stations and follow systems which were the least liable to be observed or to give offence, and to avoid every mark of ostentation and show. Hence we find that in many of our old towns the meeting-houses are built on retired spots and assumed a humble appearance, carefully shunning public notice, and seeking nothing more than a quiet enjoyment of their own opinions and worship. Such a measure was highly praiseworthy; nay, it was necessary under the circumstances in which our forefathers lived. The spot on which we meet to worship the God of our fathers, discovers in its situation marks of the prudential steps which they found it expedient to take: for this church of Christ sprang up among the very first Dissenting societies,‡ and has maintained its existence without interruption from the

---

\* At Hertford. If by any accident a stranger used the Lord's Prayer in conclusion it gave great offence, because *it is not a Christian prayer*. The congregation wished for Watts's Psalms to be introduced, but the old deacon had made a vow that psalms should not be sung in that place so long as he was in power. It happened that the meeting-house was purchased by the Christ Church School Trustees, who built the Dissenters another in a different spot. Into this Watts's Psalms were introduced with the consent of the deacon and without a breach of his pious vow.

† At Lutton in Cambridgeshire. [This till within the last sixteen years was the case at Lutton in Lincolnshire, the place probably here intended. EDITOR.]

‡ The first register of baptism in the Church of Plymouth bears date in November of the year in which the Act passed, 1662.

year in which the Act of Uniformity passed, now one hundred and sixty-five years; and although it was not in this secluded spot, but in a large room that our predecessors began their dissenting worship, yet it is evident from the appearance of the building in which we are assembled, that it was chosen for its privacy at a very early time.

Those views of Christian truth which we now profess were not the views of the former worshipers within these walls. At the time in which they lived, small advantages were enjoyed for the study of the Scriptures. The Reformers had just escaped from the thralldom of a spiritual slavery, which was distinguished by so great a mass of error and abuse, that it may be said of them that they did a great work in getting rid of so much tyranny and so many false opinions as the Reformers of the Church succeeded in cancelling. Comparing the prior state of things with that which succeeded the Reformation, it must be seen that a great light rose upon the nations of Europe; they became comparatively enlightened and free, and gave a great example for their children to follow, to search still deeper into the abuses of antiquity and remove yet more of the incumbrances which disfigured the beauteous temple of divine truth.

The Reformation has gone on: learned men have searched still farther into the language of Scripture and into the history of the church; and notwithstanding legal disabilities and threatening penal laws, the profession of Christianity has been by gradual and slow but by sure and steady steps brought back to the simple and unmixt doctrine of one God in one person, the great Author of nature, and the God and Father of his faithful servant and beloved Son Christ Jesus.

When the business of Reformation first began in the Church it was grounded upon this principle, that every man is accountable to God both for his opinions and for his conduct in life—that one man will not be required to answer for another man, and therefore that one man has no right to impose upon another either what he shall believe or what he shall do—that consequently the mind is free to think for itself, to adopt such principles as recommend themselves to it by their own excellence and by their correspondence with the words of holy writ, and to observe such rites of worship as appear most pure and most befitting the solemn object in view, the worship of our everlasting Father and Friend. These are especially the avowed principles of Protestant Dissent.

Preserving the maxims of our forefathers, we call no man master upon earth; for one is our master, even Christ. As they were not held by the doctrines and the rites which their Catholic parents approved, so neither have we been held by the opinions which they retained. Finding that, although they had made great and most respectable advances towards the truth, yet they were still on some points cherishing error, we have used towards them the liberty they used towards their forerunners, and have expunged from our creed, as they had expunged from theirs, every thing that we have found reason to believe unwarranted by the words of holy writ. Thus acting upon the true basis of Protestant Dissent; thus asserting our liberty in Christ Jesus; searching the Scriptures whether things are so; obeying our Lord's command, of judging for ourselves what is right, and bowing to no spiritual authority but that of Christ Jesus our Lord.

Still we acknowledge the value of the apostle's advice, that all things be done decently and in order. In the affairs of common life we hold it good for external appearances to correspond with the persons and the stations to which they belong. That which is suitable to one situation may be impru-

dent or absurd in another ; and that plainness of style which a mean station may require, would be regarded as a species of affectation in a higher and more respectable rank. And it may be observed, that the circumstances connected with life are varying, as time wears on and brings with it new features of mind and new indications of disposition. Times are changing, and we are changing with them.

That which under some circumstances may be regarded as decent and proper, may under other circumstances be thought an unnecessary abasement and an injurious neglect. Thus it is obvious to remark, that the English Dissenters are now in a situation extremely unlike that in which they were placed half a century ago. The number of Dissenters is increased in an immense proportion to the friends of the Establishment, I might almost say, as the friends of the Establishment have lessened ; in so much that it may with truth be stated, that their number is equal to the number of the members of the Established Church, notwithstanding all the privileges which the latter enjoy, and the necessity the former lie under to maintain their worship at a considerable expense, which if they please they are at liberty to spare. If we consider the comparative situation of the members of an establishment, who have a costly worship provided for them at the national charge, and that of the Dissenters in this country, who have not only the Church establishment to maintain, but their own worship to provide for in all its bearings, it is, indeed, a proud thought which we may indulge, that the actual amount of Dissenters is equal to that of consistent, steady, and faithful Churchmen—perhaps it is even greater ; for by far the larger proportion of those who do not join Dissenting societies can be said to belong to the Established Church only in as much as they now and then attend its services, and perhaps seldom or never except at the observance of those ceremonies and rites in which it acts a civil and not a religious part.

This circumstance of the great increase of steady, regular Dissenters, who are not so in name only, but are actual supporters of the Dissenting worship, and attendants upon its services, generally with punctuality, has very much changed the face of affairs in this country as it regards the profession of Christianity. The Dissenters have throughout the kingdom been the principal promoters of those great schemes which have tended to enlighten the public mind. With them originated in most places the Sunday and Charity schools ; they have uniformly supported the Lancasterian institutions ; book clubs and reading societies had their origin very generally in Dissenters ; public libraries and philosophical institutions have owed their formation and support in many of our principal towns to the Dissenters ; some of the most noble of the charitable institutions of the metropolis originated with them ; and the more recent and very important institutes for the better instruction of our mechanics have found many patrons among them. So very different is the public feeling of the present day from that which characterized the year 1791, in which the philosophical apparatus, the rich library, and the invaluable manuscripts of the immortal Priestley were placed on the funeral pile of a mob, instigated by a minister of the Established Church, and in which the very name of Unitarian was a reproach dangerous to bear, that we seem to have got into another world, and scarcely know where to limit our expectations and what boundary to affix to our hopes. We are ready to spread our sails as the breeze of prosperity strengthens ; we catch the flow of the tide of knowledge and of liberality which is moving us on towards the enjoyment of equal rights and equal laws.

"To the friendship and peace which its precepts impart."  
 "Ah, who 'midst the horrors of night would abide,  
 That can taste the pure breezes of morn?  
 Or who that has drunk of the crystalline tide,  
 To the feculent flood would return?"

At last, the representatives of the Commons of our land have given an unanimous vote, that we shall be free, that we shall have a larger enjoyment of our civil rights, as a distinct order of Christian worshippers. They have removed those penal statutes which long threatened us with seclusion from our personal liberties, with fines, and, what is worse, with the marks of obloquy and reproach. They have declared that we ought to be exempt from all religious impositions when we are contracting those important civil obligations upon which the building up of families rests; that, when we pledge our faith to a fellow-mortal, we shall no longer be compelled to violate our faith in God, and acknowledge in the church a divine authority which in our religious services we deny: an acknowledgment, to the justice of which the dignified order of men among us have yielded their assent, although they have not completed the fulfilment of the duty to which they acknowledge the circumstances of the times have called them. We look for still better things. The tide of liberality, of justice, of truth, cannot be stayed. It will still advance, and the most sanguine friends of the public weal may not be able to presage what another half century will bring about; but they are allowed from present appearances to calculate upon still greater advances towards perfection of worship and purity of faith.

Under these encouraging circumstances our principles no longer seek concealment, nor the forms of our worship retirement. We have cast off that fear which possessed the minds of our forefathers, and with it that superstitious dread of using any external distinctions which have aided the cause of those from whom we dissent. You have long been accustomed in this place to a form of devotion which I consider, without exception, the best that has been published in the island. You have thought fit to clothe your minister with the robes of his order. You have encouraged vocal and instrumental music, so highly gratifying to the animal system, and so well calculated to raise and to maintain devotional feelings, which, with the personal assistance that it receives from some of our friends, may be esteemed, under such circumstances, of the highest order. All these things regard *decency and order*. There is nothing superstitious in them; nothing, as I conceive, that carries away the mind from the business of devotion to sensual feelings and a slavish submission: but there is that which may please without offending, and may gratify the man while it trains up the Christian.

Our principles ask now for nothing so much as exposure. Within the last few years they have been much offered to the public attention. But a short time ago the opponents of our faith thought, at one blow, to break down our fortress and raze our walls. But they have been convinced of their mistake; for the effect of such efforts has been, in most places, the reverse of what they expected; and the champion employed to crush our cause has, in many instances, become our ally, in consequence of his mind being directed to a serious consideration of the state of the argument. I repeat, that we now demand nothing but exposure. Unitarianism has, in many places, lifted a proud head, proud of its integrity and of the divine foundation on which it rests; and has appeared in magnificent houses of worship with all the aids of art and the graces of culture. This has been

Jesus in sincerity to all who call themselves by his name.



particularly the case in the United States of America, where it is advancing with rapid strides to the rank of a national religion. There no rich endowments are formed to support superstition, and no stipends are paid to purchase arguments for a favoured faith. Truth and falsehood are running a fair race, and which will gain the prize we can entertain no doubt. Opposed by nothing but the prejudices of education, which are fast wearing out, in these States a very large proportion of the Quakers, considerable societies of Episcopalians, congregational churches without number, and a very extensive connexion, widely spread, calling themselves Christians, are holding the Unitarian faith, and are offering their adorations to the Father of Christ Jesus, and to none but him; while numerous other societies are forming with the same views in all parts of the Union.

Indeed, we must believe that no step should be neglected by us which is calculated to promote the good cause we have espoused, and is within the compass of our power. The more our tenets are known, the more we can lay them before the public in a fair and honourable way, with decency and order, and invite public attention to them, the more they will be acknowledged true, the more advocates will avow their value and publish their praise. In a country like this, in which rich premiums are given to support what, if our own principles are true, we can regard as no other than the grossest error, we must not indeed expect too much. We are still contending against a phalanx of prejudice and of interest; and if within the last few years we have gained much, it can be attributed only to the goodness of our cause, to the more enlightened state of the public mind, become more enlightened by those means which the Dissenters have themselves originated and have supported, by numbers comparatively small, and resources comparatively insignificant. Yes, I am proud to declare it my persuasion, that the very improved state of general thinking and of public feeling, in this country, may be greatly attributed to the Dissenters; and they will reap the benefit of it. It is certain that a very small proportion of it can be assigned to the hierarchy of England; and it is manifest, that every future measure of utility, in which the clergy of the Church do not take a distinguished part, will aid the great work of universal knowledge; while its value will be reflected on their own ranks. As the world becomes more liberal and more wise, the wise ones of the world must see to it that they become wiser still. Antiquated rules and prescriptions, made venerable by time, will be no defence against the real and substantial advantages which an enlarged knowledge of nature and improvement in science will afford; and, as the mind of the great population of our island becomes more enlarged, and the interesting objects of nature and of art are more fully understood, will not the yet more interesting, the infinitely important objects of divine knowledge be examined with an eye less suffused by prejudice, with a mind more free to embrace truth and usefulness? We must think and believe that they will. And if, through the causes that have been in operation, our views, which by all ranks in society have been regarded with a kind of horror, upon which our legislators frowned half a century ago, are now meeting with a patient investigation and calling forth acknowledgments of indulgence and respect, why should we doubt that they will become more and better known, that every stain cast on them by the laws of the land shall be wiped off, every unpleasant feeling they have occasioned be removed, and a fair door be opened for enjoyment without any restraint, and for the hand of brotherly affection, guided by a true Christian charity, to be held out to all who love the Lord Jesus in sincerity, to all who call themselves by his name?



In the mean time, and in order to supply all that is in our power to promote this great end—for the Almighty effects his purposes by second causes, and by ordinary means—let all things, in the conducting of our religious services, and all things in the regulation of our lives and conversations, be done decently and in order; and that the real worth of our principles may be known, that they may not be regarded by others as mere matters of speculation and entertaining subjects of discourse, let it be seen that they produce the best fruits of integrity and of holiness in our lives. Whatsoever things are true and venerable for their goodness, are useful to others, are lovely, and, therefore, are of good report with all,—let us think on these things, and happy shall we be if we do them.

It is good for us sometimes to look back in this manner upon times which are past, to inquire of the days of old, and to observe the workings of Providence with those who have gone before us, and with those who are living in the present day. We may not, in all cases, be able to judge why those plans have been chosen in his wisdom, which, nevertheless, we must be persuaded were the wisest and the best; and if, in the comparison of the one with the other, we can discern the greater kindness of those under which we live, and if we can bring ourselves to think that we are among the feeble instruments which it pleases him to employ to effect his glorious purposes, how great will be our gratitude, how elevating our devotional feelings, to that Being who rules all by his counsels, and has been waiting to be gracious to us! And if existing circumstances seem to promise yet better things, shall not our prayers ascend with still greater fervour, that the kingdom of our Father in heaven may come and his will be done upon earth; and shall we not be ready to employ those energies and those means with which he has entrusted us, as the stewards of his bounties, in effecting his righteous determinations?

And why should any one, under such encouragement, indulge a timid spirit and seek a retreat under the shade of secrecy? There was a time when this was prudent and right; but that time is passed by, and the voice of a favouring Providence is inviting us to pursue that line of conduct, with an open and candid but a determined spirit, which will lead to the entire recovery of all civil and religious rights and privileges, that we may stand secure and fast in the liberty with which Christ has set us free;—the most certain step to which happy result is, to make our principles known as widely as possible, to invite others to hear and to understand that in which we believe, to inspire them with the spirit of candour and good-will which those principles breathe; thus to remove the unwarrantable prejudices which, in some worthy breasts, are still at work against us, and open a new era by opening the hearts of all to charity and good-will. One talent at least is entrusted to every one: there is no one perfectly destitute. Wrap it not up in a napkin; hide it not in the earth; put it out to interest, in your families, in your neighbourhood, among your kindred and your acquaintance. Remember, you will be asked, at a future day, what you have been doing with the means of usefulness which have been entrusted to you, and your Lord will be waiting to receive your talent with increase.

I. W.

# **LINES TO THE MEMORY OF A YOUNG FRIEND.**

**Would I call thee back? No, never—unless  
 I could call back those days of happiness,  
 When thou wert springing, all fair and free,  
 In the morn-dew of life, like a bright young tree :—**

**Like a bright young tree in the fragrant spring,  
 Unseared by the blight of the tempest's wing,  
 That joyously raises its green head high,  
 And drinks the milk of the nursing sky!**

**Thou art gone—but not with thy breath is gone  
 The stainless truth through thy life that shone,  
 And to all its course a pure lustre gave,  
 As the gem-sands light some fairy wave.**

**Thou art gone—but thy virtues yet remain  
 To brighten our hearts in the midst of pain,  
 As the sunbeams rest on the mountain snow,  
 When night has shadowed the vales below.**

**We will think of thee, and thy memory still  
 Shall flow through our hearts like a sacred rill,  
 Which hallows the shore that its waves go by,  
 And, though born from earth, reflects the sky.**

**Thou art gone—but the thought of all thou hast been  
 Survives the grave we have sadly seen ;  
 And thy spirit with us outlives life's close,  
 As the perfume breathes o'er the faded rose.**

**Soon was thy path in this cold world trod,—  
 Early thy spirit was called to God,—  
 Like the mist by the pure night-rainbow spanned,  
 Exhaled to brighten a starrier land.**

**May we keep our hearts as thine was kept,  
 That the tears we weep may for us be wept !  
 May we pass like thee through pleasure and pain,  
 That the lost and the living may meet again !**

**Thy task is done, and thy star-wreath twined—  
 We are yet in the world thou hast left behind,  
 To walk, by the twilight of Time's dim sky,  
 To the burning dawn of Eternity.**

**Farewell—but not for ever—farewell !  
 There's a golden world where the pure shall dwell :—  
 All tears will be wiped on that radiant shore,  
 And the mourned and the mourner will part no more.**

*Crediton.*

ON THE COMMAND OF JOSHUA.  
SIR, August 3, 1827.

WHEN I confess my utter ignorance of the Hebrew tongue, I shall perhaps be accused of presumption in attempting a reply to the objections of your correspondent "Jarchi," to the common rendering of Joshua x. 12, 13. But those of his objections which I am about to notice have no connexion with verbal criticism, and are therefore open to the strictures of the mere English reader of the Bible.

Your correspondent, quoting from an author "no ways favourable (as he admits) to the Sacred Scriptures," objects to the place which the incident (of the sun and moon standing still) occupies in the narrative. "It is absurd," says he, "to suppose, that after the battle and conquest are described, and the remaining part of the Amorites had fled, the writer should return to give an account of the same transactions, or that there was a necessity for a miracle to be wrought to conquer the Amorites, when the account states that it was already done before the sun and moon are said to have stood still." Now, Sir, I see no "absurdity" at all in an author's first relating the event of a contest, and then "returning," not, as the objector has it, to give a fresh account of the same transactions, but to mention a circumstance which had taken place during the contest, and which he had not previously mentioned. As to the supposition that the miracle was wrought after the defeat of the Amorites, there is no need to resort to it.

The presumption of Joshua, in daring to act "*proprio Marte*, by his own sole power, and independent of the authority of the Almighty Jehovah," requires proof. In fact, we have an intimation that, previously to performing the miracle, he addressed the Supreme Being, though the words of his address are not given. "Then spake Joshua to the Lord, in the day when the Lord delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel, and he said in the sight of the children of Israel, 'Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon,' " &c.

The "unphilosophical" manner in which the historian describes the miracle, cannot surely be urged as an objection. The account is in conformity with the astronomical system of that day, and it is too much to dispute the record of a fact, because the writer was unacquainted with the discoveries of later ages, and therefore described it according to its apparent rather than its real nature.

That the moon also is said to have stood still, furnishes, I think, one argument for the reality of the miracle. For although there was, I admit, no occasion for this when the sun was shining, it was (according to the modern and true theory of the motions of the celestial bodies) a necessary consequence of the cessation of the earth's diurnal rotation, in which, I presume, the miracle consisted.

But the grand objection of your correspondent (stated in a note) is one which, if sincere in "not wishing to do away with the miracles in the Sacred Scripture indiscriminately," he cannot consistently use. "I take my stand," he says, "on the immutability of God, and the consequent immutability of those laws by which he governs the universe, and am, therefore, imperiously led to consider any assertion by which this primary principle is either wholly or in part impugned, as an open insult to the majesty of the Divine Being." Now, Sir, if this argument has any force, it affects all other miracles as much as the one in question, since all are departures

from the laws by which God governs the universe, and therefore must (according to the reasoning of Jarchi) "wholly or in part, impugn the primary principle of his immutability." I do not see, however, that the supposition of God's occasional departure from the usual mode in which he conducts the operations of his providence, for the accomplishment of some wise and beneficent end, militates against the immutability of his character or purposes, or can be "an open insult" to him. Indeed, it does not derogate from his glory so much as that hypothesis which would limit his omnipotence by making him the slave of his own decrees.

I am aware that the above reasonings vindicate the correctness of the received translation only so far as they disprove your correspondent's assertion, that in abandoning it "we get rid of a miracle for which there was no necessity,\* and which, when considered according to the narrative, as the performance of a mere mortal, outstrips, in point of possibility, all that has ever been told in the tales of the Talmud or the legends of the Koran." It would have been as well if he had confined himself to the simple question of the conformity of either version to the original; or, at any rate, have expressed his objections to the common account of the transaction in more guarded and moderate language.

The received version possesses one merit of which Mr. Bellamy's seems to me to be destitute—it is intelligible; and I should be glad to know how Mr. Bellamy renders the context, in which (according to the received version) we are told, "that the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day; and there was no day like that before it or after it, that the Lord hearkened unto the voice of a man."

J. C. M.

#### THE BOODHIST AND BRAHMINICAL RELIGIONS.

[From the Sphinx.]

"THE two great classes into which the pagan religion of Eastern Asia is divided, are the Brahminical and the Boodhist. The first is the religion of nearly all the Hindoos—a hundred millions at least—and the latter the religion of all China, part of Tartary, Cochin-China, Japan, Ava, Siam, Ceylon, and many other parts of the East, probably embracing from three to four hundred millions of believers, and unquestionably the most numerically popular belief of any that exists upon the face of the globe. It may seem strange that, except as connected with the late Burmese war, we should have heard so little of this widely-spread faith until now. But, while we English laugh at the vanity of the Chinese Emperor (who has 300,000,000 of beings under his sway) for fancying his nation to be the greatest in the world, we are not unfrequently quite as egotistical, in believing that not merely the great Christian faith, which nearly all Europe professes, but the little subdivision of it by which we swear, as sectarians or dissenters from the Church of Rome, is the most widely spread and most universally popular of all the faiths entertained by men. The Boodhist religion, of which millions in England have never yet even heard, counts nearly as many believers as any two other of the great classes of believers put together, while they are much

\* We should regard this miracle as one of a series by which the Lord wrought out the deliverance of the Jews from Egypt and their settlement in the promised land.



more numerous than either the Christians, Jews, Mohammedans, or Idolaters, taken separately.

The history and monumental remains of such a religion, are not, therefore, wholly insignificant as objects of rational inquiry; and, without professing the least veneration for that which is ancient, or even extensive, merely because of its antiquity or universality, we think we shall not altogether waste our space or time in devoting a portion of each to their investigation.

It has been a question among scholars and antiquaries, whether the religion and mythology of Egypt and India were so closely connected as for one to have been the source of the other; and if so, which preceded and which followed. The points of resemblance are many and striking, but not more so than the points of dissimilarity. The antiquity of the monuments of Egypt is undoubtedly much greater than that of the monuments of India. The dry climate and barren soil of the one country is eminently favourable to the duration of architectural edifices; the moist climate and exuberant vegetation of the other is destructive even of its cavernous excavations, the most durable form, not even excepting the pyramids, in which human labour can be transmitted to remote posterity. There is in Egypt historical as well as local evidence of the antiquity of some of its temples exceeding the age of three thousand years; and yet on some of these, the colouring of the painter and the red ochre pencil-tracings of the sculptor are as fresh as when they were first put on, there never having been sufficient moisture in the atmosphere (where rain never falls, and where dew is unknown) to dim the lustre of the one or obliterate the faintest lines of the other, through thirty centuries of time! In India, on the contrary, where for half the year the sky pours down floods of rain, and for the other half the sun exhales it in steam and vapour, a building of a single year old would require repairing and repainting, and half a century of neglect (as in the splendid ruins of Dacca) is sufficient to cause the most colossal monuments of the country, caverns and hewn rocks alone excepted, to be toppled down and overturned by the united powers of destructive vegetation, and decaying heat and moisture. In the monuments that remain in each country, however, there are very striking differences: first, in those of Egypt the outline is always peculiarly chaste and simple; in India the outline is grotesque, laboured, and fantastic. In those of Egypt the sculptured representations do not, in any instance, exhibit beings with many heads, arms, or legs—Briaræus alone excepted, and he has a hundred; in India, however, this multiplication of heads and limbs attached to one body is frequent. In Egypt the sculptures are all in low relief; in India they are in very high relief, amounting almost to statuary. In India the dead were burned, and scattered to the winds; in Egypt they were embalmed and carefully preserved in stone sarcophagi. These are the points of difference. The points of resemblance are,—in both, colossal dimensions—in both, human bodies with heads of animals—in both, representations of offerings in fruits and flowers—in both, a numerous and privileged priesthood—in both, the worship of the serpent and the veneration of the lotus—in both, the doctrine of the metempsychosis, and consequent abstinence from animal food. On the whole, indeed, although the differences are considerable, the resemblances must be considered most striking: for when, during the occupation of Egypt by the French army, a detachment of our Indian sepoys was sent from India by the Red Sea, under General Sir David Baird, and the men were landed at Cosseir to march across the Desert to the Nile, they had no sooner reached the banks of that sacred stream, and entered one of the ruined temples of Isis, at Tentyra,



near Thebes, than they all spontaneously fell on their faces to worship, avowing to each other their belief that they were then in one of the pagodas or temples of their ancestors, and saw around them their own ceremonies and their own gods.

Though the opinion of the learned is in favour of the Brahminical religion having originally passed from Egypt into Hindoostan, and of the Boodhist religion being again a branch of this last, there is this peculiarity belonging to Boodhism which raises it much in dignity above the other two, and makes it more nearly accord both with the earliest notions of the unity of God, and with the later opinions that prevail on the same sublime point of faith. The Boodhists have only one sculptured representation of a living being in their temples; this is a sitting figure, generally of a colossal size, but always strictly human, without any of the monstrous combinations which disfigure the Egyptian and Hindoo mythology. He is generally seated on a lotus, is always thick-lipped and woolly-headed, which would indicate an African origin, and is certainly not Asiatic; and is always in the benevolent act of narration, demonstration, or instruction. The Boodhists believe in one God, of whom Boodh, himself a mortal, was merely the last and the purest of the prophets, resembling in this respect the Mohammedans and Unitarian Christians. The Hindoos have three hundred and thirty-three millions of gods, besides their great trinity of Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva, the creator, preserver, and destroyer, all emanating from the great quiescent source, *Brahm*; besides incarnations in the shape of cows, fishes, pigeons, geese, and other undignified animals. The Boodhists believe in no incarnations whatever, regarding God as God, and man as man, and assigning to their prophet only the province to teach the will of their common Lord and Creator.

“Between two religions so opposed in their genius and character as these, it can hardly be a matter of wonder that violent antipathies should exist: and as that faith which is most superstitious is generally most powerful in its hold on the zeal of the people, and most cordially supported by all the means necessary to organize a force for its protection; so, whenever the two have come in conflict, the gross superstitions of the Brahmins have beaten the simpler tenets of the Boodhists out of the field: and the latter have almost entirely disappeared in India, though they still spread over the immense empire of China, and the countries already enumerated in conjunction with it.

“About ten centuries ago, indeed, (which is as yesterday in an Indian history,) they occupied several cave-temples in the Island of Salsette, near Bombay, while the Brahmins held the great cave-temple of Elephanta in the same quarter. In the able and learned account of this cave, given by Mr. Erskine, (the joint-translator with the late Dr. Leyden of the interesting ‘Memoirs of the Emperor Baber,’) in the ‘Transactions of the Literary Society of Bombay,’ there is a very full and satisfactory account of both religions and their professors at this period; since which they have existed only in the Eastern parts of India.”

Colonel Francklin has lately published a volume, entitled “Researches into the Tenets and Doctrines of the Jeynes and Boodhists,” in which he has collected a great mass of information, acquired by him during his residence in India, with regard to the history and tenets of their remarkable religion. He has also added a curious dissertation on the worship of the Serpent, which he traced not only throughout the East, but in various other quarters of the globe.

the Irish and Welsh are in a manner the same language—like the Saxon and English—both being of the same family. I was induced to consult Richard's *Antiquæ Linguae Britannicæ Thesaurus*, where I find Orian and Orian, vide Gairn, *Gairn's Dictionary* (in the sense of praying or crying to the Lord); and on turning to Dr. David's *Linguae Britannicæ Thesaurus*, I was committed by a former communication to say a few words, which I thought if I subjoined my signature it was by mistake; for, as that communication related to the Welsh and Sanscrit languages, which I do not understand, prudence would have suggested, at least, some caution; and no expectation should have been raised where there was so little to say.

But, be these matters as they may, the pledge must now in some sort be redeemed; for though no particular observations were made at the time, nor intended to be made in that letter, yet a reserve was left for a few which might possibly follow.

Indeed, what was there said was offered with a particular, *professed* design, distinct from any intention or profession of my own, and the design was two-fold; first, to excite some one of the Cambrian friends of the late Mr. Williams, better acquainted with the history and character of that Druid-bard, to pay the proper tribute of respect to his memory; and, secondly, to induce some one well acquainted with the Welsh language, and (if it might be) any ways conversant with the Sanscrit, to consider the difficulties expressed by Mr. Williams on the appearance of some supposed Sanscrit lines among the poems of the old British bard Taliesin.

But, as I have since heard that a friend of Mr. Williams is preparing a *Memoir of his Life and Writings*, and that he himself has left in MS. a regular piece of auto-biography, there is the less reason for solicitude on the former account, and the less for discussion on the latter: for the lines quoted by Mr. Williams from Taliesin, are, after all, not Sanscrit; Mr. Williams was misled by his learned friend. There are many persons in the country instructed in the Persian, and some in some of the East-Indian languages, but very few indeed who know much, or indeed anything, of the Sanscrit. I, too, misconceived the meaning of the gentleman whom I consulted on the matter, in a very short and rapid interview, many years ago; he took down the words, I remember, somewhat cautiously at the time, and I thought seemed to concede them to be Sanscrit. I put Mr. Williams's letter by, and never thought of it again till lately, on hearing of his death; I then consulted more deliberately a gentleman in London eminently distinguished for his knowledge of the Sanscrit, and I am positively assured by him, that the said lines are certainly not in that language: so that the few thoughts which were floating on my mind on a persuasion that they were, must of course be suppressed. The words, however, as quoted in a former letter, may still be left for the consideration of any one who may be busied about such matters.

But I shall beg leave to add a word or two on what Mr. Williams observes about the Welsh: he says, "there is not a word of *Welsh* in these lines." I am little prepared or qualified to dispute that point properly with one who was so conversant with his own language. I will suppose that there are no *satire* words of *pure modern* Welsh, and that the whole passage might not, in prosodical construction, be agreeable to the pronunciation of the Welsh language; still, when our bard adds, "there is nothing *like* Welsh in them," I am disposed, though with due deference, to demur. On shewing these verses to a gentleman who knows a little of old Irish, he said, I remember, that the first word was old Irish, and related to prayer. Now, as

the Irish and Welsh are in a manner the same language—like the Saxon and English—both being of the same family, the Celtic, I was induced to consult Richards's *Antiquæ Linguae Britannicæ Thesaurus*, where I find *Orian* and *Oriain*, vide *Gawri*, *Goriain*, Heb. *שָׁרָה*, to cry (in the sense of praying or crying to the Lord); and on turning to Dr. Davies's *Linguae Britannicæ Rudimenta*, 1621, I see that the third person plural of the præterfect tense ends in *ant*; *Brith*, too, according to Richards, is *speckled* or *spotted*; and the additional vowel is one of the three ways by which the Welsh form a plural substantive, and *Pluralia adjectiva formantur a singularibus masculinis eadem fere vocalium et diphthongorum mutatione, qua plurales substantivorum*: I must suppose that *Brith* or *Brithanai* means Britons; *Syched*, according to Richards, means thirst (from the Heb.), and may give, perhaps, *Sychedi* as a plural; *euroi* is a Greek word, but *euro* in Welsh is gold; and what appear to be nominative cases in the passage quoted, are formed partly according to the Latin, and partly according to the Greek idiom. And it will be noticed, that not only the Irish and Welsh, but the Greek and Latin, as well as the Sanscrit, are all of Celtic origin. Though, therefore, Mr. Williams may, for aught I know, have been correct in saying there was not a word of Welsh (meaning thereby, *pure modern Welsh*), I think that he goes too far at least in saying, *there is nothing like Welsh* in them.

Dr. Davies, in his Grammar, which I have had occasion to consult, seems to speak as if the language of the Welsh had never undergone any alteration, but was, like the Hebrew, simple, and in its simplicity had been fixed and permanent; and Mr. Williams seems to think that the Welsh was a primitive, original language, and that the Welsh were like the Athenians in their country, the native, *γῆγενεῖς*, inhabitants of the place.

Neither of these opinions, however, is capable of proof, nor indeed appears to be true. And, in reality, Dr. Davies seems to bear testimony against himself in his Preface to his own Grammar: and Mr. Williams speaks somewhere of the Welsh having been corrupted by the Irish.

The most common belief with the learned (and it seems the most probable opinion) is, that Wales was colonized from the East; to this their name, *Cymri*, the name of their language, *Cymraeg*, and some of their ancient religious opinions, particularly that of the metempsychosis, seem to bear the clearest testimony. Old Taliesin, called the Prince of the Welsh Bards, asserts the oriental descent of his countrymen.\*

I therefore was not so startled, I confess, as Mr. Williams was, at the supposed Sanscrit lines which were found among Taliesin's Poems; and, indeed, had got together a few facts, and conjured up a few fancies, to account for the phenomenon. But as the matter turns out, no room is left either for fancies or facts.

The only way, then, left to solve Mr. Williams's difficulty, (for I at least know no other,) is to admit that the aforesaid supposed Sanscrit is indeed Welsh in some very corrupted or very antiquated state: for it is difficult to believe, with Dr. Davies, that the old British language never underwent any change; and it is clear, I think, that our bard brings out a conclusion too direct and general, that "there is nothing like Welsh in the above-mentioned lines": the rule of Horace will probably apply to one part of the language of this island, the English, as it did to the other.

A remarkable passage from Taliesin's Poems (with an English version of it) may be seen in a very curious work, lately published. I have only had an opportunity, as yet, of just looking into it: it is entitled *Celtic Researches*.

Multa renascentur, quæ jam cecedere, cadentque  
 Quæ nunc sunt in honore vocabula, si volet usus,  
 Quem penes arbitrium est et ius, et norma loquendi.

We all know how the proper English has varied ; from the time of Alfred (and much higher still) even to that of Chaucer ; from the time of Chaucer to that of Har. VIII. ; from the time of Har. VIII. to the present ; so that if we step backward to a very remote period we shall appear to be hardly in possession of the same language. Mr. Williams talks of having perused Welsh MSS. of the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries, and I have perused MSS. perhaps much older still in the ancient Irish character, and containing some Greek, in the large Uñcial letters. Taliesin must have had writings or records, long since lost, which went back hundreds and hundreds of years from *his* time ; and what varieties the British language may have gone through during that period, or what variations there may have been in the style of particular bards, it would be difficult to say. Though the people might be in a manner what we call barbarous, yet the Druids had much literature among them, for the acquisition of which the Gauls, as Cæsar tells us, came to Britain ; he also tells us, among other particulars, that the Druids had among them the Greek characters.

But as most probably some of your Cambrian readers may think what is thus advanced a mere theory of possibilities, or rather impossibilities, as fickle as what it was intended to bring forward on the Sanscrit, and may urge the unchanged, unchangeable state of his native language, he may turn back to the lines quoted in the former number of the Repository, and account for the appearance of those *foreign* lines in Taliesin's poems, and be able to account for it, with due allowances for one who understands neither Sanscrit nor Welsh, in some more probable, clearer way.

GEORGE DYER.

P. S. Since forwarding the above communication to the New Series of the Monthly Repository, I have had an opportunity of referring to the Welsh Archæology, as pointed out to me in a note to the former letter.

The Welsh Archæology is a work in three thick volumes, large octavo, consisting of Welsh poetry and Welsh prose. The poetry is placed chronologically, and the lines under consideration, as quoted in my last communication from Mr. Williams's letter, appear under the division 520---570, with Taliesin's name added to the date. But his name does not accompany the poem under consideration, as it does under some others in that series. Hence, I should infer, that though the poem may not be written by Taliesin, yet that it must be either obsolete Welsh, or erroneous Welsh, introduced by some blundering copyist : for, as it appears, the lines are not Sanscrit. I must further observe, that the lines occur in a poem of about eighty lines in length, and not as a quotation, but as a regular part of the poem, entitled, Gwawd Ludd-y-Mawr, the Praise of Ludd the Great.

If the lines under consideration and the poem itself are not Welsh, how could the three responsible editors insert them in a collection of Welsh poems? And why do they not explain the circumstance in a note, or in the preface, which is sufficiently ample, minute, and judicious, and written in English? But what puzzles me most, is, that Edward Williams's own name appears as one of these three responsible Editors. I have fallen on this subject, as you may perceive, without design ; but as two or three foreign ideas have obtruded themselves into my mind, I may perhaps endeavour to relieve myself of them by forwarding them to you on some future occasion.



## REVIEW.

**ART. I.—*The Doctrine of the Trinity founded neither on Scripture nor on Reason and Common Sense, but on Tradition and the Infallible Church, &c.* By William Hamilton Drummond, D. D. 2d Edit. Dublin, 1827.**

IN the course of the religious controversy which has, for some time past, occupied the public attention in Ireland, it has been usual with both the contending parties to abuse the Unitarians; the Roman Catholics, however, admitting, that without the authority of an infallible church the doctrine of the Trinity cannot be maintained; whilst the Protestants urge, that it is defensible on the principles of private judgment and “rests on a scriptural foundation.” Dr. Drummond, one of the ministers of Strand-Street Meeting-house, in Dublin, a gentleman well known by several poetical publications, and generally considered to be an Arian, has come forward, in a pamphlet, which has in a very short time reached a second edition, to maintain, in opposition to some of the disputants, that “the doctrine of the Trinity is founded neither on Scripture nor on reason and common sense, but on tradition and the infallible church;” and this work he has, with great propriety, dedicated to Rammohun Roy and Dr. Channing. In a short address to the reader, Dr. Drummond “divides all Christians into two denominations, Unitarians and Trinitarians. With their various subdivisions he does not interfere, deeming it enough, at present, to contend for the Supreme Deity of God alone, and believing that every departure from that doctrine leads to a perversion of the Scriptures, and the adoption of opinions hostile to the religion of the gospel.” We wish that this course were more generally adopted; because, though we attach importance to our own peculiar views of Christian doctrine, we consider the distinction between the worshipers of a Trinity in Unity, and those who maintain the Supreme Deity of One God, to be a much more important one, as it regards practice, than that between those called Arians and Socinians. “The more simple,” says Dr. Drummond, “the creed of Christians, the more chance of harmony. In proportion as the chords of a musical instrument are multiplied, the difficulty of preserving concord is increased. A belief in the one living and true God, and that he is a rich rewarder of those who diligently seek him; and in Jesus Christ, his well-beloved Son, that he is the author of eternal salvation to all who obey him, commingled with that charity which the inspired apostle declares to be superior to faith and hope, and without which there is no Christianity, should be a sufficient bond of fraternity and affection among all who would be followers of Christ, not in name only, but in deed and in truth.” Agreeably to this opinion, Dr. Drummond confines his attention to the defence of those common tenets which, under the name of Socinianism, are “stigmatized as leprogies and soul-destroying heresies by those who see them only with a *mind diseased* and a *jaundiced eye*, and through the distorting and discolouring medium of human creeds.”

In our opinion, Dr. Drummond has performed well the task he has undertaken, and has proved himself a worthy successor of EMLYN, who was minister of the congregation to which that new Meeting in Strand-Street has regularly succeeded, at the time when he became the object of an unholily persecution for teaching the same doctrine of the Unity of God. The

pamphlet is at the same time argumentative and eloquent, calculated both to correct the judgment and to rouse the feelings of the reader; and we anticipate that it will produce a considerable effect, and that, in connexion with the sermons of Dr. Bruce, and the persecuting spirit shewn in the Synod of Ulster, it will contribute to spread the influence of true and undefiled religion in Ireland. We shall proceed to give our readers some short extracts, in the hope that they may be induced to procure and peruse the work itself.

After shewing what Unitarianism is, by an enumeration of the various articles of the belief of Unitarians, he proceeds,

“Such is a brief summary of the Unitarians’ creed, derived not from *a priori* speculations on the incomprehensible nature of the Deity, but from a clear interpretation of the two great volumes of the Almighty, Nature and Revelation. The one corroborates the language of the other. What nature teaches, revelation does not contradict, but confirm. The visible frame of the universe has been well denominated the ‘elder Scripture,’ and it is a work to which the book of inspiration does not disdain to refer. The eternal power and godhead of the one Supreme Intelligence are clearly seen in the things that are made. ‘The earth is full of the goodness of the Lord, the heavens declare his glory, and the firmament sheweth forth the work of his hand;’ so that they are without excuse who do not read the volume of nature, and learn from the unity of design apparent in the creation, the unity of the great First Cause. This is the grand and fundamental principle of all religion. It corresponds with the conclusions of the most sublime philosophy, and the plainest dictates of inspiration. It was taught by Moses and the prophets, by Christ and his apostles. It has been adopted by many of the wisest and best of our species—by men who devoted their lives to the study of the Scriptures, and whose early prejudices, education, profession, and worldly interest were all arrayed against its reception—by men who have honoured it by the most heroic sacrifices of fortune and ambition—by the greatest philanthropists, poets, and metaphysicians—by Newton, Milton, and Locke: yet Mr. Pope and the theologians of his school” [*soi-disant* evangelical Churchmen] “have no scruple to class those who profess Unitarianism with Deists and Infidels, (why not with Atheists?) and to brand their faith with the name of leprosy, and a soul-destroying heresy! How simple and how grand is the Unitarian’s faith compared with the Trinitarian’s! When we turn from the one to the other, it is like turning from the contemplation of a beautiful world, when the sun is in the firmament, ‘rejoicing in his strength,’ to the view of a rough and dismal region, covered with continual clouds.”—P. 4.

“The Unitarian turns with delight from the Trinitarian hypothesis to the contemplation of his own simple and sublime faith. He rejoices to escape from the dark fogs of a dungeon to view the ethereal vault, and respire the pure breeze of heaven. His soul feels emancipated from bondage; and he comes forth rejoicing in the benignant smile of the Father of all. His heart expands and thrills with emotions of love to the Almighty One, his everlasting benefactor and friend. In the scheme of man’s redemption, he beholds a scheme of ineffable love, planned by the great Author of good, and executed by the ministry of his Divine Son. He drinks of the waters of salvation flowing from the living rock, as an emanation from the free grace of God unmerited and unbought; not as the purchase of a bloody sacrifice, or as a right extorted, by an infinite price, from inexorable wrath. The supreme exaltation of the Father does not diminish the honour and glory which are gratefully acknowledged to be due to the Son. But he believes that he loves and honours the Son most, when he acts most conformably to his precepts. He honours the Son even as he honours the Father, in receiving his dictates as the dictates of God himself.”—P. 63.

“As Unitarianism possesses so many incontestible claims to preference,

being the religion of reason, common sense, and the Bible, it may be asked, why it has not been more extensively diffused? Our blessed Lord himself will furnish the answer: "This is the condemnation, that light has come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." It is among the ordinances of a probationary state, that virtue shall be opposed by vice, and truth by falsehood. Unitarianism must expect, and should always be prepared to meet, the hostilities of Polytheistic creeds. It is passed by with contempt by the sanctimonious Pharisee, excluded by the wealthy synagogue of the lordly Sadducee, and branded with the names of leprosy, infidelity, deism, and enmity to God. But it has always possessed a mind conscious of its own rectitude, and a holy reliance on the Eternal One, whose name it delighteth to honour. Its spirit is immortal. It may be repressed, but never extinguished; "persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed." It may be silenced by clamour, never overcome by argument; harassed by Test and Corporation Acts, never deprived of communion with God. It is driven from courts, and finds an asylum in heaven."—P. 56.

After pointing out the difficulties Unitarians have to encounter, and the worldly motives they have to forsake the principles of their profession, he adds,

"Those who would proselyte Unitarians have every thing to assist them, except truth and the gospel. What but the strongest conviction can bind them to their unpopular belief? Overcome that conviction: prove to their satisfaction that they are in a wrong path, and they will join the many who have entered by the broad gate, and are crowding along the royal highway. Shew them a religion, with credentials from heaven, more beautiful and more easily comprehended than their own; more influential on human conduct; and more adapted to the wants, the hopes, the wishes, and all the lofty and holy aspirations of the immortal soul, and be assured, they are not such enemies to their own good as to refuse its adoption. They stand on the right of private judgment, and this right with them is not a name, but a reality."—P. 58.

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

(Concluded from p. 601.)

We cannot pass without remark the criticism on John viii. 58, because Mr. Bloomfield has observed that "the Socinians are, in the interpretation of this passage, driven to great straits, and, in order to evade the plain sense of the words, are compelled to do violence to every principle of sound criticism and legitimate interpretation." It certainly has always appeared to us that the interpretation we adopt, and which we believe to be most generally received amongst the Unitarians of the present day, is attended with fewer difficulties in itself, and considering this passage alone, than any other which has been proposed, besides that it seems to us best to harmonize with many plain declarations of Scripture, and with the general sense of the sacred writings; but one or two observations on what our learned annotator has brought forward, will enable our readers to judge for themselves whether his triumph over the Socinians be not somewhat premature.

We cannot, indeed, undertake to defend the interpretation of Augustus Socinus, founded on the mystical sense of the name Abraham. It is anju-

rious, and the play upon the word would not, perhaps, have seemed to an audience of Jews, as it is apt to do to us, beneath the dignity of the subject and occasion; but we cannot think that a good connexion of the sentiment with the preceding discourse has been established; and though the words *might* be translated in the manner proposed, the proofs that they *should* be so seem to us to fail. If it was good Greek to use *γίνομαι* at all in the sense of *being born*, it signifies little that so common a word has been employed by the writer of this text ninety times in its more usual sense. If we meet with the very expression *πριν . . . γενεσθαι*, in the sense, “before a person named *was born*,” in other writers, the Apostle John’s happening elsewhere to use *πριν γενεσθαι* for “before it came to pass,” does not render it unlikely that, with a proper name before the verb, he should mean by the phrase what others had meant by it. It signifies little to tell us that “the form *γενεσθαι*, generally throughout the New Testament, and *always* in St. John’s writings, has a future signification,” when this form, being in its nature indeterminate as to time, depends on the connexion for its reference to the past or the future. The objections made to supposing *εγω ειμι* to refer to past time seem equally unfounded; after all, however, we think that this interpretation of Socinus, which has been ably defended by Dr. Carpenter, is generally treated much more severely than it deserves, and may safely be compared in reasonableness and probability with either of the orthodox interpretations.

In our remarks on Mr. Bloomfield we must begin at ver. 56: “Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad.” Having justly observed that *ἡγαλλιάσατο* with *ἵνα* expresses desire, “greatly longed to see my day,” he proceeds to interpret, “and he saw it and rejoiced,” i. e. in the seats of the blessed, in *orcu*, not in “heaven.” “He has seen, i. e. *mentally* has known, my advent, and has felt joy at it.” He mentions the explanation “saw, i. e. *foresaw*,” along with several others little worth our notice, which he thus dispatches: “All these interpretations are too far-fetched, and are indeed at variance with the *usus loquendi* and the context.” We, nevertheless, take this explanation to be the most obvious and natural, and that which alone harmonizes well with the context. The purposes of God in the separation of the family of Abraham were but gradually made known to the Patriarch. He longed to see the grand result; at length he was permitted to see in prophetic vision how all the nations of the earth should be blessed in his seed, to form some imperfect anticipation of the glorious kingdom of the Saviour of the world, *εἶδε καὶ ἐχάρη*. “He saw and was glad,” *πρόβλεπεν τὰς επαγγελίας ἰδόντες*, Heb. xi. 13, quoted by Schleusner *in verb.*, is a clear instance of a similar use of the word; it will, indeed, hardly be denied by any that it may bear such a meaning. What Mr. Bloomfield calls the common interpretation, besides assuming a theory respecting the state of the dead, which will hardly be proved to be scriptural, renders our Lord’s observation trifling and inappropriate. He answers the query, “Art thou greater than our Father Abraham?” by shewing that it was a privilege to Abraham to be allowed to anticipate *his* coming—an indirect yet decisive assertion of his own superiority.

In the 57th verse, the Jews, either stupidly or maliciously misunderstanding our Lord’s words, say to him, “Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?” The answer to be expected must, of course, shew how the previous assertion might be true, notwithstanding that Jesus could not have been personally contemporary with Abraham, and this could certainly be done no better than by observing, as we understand our Lord’s



answer, that as his mission was settled in the Divine counsels before Abraham's time, it might well have been prophetically made known to him. The interpretations which suppose Christ to assert his eternal independent existence, or at least his real and personal existence, before the time of Abraham, by no means so well suit the 56th verse, because it is not there said that Abraham saw or conversed with Christ, but that he saw *his day*, the circumstances of his coming, which, whether Christ existed previously or not, could only have been seen by the Patriarch prophetically and with the eye of faith. Thus strong in the connexion, we proceed to examine the words. In the translation of the first clause, *πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι*, "Before Abraham was born," we agree with Mr. Bloomfield, and with most commentators, in opposition to Socinus and his followers, and we have already given our reasons. We pass to the important words *ἐγώ εἰμι*. Here there can be no allusion to Exod. iii. 14, "I am that I am," as many suppose; because in the Hebrew the verb is future, and the expression ought to be understood as a declaration not of eternal existence but of faithfulness in the performance of what had been promised to the people of Israel. It seems to be an application of the name *Jehovah*, which may have been originally used to express eternal existence, to the particular circumstances of the people of Israel. The LXX. did, indeed, understand the expression of eternal independent existence, rendering it *ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν*, whence it is nearly certain that if our Lord had intended to convey that sense, we should have found the same words in the Greek gospel. But the true sense of the words *ἐγώ εἰμι* is sufficiently determined by their occurrence twice in the same chapter, and altogether nine times in the gospels, where it is universally agreed that there is an ellipsis, and that we must understand "the Christ." Ch. viii. 24, "If ye believe not that *I am*," our translators supply *he*, meaning the Christ, as the general sense suggests, though neither this nor any other title had been mentioned in the preceding verses: "Ye shall die in your sins;" and in ver. 28, "When ye have lift up the Son of Man, then shall ye know that I am *he*, and that I do nothing of myself, but as my Father hath taught me I speak these things." There can be no possible reason for rendering *ἐγώ εἰμι* in these places, and in ver. 58, differently. It, at least, cannot be denied, that to render the words in the same manner in both places is the most natural method, and not to be departed from without some strong and special grounds. We, therefore, assume that I am *he*, meaning the Messiah, is the correct translation of the words. As to the *time* expressed by *εἰμι*, Mr. Bloomfield justly remarks, "The present is often so put as to have the force of the imperfect, especially when the thing which is said some time to have been still *continues to be*," of which he gives examples. The application we should make of this remark is somewhat different from our author's. We understand "before the birth of Abraham I have been appointed to that office which I am now filling—I have been as I now am, the Messiah." Mr. Bloomfield refers to Is. xliii. 13, and it is an important passage, which might remove all doubt respecting the meaning of our Lord's words. We should keep in mind in this inquiry, as Dr. J. P. Smith has observed, "that Jesus, speaking in the dialect of his country, most probably used *no verb* at all. The idiom of the Hebraic languages would have required I *HE*, as it occurs in several passages of the Old Testament; *אני ה'נ* Deut. xxxii. 39; Is. xli. 4, xliii. 10, 13, xlv. 4, xlviii. 12. In these passages the translation of the LXX. is the very phrase, *ἐγώ εἰμι*, I am." (Smith's Script. Test. Vol. II. p. 169, and note.) We add, that in all these places the common and unquestioned translation is, "I

am he," the personal reference being evident from the context. Is. xliii. 13, "before the day was I am He," meaning, I have always been God, is a clear instance of "I am he" referring to past time, and is in the form of expression very similar to our Lord's words, "Before Abraham was born, I have been appointed to the office I am now filling." The word to be supplied is *Messiah, anointed*, which necessarily refers not to existence, but to designation to office, and this alone was necessary that Abraham might foresee his day. If any one, accustomed only to our modern modes of speech, should still think it strange that our Lord should thus assert his appointment before the time of Abraham, let him consider the following and similar expressions. Rev. xiii. 8, "The lamb slain from the foundation of the world," i. e. appointed to be slain in the Divine counsels, which rendered the violent death of the Saviour essential to the accomplishment of the great ends of his mission. Rev. xvii. 8, "Whose names were not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world." Ephes. i. 4, "As he (God) hath chosen us in him (Christ) before the foundation of the world." We may add, from the Targum of Jonathan, "Before the world was created, the Lord Jehovah created the law; he prepared the garden of Eden for the just."

We shall only stop on ch. x. 30, ("I and my Father are one.") to express our surprise at finding Mr. Bloomfield taking part with those who contend for unity of nature and essence; whilst we acknowledge that, as he has fairly given the high authorities in favour of the other interpretation, and his own arguments are altogether ineffectual, there is little danger of his misleading any inquiring reader.

On ch. xvii. ver. 3, our author has a long and laboured annotation, chiefly from Tittman, designed to rescue this clear and important passage out of the hands of the Socinians, as he is pleased to call them, who are likely, nevertheless, still to assert their claims to it. That our Lord in prayer addresses the Father as "the *only true God*," and designates himself as one sent by him, possessing authority only as his messenger, is a scriptural fact, which those who deify the Saviour have ever found it difficult to bring even into apparent accordance with their theory. It is one of those cases in which those who usually make it their boast to follow the *obvious and natural meaning* of the words of Scripture, that is to say, the meaning which is familiar to their prejudices, rejecting with scorn explanations the most certainly required by Jewish idiom, by parallel passages, or by the scope of the context, are reduced to the necessity of trying the weapons they have so often despised, and of which in their difficulties they are far from shewing themselves masters. On the present occasion what Mr. Bloomfield calls "the *masterly* illustrations of the *orthodox, learned and acute* Tittman," however they may contribute to his reputation for *orthodoxy*, will not much advance his credit as an impartial inquirer or a sound reasoner. He first rather strangely infers that because Jesus asserts that "God had given him power over all flesh," (Mr. Bloomfield properly explains it both Jews and Gentiles,) "that he might bestow eternal life on as many as God had given to him;" therefore he is the Son of God, *equal* to the Father and God *himself*. He then proceeds to observe, that "this word *υπακουω*, as is well known and universally admitted, here, as in many other passages of Scripture," (a convenient and sufficiently bold assumption!) "must denote not only to know but to worship. But this worship can be suitable only to the true God, and our Lord here expressly refers that worship not only to the Father but to himself, and he requires of all who would aspire to eternal life,

that they should worship Christ in the same manner as they worship the Father, &c. Now, it is true that, though *γῶσκα* could not with propriety have the sense of *worshipping*, ascribed to it, it may sometimes from the connexion and by a Hebrew idiom *imply* worship, as LXX., 1 Chron. xxviii. 9, *γῶσθι τὸν Θεὸν τῶν πατέρων σου*, "acknowledge or worship the God of thy fathers;" and there is one passage in the New Testament which may be supposed to be of this kind. John viii. 55, "Ye say that he is your God, yet ye have not *known*, i. e. served him;" but even here there can be no reference to worship in a strict sense, since the Jews were not accused of departing from the worship of the true God, but of making his laws of none effect. We do not recollect any other passage in the New Testament in which the word can even be supposed to imply worship; and Schleusner only says, (*in verb.* No. 17,) "*agnosco aliquem meum esse et ad me pertinere, et ex adjuncto: magnifico, revereor, amo, beneficiis afficio.*" Now, in the passage under consideration, the Father is expressly addressed as "*the only true God*," whilst our Lord describes himself as "*the Christ* or anointed, i. e. the appointed person *whom God had sent*," consequently, *ex adjuncto*, it is evident that the sense of *worshipping* is here inadmissible.

It is farther observed, that in this whole passage Christ speaks "not as the Son of God, but as the legate of the Father." We should reply by referring to the passages which prove that "Son of God," and "Christ, appointed messenger, i. e. legate of God," were, as understood by the Jews, *equivalent phrases*; but we cannot help remarking that this mode of evading a difficulty by representing our Lord as sometimes affirming in one character, what is not true in another character or nature, which he equally sustains at the same time, defends orthodoxy (so far as it can be thought by any to defend it) at the expense of our Lord's character for sincerity and honesty, and lowers him in our moral estimation in proportion as it raises his nature above our comprehension, and lessens the credibility of his history.

Mr. Bloomfield is nowhere more positive than in his interpretation of ch. xvii. 5, ("And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was,") "That these words are to be explained of the future felicity of Christ in heaven and of the beatitude which he had already enjoyed with the Father before the creation of the world, is so certain, that I do not see how it can be reasonably doubted by any one." Yet must we still presume to think the interpretation usually given by Unitarian commentators in every respect preferable, more agreeable to the context and the customary use of the phraseology, and more suitable to our Lord's character and circumstances. The first question is respecting the sort of *glory* for which our Lord prayed. Tittman (ap. Bloomfield) says, "*δόξα* (Heb. כבוד,) the *Divine Majesty*, embracing the whole compass of the Divine nature, attributes, counsels, and works;" but this is mere assumption. The whole language of Christ's prayer is against it. Ver. 1, "Father, *glorify* thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee," where Mr. Bloomfield acknowledges that the glory must be understood of the propagation of Christ's doctrine. "I have glorified thee on earth," by finishing the appointed work for the salvation of mankind. "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self," (*κατὰ σεαυτόν* opposed to *ἐν τῇ δόξῃ*, in the heavenly state,) give me the glory of seeing in heaven, now that my earthly labour is finished, the result of what I have done—allow me to witness and enjoy the success of my mission as appointed by thee before the world was. Again, ver. 10, "All mine are thine, and thine are mine, and



*I am glorified in them:* my glory consists in their fidelity, and their success in diffusing my religion. “*I shall be glorified in them,* by their propagating my religion, communicating to others what I taught them, and making manifest among men my dignity of Messiah.” (Kuinoel, ap. Bloomfield.) Ver. 22, “*The glory which thou gavest me I have given them.*” I have made them partakers in the honour and happiness of accomplishing the work for which I was sent. Ver. 24, “*I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me; for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.*” His *glory*, the accomplishment of the purposes of his mission, to which he had been chosen before the foundation of the world, he wishes that his disciples may at length be able fully to perceive by being admitted after their labours into that heavenly state upon which he is now about to enter. It appears, from a comparison of these passages, that the glory sought by Christ consisted in the success of his religion, and was to be participated by his faithful followers; that it could not be any personal benefit or any attribute of Deity, and that it could not have been actually enjoyed by him before, because it is described as resulting from the labours in which he had now been engaged. The passages usually cited to prove that *παρὰ σοί*, with thee, in the last clause signifies in thy counsels and purposes, seem to us perfectly satisfactory: “with respect to,” or “in the estimation of,” being a common meaning of the preposition, and the difference between *σεαυτῷ* and *σοί* suggesting the difference of sense between the two clauses. The use of *ἐμεν*, to signify destination, is objected to by Tittman and Lampe, who accuse the Socinians of trifling egregiously. Schleusner, however, expressly ascribes this meaning to the word: habeo mihi aliquid concessum. Matt. vi. 1, *μισθὸν ἔχετε παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ ὑμῶν*, “Ye have no reward,” there is none appointed or destined for you “with your Father in heaven,” in his counsels and plans: nor can we think, *εἶχον πρὸς τὰ τοῦ κόσμου εἶναι*, “I possessed (meaning in the Divine decrees) before the world was,” even putting out of the question the qualifying *παρὰ σοί*, more difficult than *ἀργίον ἡσθαγμένον ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*, or other similar passages referred to in our remarks on ch. viii. 58. Lampe’s objection, founded on the use of the word *δοθεῖσθαι*, in 2 Tim. i. 9, “that it is one thing for any thing to be given, which signifies only the act of the giver, and another to have it,” is extremely trifling in relation to that passage, and is not applicable to the example we have now quoted, where an event is plainly spoken of as having taken place many ages before it actually occurred, because it was fully determined upon in the Divine counsels. An observation of Mr. Bloomfield on ch. xx. 28, is worth quoting as coming from *him*. After endeavouring to defend the explanation (*σὺ εἶ*) ὁ κύριός μου, “thou art my Lord and my God,” he adds, “It may, however, be justly doubted whether the so lately incredulous (because prejudiced and unenlightened) disciple had *then* (or at any time before the illumination of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost) any complete notion of the divine nature of Jesus as forming part of the Godhead.” We think, indeed, it may be more than doubted, but we hardly expected such an acknowledgment from our author, who has laboured so hard to prove that Jesus frequently and distinctly taught his divine nature. We think Mr. Bloomfield right in supposing that we are to take ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου as nominative cases, but surely the most natural way of filling up the imperfect sentence is “my Lord and my God,” is here manifested, is the author of this wonderful miracle. “It is my Lord and my God.” The ancient Syriac and Persic versions do not, we think, sanction Mr. Bloomfield’s



construction, though the Latin translations placed beside them in the Polyglot may in some degree do so. They are themselves as ambiguous as the Greek.

We must now conclude. Mr. Bloomfield has certainly made an important contribution to our English theological literature, and we trust he will be very useful in diffusing sound principles of scriptural interpretation. Much as we differ from him on many points of great interest, we highly approve the general character and spirit of his expositions, and are happy to think that they will probably be studied by many who have been accustomed to draw from very inferior sources.

ART. III.—*Hints on Extemporaneous Preaching.* By Henry Ware, Jun., Minister of the Second Church in Boston. Boston, North America, 1824.

THIS is a very elegant and pleasing essay, and in our opinion well deserves the compliment of a reprint in this country. It is divided into three chapters, in the first of which the author treats of the advantages of extemporaneous preaching; in the second, he examines and endeavours to obviate the objections commonly urged against this practice; and in the third, he proposes some rules with a view to its attainment and cultivation. Though we are by no means disposed to go all his length in recommending the disuse of written notes as an habitual practice, yet many of his observations are unquestionably very just, and may at least serve to convince the reader that the power of *occasional* extemporaneous delivery in the pulpit is an important and valuable talent,—that to a considerable extent it is capable of being acquired, and will amply repay the labour which is necessary for that purpose.

We should hesitate, however, in making this concession, if it should be thought necessary for the attainment of the desired facility in this talent, that it be made the constant or ordinary practice. We readily admit that there are occasions when the employment of unpremeditated language even in the delivery of premeditated thoughts is desirable in the pulpit, and Mr. Ware on the other hand acknowledges that the Christian preacher is called upon to treat of many subjects which are far from being well adapted to extemporaneous discourse. He, however, seems to consider the latter as the exception, and the former as the rule; to us it appears to be nearly the reverse. An important distinction is very properly insisted upon between extemporaneous speaking and that which is absolutely unpremeditated; while the former is recommended, the latter, when introduced into the pulpit, is justly stigmatized as an unwarrantable abuse of a valuable endowment. While the language is to be trusted to the moment, the thoughts are to be the objects of careful and attentive study. But how is this study to be carried on? With respect to the greater part of the topics with which the preacher is conversant, we are inclined to think that there is no way in which the business of previous preparation can be carried on so effectually and completely as by writing upon them. Every one accustomed to composition well knows that the very act of committing to paper his thoughts upon any subject, not only enables him to ascertain more exactly the extent and the deficiencies of his knowledge, but also tends very remarkably to render that knowledge more distinct and precise. This being the case, it seems to follow in general, that a preacher is scarcely warranted in attempt-

ing to address a congregation, or can be considered as having given them all the advantage they are entitled to expect from the exercise of his abilities and industry in their service, unless he have previously devoted as much time and labour to the examination of his subject as would have enabled him to compose a written discourse, and even that in the conduct of his examination, if it have been pursued judiciously, a considerable portion of that time must have been occupied in the actual business of composition. They who suppose that by the mere animation or vehemence which they can communicate to words hastily poured off from a fluent tongue, they can dispense with previous study, or are authorized to put their hearers off with the crude, hasty, and ill-considered idea which may occur to them at the moment, certainly cannot be regarded as doing justice either to themselves, to their audience, or to the all-important truths on which it is their duty to discourse.

In estimating, therefore, the comparative advantages of extemporary and written sermons, the real question we have to consider is simply this; in which way is the preacher likely to make the most powerful impression on the minds of his audience, at the same time that he communicates distinctly and satisfactorily the requisite religious instruction? Now, upon this point it is, perhaps, scarcely practicable to arrive at a decision which shall be fairly applicable to all cases or to all preachers. We hold that in respect of this, as of all other intellectual endowments, there are considerable original, and still more extensive acquired, diversities. There are some who, without any course of mental discipline which can be distinctly traced, find themselves possessed of a more than ordinary degree of self-command and fluency of language, while at the same time they have less aptitude for the labour of composition with the pen. But, without pretending to decide on extreme cases, we should venture to lay it down as a general rule, that most men, possessed of such habits of composition as are implied in the degree of intellectual culture which is admitted on all hands to be indispensable to the Christian minister, might be expected to compose a written discourse *intrinsically* superior to any which they could speak.

If this assumption be correct, as far at least as the ordinary routine, if we may so call it, of pulpit duty is concerned, we have only to inquire whether the superiority of *manner* ascribed to the one mode of preparation and delivery would more than counterbalance the superiority of *matter*, as we think not unreasonably expected from the other? In discussing this point, at the same time that we are fully sensible of the justness of many of his remarks, we are inclined to think that Mr. Ware has been led into a fallacy by uniformly contrasting the best forms of the one mode with the worst forms of the other; taking it for granted that every extempore speaker must be animated and impressive, while every reader is unavoidably dull and uninteresting. He speaks continually of "the drowsy uniformity of the man that reads," "cold reading," "indifferent reading," &c. But is it necessary that reading should be drowsy, monotonous, cold, or indifferent? On the contrary, does not every one's experience bring to his recollection examples of preachers who have been in the general habit of reading written compositions, but who have, nevertheless, been remarkable for earnestness, variety, impressiveness, and animation? It is a well-known fact, that many of the most eminent and popular preachers of the present day, such as Chalmers and Irving, are mere readers; the latter, especially, even slavishly confined to his notes. We are not recommending either of these distinguished men as models in pulpit eloquence; they are eminent, not in consequence, but in spite of, their peculiarities. We only bring them forward as proofs that dull and monotonous uniformity are not the inseparable con-

comitants of written discourses; and it would be easy to cite many instances both of living and departed excellence in preachers who have been deservedly acceptable, not merely to the refined and thinking few, but to numerous congregations, and who are not only known as readers of precomposed sermons, but are universally admired for correctness, elegance, and good taste. Certainly there is nothing in the mere act of *reading* which is inconsistent with a deep feeling of the importance and interest of the subject, with an earnest wish to impart that feeling to others, or with the capacity of pronouncing the prepared sentences by which it is to be imparted with energy, animation, and effect. It is not *necessary* that a reader should be fixed like a statue, that his eye should be constantly fixed on his paper, or that he should express himself with cold and lifeless monotony. If he have real sincerity and feeling, it is unquestionably practicable for him to deliver in public what he composed under the influence of this feeling, in such a manner as to communicate it to his hearers.

“The cold reading of what a man wrote, perhaps, with little excitement and delivers with less,” is doubtless flat and unprofitable enough; we should say, however, that this was to be ascribed not to his reading, but to his *bad* reading; and should be inclined to address to him our author’s exhortation not to attempt to exercise in public an art of which he had neither studied the principles nor applied the rules to practice. It appears, therefore, that the evil complained of arises, in a great measure, not from any thing inherent in the method itself, but from the bungling and imperfect manner in which it is practised by many who are contented with being able to read, but to whom the art of reading *well*, with correctness, propriety and good taste, has never occurred as an object worthy of serious consideration. That such imperfections may be removed, the success of many eminent and highly popular preachers who read their sermons, is a sufficient proof.

“In the inquiry,” says Mr. W., “which of the two methods is to be preferred in the pulpit, we must consider, not which has the most excellencies when it is found in perfection, but which has excellencies attainable by the largest number of preachers.” (P. 18.) This is certainly a very important point to be attended to in instituting this comparison, and in our judgment it seems materially to influence the result; because it will scarcely admit of a question, that the number is much less of those who are capable of becoming *good* extempore speakers, than of those who can learn to read with propriety a discourse recently composed under the influence of right feelings, when the train of thought and argument pursued in it is deeply impressed upon their minds. And this leads us to observe, that as it is not necessary that a sermon should be *read* in a dull and lifeless manner, so it is not necessary that it be *written* with little excitement of feeling. If a sermon produced under such circumstances is dry and uninteresting, and consequently fails of working a desirable effect upon the audience, may we not say that it is not because it is written, but because it is *ill* written? A man of learning, well accustomed to the business of composition, may nevertheless forget, when employed in preparing himself for the pulpit, that he is not engaged upon a moral essay or a critical dissertation intended for the press; and in that case, whatever correctness, elegance or ability, his production might display in other respects, we should not hesitate to pronounce it an ill-written sermon. But surely it is not *impossible* that a discourse intended to be addressed to a numerous audience, in circumstances of solemnity which ought to be attended by considerable elevation, if not excitement, of feeling, should be composed under the influence of a constant recollection of its intended object. This



recollection, carefully preserved, will infallibly produce, if the mind be otherwise well disposed and prepared, such a degree of warmth of feeling even in the leisure and retirement of his study; as will enable him to communicate to his composition its appropriate and essential character. A written sermon is a discourse of a distinct species, the preparation of which is an art which has its own peculiar rules. That it has also its peculiar difficulties is readily admitted; but they are difficulties which may be surmounted by attention and perseverance; and it is reasonably expected of the preacher that he exercise this attention and perseverance in the due discharge of his office.

Not only a warmth, but an ease and rapidity of composition in every variety of situation, is frequently very important to the Christian minister in his preparation for the stated duties of his office, and more especially for occasional services; and this, too, is capable of being acquired by practice. This species of *extemporaneous writing* is an art possessed in high perfection by some of those who are but little distinguished for fluency of speech, and has frequently enabled them, on very short notice, to avail themselves of peculiar circumstances and unforeseen emergencies with no inconsiderable readiness and propriety. Still, however, it must be admitted, that a minister is liable to be placed in situations where no adequate substitute can be found for the easy and correct delivery of unwritten discourse. And this furnishes a strong recommendation, not, we think, of the habitual practice, but of such intellectual exercises as are necessary to secure the power of extempore speech. It is forcibly urged by Mr. W. in the following passage:

“Occasions will sometimes occur when the want of this power may expose a minister to mortification, and deprive him of an opportunity of usefulness. For such emergencies one would choose to be prepared. It may be of consequence that he should express his opinion in an *ecclesiastical council*, and give reason for the adoption or rejection of important measures. Possibly he may be only required to state facts which have come to his knowledge. It is very desirable to be able to do this readily, fluently, without embarrassment to himself, and pleasantly to those who hear; and in order to this, a habit of speaking is necessary. In the course of his ministration also among his own people, occasions will arise when an exhortation or address would be seasonable and useful, but when there is no time for written preparation. If, then, he have cultivated the art of extemporaneous speaking, and attained to any degree of facility and confidence in it, he may avail himself of the opportunity to do good, which he must otherwise have passed by unimproved. Funerals and baptisms afford suitable occasions of making good religious impressions. A sudden providence also on the very day of the sabbath, may suggest most valuable topics of reflection and exhortation, lost to him who is confined to what he may have previously written, but choice treasure to him who can venture to speak without writing. If it were only to avail himself of a few opportunities like these in the course of his life, or to save himself but once the mortification of being silent when he ought to speak, is expected to speak, and would do good by speaking, it would be well worth all the time and pains it would cost to acquire it.”—P. 21.

Mr. Ware in several places holds it out as a recommendation of the habit of extempore preaching, that it saves time in preparation, which may be conveniently and profitably employed in prosecuting other studies. How far this is consistent with the view which he gives of the labour and perseverance required in the cultivation of this art, and the disapprobation which he frequently expresses of those who presume to enter the pulpit with their minds not fully possessed by and familiar with their subject, it may not be easy to determine. The advantage, however, if it be one, is intimately connected with one of the most serious objections to the practice, in the



temptation which it holds out to the indolent, who, finding themselves possessed of the talent of ready and fluent elocution, are sometimes induced to dispense with previous study altogether; trusting to their power of unprepared expression to bring them through all difficulties. This mode of feeding the flock with chaff, through an unjustifiable perversion of a useful accomplishment to the purposes of idleness or frivolity, cannot be too strongly reprobated. But it may be said that we ought not to argue from the abuse of a talent against its right application, and that this abuse in particular must be confined to those who are devoid of all seriousness of mind, or feeling of the dignity and responsibility of their office.

The concluding chapter contains a series of practical suggestions for facilitating the attainment and exercise of this faculty. Most of these are highly sensible and judicious, and well deserve the young preacher's attention, in whatever mode he may think it advisable statedly and habitually to conduct his public services. Indeed, we cannot conclude without repeating our wish, that the whole essay were more accessible to our young divines, who would find in it much to admire and profit by, though they should not be persuaded to adopt in its full extent the author's favourite method. We rise from it with a very pleasing idea both of his talents and general character. He is evidently an elegant scholar, an agreeable writer, and a conscientious and able labourer in his Master's vineyard.

We insert the concluding passage, which no one, we think, can read without a wish to see what precedes.

"After all, therefore, which can be said, the great essential requisite to effective preaching in this method, (or indeed in any method,) is a devoted heart. A strong religious sentiment, leading to a fervent zeal for the good of other men, is better than all rules of art; it will give him courage, which no science or practice could impart, and open his lips boldly, when the fear of man would keep them closed. Art may fail him, and all his treasures of knowledge desert him; but if his heart be warm with love, he will 'speak right on,' aiming at the heart, and reaching the heart; and satisfied to accomplish the great purpose, whether he be thought to do it tastefully or not.

"This is the true spirit of his office, to be cherished and cultivated above all things else, and capable of rendering all its labours comparatively easy. It reminds him that his purpose is not to make profound discussions of theological doctrines, or disquisitions on moral and metaphysical science; but to present such views of the great and acknowledged truths of revelation, with such applications of them to the understanding and conscience, as may affect and reform his hearers. Now it is not study only, in divinity or rhetoric, which will enable him to do this. He may reason ingeniously, but not convincingly; he may declaim eloquently, but not persuasively. There is an immense, though indescribable, difference between the same arguments and truths, as presented by him who earnestly feels and desires to persuade, and by him who designs only a display of intellectual strength, or an exercise of rhetorical skill. In the latter case, the declamation may be splendid, but it will be cold and without expression: lulling the ear and diverting the fancy, but leaving the feelings untouched. In the other, there is an air of reality and sincerity which words cannot describe, but which the heart feels, which finds its way to the recesses of the soul, and overcomes it by a powerful sympathy. This is a difference which all can perceive, and all can account for. The truths of religion are not matters of philosophical speculation, but of experience. The heart, and all the spiritual man, and all the interests and feelings of the immortal being, have an intimate concern in them. It is perceived at once, whether they are stated by one who has felt them himself, is personally acquainted with their power, is subject to their influence, and speaks from actual experience; or whether they come from one who knows

them only in speculation, has gathered them from books, and thought them out by his own reason, but without any sense of their spiritual operation. But who does not know how much easier it is to declare what has come to our knowledge from our own experience, than what we have gathered coldly at second-hand from that of others;—how much easier it is to describe feelings we have ourselves had, and pleasures we have ourselves enjoyed, than to fashion a description of what others have told us;—how much more freely and convincingly we can speak of happiness we have known, than of that to which we are strangers! We see, then, how much is lost to the speaker by coldness or ignorance in the exercises of personal religion. How can he effectually represent the joys of a religious mind, who has never known what it is to feel them? How can he effectually aid the contrite, the desponding, the distrustful, the tempted, who has never himself passed through the same fears and sorrows? Or how can he paint in the warm colours of truth, religious exercises and spiritual desires, who is personally a stranger to them? Alas! he cannot at all come in contact with those souls which stand most in need of his sympathy and aid. But if he have cherished in himself fondly and habitually the affections he would excite in others, if he have combated temptation and practised self-denial, and been instant in prayer, and tasted the joy and peace of a tried faith and hope;—then he may communicate directly with the hearts of his fellow-men, and win them over to that which he so feelingly describes. If his spirit be always warm and stirring with these pure and kind emotions, and anxious to impart the means of his own felicity to others, how easily and freely will he pour himself forth! and how little will he think of the embarrassments of the presence of mortal man, while he is conscious only of labouring for the glory of the ever-present God! This, then, is the one thing essential to be attained and cherished by the Christian preacher. With this he must begin, and with this he must go on to the end. Then he never can greatly fail; for he will feel his subject thoroughly, and speak without fear."

## CRITICAL

## NOTICES.

ART. IV.—*A Letter addressed to the Right Hon. George Canning, First Lord of the Treasury, &c., intended as an Humble Vindication of the Present Ministry.* By A. S. Wade, D. D., of St. John's College, Cambridge, &c. 8vo. pp. 32. 1827.

THE lamented death of Mr. Canning has not entirely taken away the interest which we feel in such publications as this; since Mr. Canning's name is used as the index to a liberal system of policy, domestic and foreign, which, thanks to His Majesty! is likely to be still maintained. Dr. Wade is one of the few members of the clerical body who look with unqualified approbation upon the present liberal administration. He is the declared enemy of the Holy Alliance, of the Bourbon influence, and of Turkish despotism; he is the avowed friend of free trade, of the independence of the Continental and South American States, and of religious liberty, with regard to

both Roman Catholics and Protestant Dissenters. In his aversion and opposition to Toryism, he takes his late much-revered friend Dr. Parr, for a guide and authority. That sound politician and eminent scholar would have been ready to acknowledge Dr. Wade as a disciple in the former character, but not in the latter: for what, in the name of all that is liberal, could have induced this Cambridge man to pen the following silly, Cobbett-like sentence?—"The classical learning on which the nominally Great pride themselves so much, however befitting it may be to idle gentlemen and men of taste, is of very little practical value." (P. 10.) We acknowledge the independence of the clergyman who can defy the "Great," but the reverend gentleman need not surely condemn the aristocracy for their "too much learning." Anxious, however, to remove the impression made by this morsel of vulgar feeling and incoherent writing, the Rev. Doctor boasts in a note,

(p. 14.) of his Alma Mater, which has produced so many learned and patriotic men in the different walks in life. But for two or three extravagancies and inconsistencies of this sort, the Letter may be read with pleasure as the expression of the sentiments of a liberal and honest man, whose defects, both as a reasoner and a writer, are more than made up by homely integrity.

ART. V. — *A Descriptive Catalogue of the MSS. and Printed Books contained in the Library of His Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex.* By Thomas Jos. Pettigrew, F. R. S. Vol. I. Parts I and II.

It has long been known that the Duke of Sussex had been eminently successful in the collection of a splendid library, particularly in the theological department. The volume now published contains only a part of this extraordinary collection. The first part comprises the manuscript treasures of biblical literature which enrich the library. These are in a vast variety of languages, and are many of them of the most valuable and interesting character. The observations of Mr. Pettigrew (who is the Duke's Librarian) connect the whole into a most useful book of reference for information on these subjects. To shew his system of illustration we will extract his account of the Phylacteries in the Duke's collection.

“ *Phylacteries.*

“ The word Phylactery, derived from the Greek, (φυλακτήριον,) properly signifies a *preservative*, and in this sense has been used by various nations to protect them against evil spirits, diseases, dangers, &c. In many parts of the East, these superstitious practices still obtain. The phylacteries of the Jews are of three kinds, of each of which there is a specimen in His Royal Highness's Library. They consist of portions of Scripture taken from the Pentateuch, selected according to the situation for which they are destined, written upon very fine vellum, in a very small square character, and with a particular kind of ink. They are used for the head, for the arm, and are also attached to the door-posts.

I. *For the head.* The portions of the Pentateuch for the phylactery of the head consist of Exod. xiii. 2—10, 11—16; Deut. vi. 4—9, xi. 13—21. These four portions contain thirty verses, which are written upon four slips of vellum, separately rolled up, and placed in four compartments and joined together in one small square piece of skin or leather.

Upon this is written the letter *Shin*. From the case proceed two thongs of leather, which are so arranged as to go round the head, leaving the square case, containing the passages of the Pentateuch above referred to, in the centre of the forehead. The thongs make a knot at the back of the head, in the form of the letter *7 Daleth*, and then come round again to the breast. The phylacteries of the head are called frontlets, and the practice of using them appears to rest particularly upon these passages: 1. *And it shall be for a sign unto thee upon thine hand, and for a memorial between thine eyes, that the Lord's law may be in thy mouth: for with a strong hand hath the Lord brought thee out of Egypt.* Exod. xiii. 9.—2. *And it shall be for a token upon thine hand, and for frontlets between thine eyes: for by strength of hand the Lord brought us forth out of Egypt.* Exod. xiii. 16. These phylacteries are called *Tephillin shel-rosh*, or, the tefilla of the head.

II. *For the arm.* This phylactery consists of a roll of vellum, containing the same passages of the Pentateuch as those for the head, and written in the same square character, and with the same ink, but arranged in four columns. It is rolled up to a point, and enclosed in a sort of case of the skin of a clean beast. A thong of leather is attached to this case, which is placed above the bending of the left arm on the inside, that it may be near to the heart, according to the command: *And these words which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart.* (Deut. vi. 6.) After making a knot in the shape of the letter *7 Jod*, the thong is rolled seven times round the arm in a spiral form, and terminates by three times round the middle finger. These phylacteries are called *Tephillin shel-jad*, or, the tefilla of the hand.

III. *For the door-posts.* The phylactery of the door-posts is termed *Mezuzah*, and is composed of a square piece of vellum, written in the same square character, and with the same kind of ink, as those for the head and arm, and has the 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, and 9th verses of the sixth chapter of Deuteronomy, and the 13th verse of the eleventh chapter of the same book inscribed on it. This slip of vellum is enclosed in a reed or case, and on it is written the word *Shadai*, which is one of the attributes of God. The Jews affix these to the doors of their houses, chambers, and most frequented places. The Hebrew word *Mezuzah* signifies the door-posts of a house; but it is also applied to the phylactery just described.



**Art. VI.—Elements of the History of Philosophy and Science from the earliest Records to the commencement of the Eighteenth Century.** By Thomas Morell. 8vo. London, 1827.

This book contains a great fund of information in a condensed and judicious form. In the space of a moderate octavo, it combines an abridged view of the history of philosophy, as useful for the general student as the larger work of Brucher, and at the same time the general progress of knowledge and science on other subjects.

The analyses of the works and systems of the principal philosophers are carefully and accurately executed. We take the first which occurs to us, that of Lord Bacon.

“Passing over the events of Bacon’s political history, as foreign to the design of this volume, this illustrious individual will at present be regarded alone as the father of experimental philosophy in all its branches, and the inventor of an enlightened logic, founded on the principles of right reason. To this view of his literary character the inestimable writings of this great philosopher bear ample testimony. The first of these was his well-known and justly-admired treatise on the Progress and Advancement of Learning, (*De Augmentis Scientiarum*), which made its first appearance in 1605, though the subject of which it treats had long before occupied his thoughts and studies. This was followed, in 1610, by a treatise on the Wisdom of the Ancients, which bears the same characters of original inventive genius, and in which the proposed object of his former work was steadily pursued, and carried forward most successfully. In 1620, his great work, entitled *Novum Organum*, was published, which formed a second part of his Instauration of the Sciences; the treatise on the Advancement of Learning being now considered as its first division. Next to these were published, at different periods, and amidst the pressure of state affairs, the results of his physical researches and experiments in a series of treatises on the phenomena of the universe, natural history, and many other branches of practical science. The whole train of his philosophical productions terminated with his *Scala Intellectus*, a highly intellectual dissertation; intended to trace the steps by which the human mind ascends in its philosophical researches, from the lowest grade to its highest degree of elevation; from insu-

lated facts to general truths; from the simplest elements of knowledge to the perfection of science. The Historical Tracts and Moral Essays were among the latest productions of his genius, and together with many of his philosophical pieces, were written after his political fall and degradation. The Lord Chancellor Bacon terminated a life of extraordinary mental exertion and activity, in 1626, in the sixty-fifth year of his age.

“But, to form a distinct conception of the intellectual qualities of Lord Bacon, and a correct estimate of the value of those celebrated works which are unquestionably to be reckoned among the *chefs d’œuvres* of human genius, it is requisite to view them in their relative connexion; for they constitute, in reality, but one magnificent whole, and afford an exquisite specimen of the *Scala Intellectus* which he recommends to others. In the first of the above-mentioned works, (the treatise *De Augmentis*), the author proposes to take a general survey of human knowledge, contemplating the intellectual faculties under the three great divisions of Memory, Fancy or Imagination, and Understanding. Corresponding with these, all the arts and sciences are classed under three heads, namely, History, Poetry, and Philosophy. Under each of these, an inquiry is instituted into what is erroneous or defective; and the most proper means are suggested for correcting the errors, amending the defects, and supplying the omissions in all. The next surveys the works and discoveries of the ancients, and both enumerates and estimates the inventions of past ages, tracing out, as in one general chart, the several tracts of science, that still lay uncultivated and waste, and suggesting, as he proceeds, the most desirable improvements and the probable discoveries to be made by future philosophers. Having thus cleared the way for his great and principal design, he proposed, in his *Novum Organum*, to ‘raise and enlarge the powers of the mind by a more useful application of its reasoning faculty, to all the objects of philosophical research.’ In this admirable treatise, a new and rational logic is exhibited, which forms a striking contrast to that of the Scholastics: a logic calculated, not to supply arguments for controversy, but arts for the use of mankind—not to triumph over an enemy by subtle and sophistical disputation, but to subdue nature itself by experiment and analysis. Rejecting with deserved contempt the logomachies of the school-



men, he recommends a careful induction, that examines scrupulously the data on which reasonings are founded; views them in every possible light; rejects all that is not necessarily included in the subject, and draws its conclusions with truth and certainty. By this his celebrated method of induction, which forms a distinguishing feature of the philosophy of Lord Bacon, the noblest theory has been exhibited to mankind for the investigation of physical and moral truth, that the human mind has ever conceived.

A solid foundation having been thus laid in a clear and rational logic, this enlightened philosopher points out, in his remaining philosophical works, its right application, by collecting and furnishing a prodigious mass of experimental facts in physical and moral science. This vast collection, the result of patient and unwearied research, continued during many years, was not arranged and made public till after his death. It may be considered as an important step taken towards a complete History of Nature. The phenomena of the universe are classified under three general divisions: (1.) the history of generation, or the production of all the species of created existences, according to the ordinary course of nature; (2.) the history of pretergeneration, or those productions which deviate from the stated rule; (3.) the history of nature as modified, improved, altered, or debased by human art. The design of this philosophical inquirer, in making this collection of facts, he has stated to be, to construct a *Scala Intellectus*, by which the human mind may regularly ascend in its intellectual researches, and thus to furnish materials for a true and useful philosophy. All these, however, were regarded as but the preparatory steps to a yet more magnificent project which he meditated, but did not live to accomplish—that of establishing, on the immovable basis of experiment, a philosophy purely axiomatical and scientific, freed from all visionary speculations, and all uncertain conjectures and theories, resulting from that just and patient investigation of natural phenomena, of which his own writings furnish so admirable a model. Such, says his biographer, and the learned editor of his works, such, and so unlimited were his views for the universal advancement of science. Such was the noble aim to which all his philosophic labours were directed.—What Cæsar said in compliment to Cicero may, with justice, be applied to him: that it was

more glorious to have extended the limits of human wit, than to have enlarged the bounds of the Roman world. Sir Francis Bacon really did so; a truth acknowledged, not only by the greatest private names in Europe, but by all the public societies of its most civilized nations. France, Italy, Germany, Britain, I may add even Russia, have taken him for their leader, and submitted to be governed by his institutions. The empire he has erected in the learned world is as universal as the free use of reason, and the one must continue till the other is no more.”

ART. VII.—*The British Critic, Quarterly Theological Review, and Ecclesiastical Record*, No. III. 1827.

WE generally read this publication with interest. Its tone is generally candid, displaying much good sense and a great deal of biblical and classical erudition. In the number before us, however, it has been pleased to use some rather strong language towards Unitarians in a review of Dr. D'Oyly's Sermons. We shall quote the substance of a principal passage, that our contemporary may not accuse us of wishing to keep back any thing which bears upon a controversy, in which we should wish him to think that truth is our only object. The error which the Reviewer points out may not be without utility in another point of view as furnishing an additional warning which no one can too carefully observe, in whatever department of science or literature he is engaged—never to take quotations or authorities at second-hand. The Reviewer, however, might perhaps have a little qualified his charges against the works before him, by the consideration that they were anterior in date to any accurate knowledge of the reading of the Vatican manuscript Bible; and he might have still further relieved his Unitarian brethren from any suspicion of wilful concealment had he known, as probably he does not, that they were Unitarians who caused the Vatican Manuscript to be inspected, the fac-simile to be taken, and the result to be published, (though little accordant, the Reviewer would perhaps suppose, with their views or wishes,) in the edition of Griesbach, published in 1818.

After contending that the argument drawn by Dr. Priestley from the writings of Tertullian, that the mass of unlearned Christians in his time were Unitarians, rests upon the gross error of confounding the Sabellian heresy with that of the Ellogians, and was completely re-

futed by Mr. Wilson, of St. John's College, Cambridge, who exposed the mistake," the Reviewer proceeds to charge another instance of "perseverance in repeating the errors or assumptions connected with the Patripassian heresy," for the substance of which he says he is indebted to Mr. Burton's luminous *Treatise on the Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the Divinity of Christ*, which he strongly recommends to the theological student. The charge proceeds thus:

"It is well known that in the reading of Acts xx. 28, 'Feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood,' the manuscripts differ. Instead of Θεοῦ, God, some read Κυρίου, Lord, and Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ, Lord and God. The Vatican, the most ancient, as well as the most valuable, has Θεοῦ. It was examined for Griesbach's edition of the New Testament, published in 1818, and this fact alone will suffice to upset the assertion of the Unitarians, in the Improved Version, that the received text rests upon the authority of no manuscript of note or value. To this, however, may be added, the testimony of the oldest manuscripts of the Syriac Version, and the remarkable fact stated by Mr. Burton, that the church of God occurs in eleven passages of St. Paul's Epistles, whereas the church of the Lord occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. Of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, Ignatius and Tertullian support the received reading; but Irenæus, the only one who quotes the passage at length, reads the church of the Lord. But then, it must be remembered, with a view to the last, that the original Greek of Irenæus is lost, and that where fragments of the Greek have been preserved, the Latin translator has frequently substituted God for Lord, and God for Christ, and vice versâ.\* Keeping in view this state of the question,† we may now direct our readers to a note of the 'Improved Version,' where, it is said, the expression 'blood of God,' is rejected with horror by Athanasius, as an invention of the Arians; and thence to a passage in the 'Calm

\* We should like this assertion to be investigated and the instances brought under one view.

† Which the readers of the Repository will recollect was not the state of the question when the notes upon it, here referred to, were written.

Inquiry,' p. 141, which contains these words: 'Our Scriptures,' says Athanasius, nowhere mention the blood of God. Such impudent expressions are only used by Arians. Οὐδαμοῦ δὲ αἷμα Θεοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς παραδεδώκασι αἱ γραφαί. Ἀρείων τὰ τοιαῦτα τομήματα. — Athanas. cont. Apollin. apud Wetstein in loco. — And so says Wetstein, sure enough. But had the author, instead of copying from Wetstein, taken the pains, as he ought to have done, to look into the work of Athanasius himself, he would have found that these are not the words of Athanasius, but something very different, and expressive of a different sense. They are these:—Οὐδαμοῦ δὲ αἷμα Θεοῦ δίχα σαρκὸς παραδεδώκασιν αἱ γραφαί, ἢ Θεὸν δίχα σαρκὸς πάθοντα καὶ ἀναστάντα. Ἀρείων τὰ τοιαῦτα τομήματα. — The meaning of which is obviously this:—'The Scriptures nowhere speak of the blood of God without flesh; that is, without adding something which implies the incarnation of God; nor of God suffering and rising again without flesh; they are Arians who venture to use such expressions.' But Wetstein by inserting καθ' ἡμᾶς, from his own head, and leaving out the words δίχα σαρκὸς, upon which the whole meaning of the passage turns, produced a strange perversion of the sense which Mr. Belsham blindly and eagerly propagates. He was not aware," says Mr. Burton, "that this work of Athanasius was written against the Apollinarian heretics, who nearly resembled the Patripassians, and held that God, not as united to man, but in his own unmixed essential Deity, suffered on the cross and died. Athanasius, therefore, asserts in the misquoted passage, that the Scriptures never speak of the blood of God without mentioning or implying flesh. The error will appear almost incredible to the reader when he finds that, in the very next sentence, the author goes on to say, 'But the Holy Scriptures, speaking of God in the flesh, and of the flesh of God, when he became man, do mention the blood, and sufferings, and resurrection of the body of God.'—Αἱ δὲ ἀγία γραφαί ἐν σαρκὶ Θεοῦ καὶ σαρκὸς Θεοῦ ἀνθρώπου γενομένου αἷμα καὶ πᾶθος καὶ ἀναστάσεως κηρύττουσι σώματος Θεοῦ." To this may be added the fact, that Athanasius himself quotes the passage from Acts xx. 28, more than once, and expressly reads the church of God."

## OBITUARY.

REV. JOHN HUGH WORTHINGTON.

THE late Rev. JOHN HUGH WORTHINGTON was descended from a family long resident in Leicester, and universally and deservedly respected. His great uncle was the Rev. Hugh Worthington, of Salters' Hall, London, one of the most eminent preachers of his day. His great grandfather was pastor of the Presbyterian congregation in Leicester more than fifty-six years. The subject of this memoir was born the 11th of November, 1804. During his earliest years he was subject to frequent attacks of severe illness, which, probably, enfeebled his constitution, and disposed him, more than most children, to seek amusement in sedentary occupations and pursuits. He was a pupil of the writer of this article more than eight years, and never excited an angry feeling or occasioned an uneasy thought. Delightful, indeed, were the employment of a teacher had he always such scholars. His understanding was excellent, his apprehension quick, his memory retentive, his manners respectful, his temper obliging, his application unremitting. It is but justice to observe, that he was greatly indebted to maternal care and direction, which encouraged and assisted him in his early studies. In this he resembles other remarkable persons who have ascribed their happiness and success in life to the affectionate assiduity of a judicious mother. Under these circumstances, it will be readily believed, his proficiency was great in every branch of learning. As a proof of the estimation in which he was held by his schoolfellows, it may be mentioned, that on the occasion of his leaving school, they made him a handsome present, accompanied with a letter expressive of their respect. About the age of sixteen he removed to the York College with very creditable testimonials from several neighbouring ministers. At the college his studies were pursued with increasing ardour and unwearied diligence. It is probable that he did not allow himself sufficient time for relaxation, either of body or mind; and that, if any conjecture may now with reason be formed, this was a predisposing cause of his subsequent illness. Young men in general so seldom injure themselves by application, that such instances

should be noted as very rare, and are even unsafe to record, lest the negligence of many should be hereby confirmed. I believe it may, without hesitation, be said, that at York he was universally esteemed by his tutors as well as his companions. Such was the kindness of his temper, such his modesty, humility, and benevolence, that he could not fail of obtaining the respect of those who disregarded his mental qualities and attainments. It was about half a year before the expiration of his college studies that he was invited to become one of the ministers of the Cross-Street Chapel, Manchester; among the most numerous and respectable societies in our connexion. This invitation was accepted, and he removed thither at the conclusion of his college term. Never did any young minister enter upon his office with a more sincere and ardent desire to do good: his professional duty was his delight: he devised plans for the improvement of his time: for visiting the sick and the poor: for the benefit of all classes of those committed to his care; and was also very assiduous and anxious in the preparation for his public services. As a preacher his voice was clear and strong; his compositions sensible and instructive; his manner earnest and engaging: he had the persuasive eloquence of true piety, and of an ardent wish to do good. Had it pleased Providence to prolong his life, there can be no question that he would have become eminent and highly useful in his profession.

About seven months since, he was visited with a severe affliction both of mind and body, which, after many changes, exciting alternately hope and fear in his afflicted family, terminated fatally the 4th July last. He endured a lingering illness with that patience and Christian resignation which might have been expected from his character. He frequently conversed about his approaching end, and died without pain, and in that peace which Christian principles alone can produce. Let those who look around upon their families with affection, and upon some, it may be, with pride and exultation as likely to be a credit to their name, let them moderate their joy with the recollection of the frailty of earthly happiness, and the vanity of human expecta-



tions. Let the young learn by this example to seek not their reward in this world. Here we see how truly it is said of man, "He cometh up like a flower, and is cut down." By obedience to their parents, and kindness towards their relatives; by diligence, and piety, and virtue, let them adorn their useful spheres, that their parents may never think of them but with affection and delight, and that the gates of the grave may lead them to a brighter scene, where separation and death shall be known no more.

B.

P. S. When Mr. Worthington left Leicester, he was removed from the personal observation and acquaintance of the writer: on which account he has obtained permission to subjoin an extract from a funeral sermon for Mr. Worthington, delivered at Manchester, by his friend and fellow-student, the Rev. J. R. Beard, at his Chapel, Green Gate, Salford, whose observations, being those of an eye-witness, will come with greater weight and authority.

"On his entrance at the Manchester College, York, he was found to possess a degree of information and development of mind which are rarely enjoyed by the students at the commencement of their collegiate course. During his residence at the College, his application was not only vigorous but sustained; and his exertions were crowned with entire success. For depth, variety, and accuracy of information, very few persons of his own age would endure a comparison with him. But it is most pleasing to recall to one's mind those moral qualities which endeared to him the hearts of all his companions in study. He possessed a sweetness of disposition, a delicate and cultivated sensibility, a tender regard to others' feelings, a solicitude for the welfare and happiness of his associates, combined with an oblivion of self, an equanimity of temper, and a warmth of affection, which rendered his conduct a model of imitation to his companions, whilst the purity of his bosom and the rectitude of his motives, his ardent piety and profound humility, gave promise to all who knew him of exemplary excellence and success in the sacred office of a Christian teacher, and threw a charm and a finish over his demeanour amid the intercourses of a college life. These were the virtues which secured him the affection of all the fraternity with whom for a time he was associated. Through them he lived in the college beloved, and left it regretted;

and when he went forth to enter upon the career which has so soon and so painfully terminated, not a heart was there that did not bid him 'God speed,' and scarcely a tongue that did not utter its fervent prayer for his success and happiness. We have said that he received an early dedication to the Christian ministry, and through the whole period of his education he kept constantly before his mind the grand end and object of his life. He devoted himself to the ministry because he *loved* its duties; his *whole* soul was engaged to the service of God; and many a delightful hour, though *now* mournful to remember, has the preacher spent with him in discoursing on the duties and pleasures of religion, and the duties, pleasures and difficulties of the pastoral office. From principle he was a firm believer in the supremacy and essential goodness of the great God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ—but estimated opinions by their tendency to promote pious emotion and holy practice. In common with many others he lamented the comparative indifference to the claims of truth and duty which attach to the great body of Unitarians in England, and, if his life had been spared until his influence was corroborated, he would have been highly efficient in bringing about a more intense and heartfelt apprehension of religious truths, and a more vigorous and consistent maintenance of them, than now prevails amongst us. As it is, his influence in the college was highly valuable in countenancing and nourishing a religious tone of thinking and feeling, and in the establishment of a society, among the senior divinity students, for the support of missionary preaching in the vicinity of York. To this society, which he was a chief means of instituting, he invariably gave his best support, and thus lent his aid to the promotion and perpetuation of an institution to which not only the neighbourhood of the college owes much happiness, but many of the students also much of the success which may have attended, or shall attend, upon their ministry. These details of his college life may appear long and disproportionate, but it is pleasing to me to dwell upon them.

"The period of his ministry was so short, that I love to contemplate him as a *student*, and to revert to days which were full of tranquil happiness and deceptive hope. At length, however, the period arrived when he was to enter upon his office. The days of preparation



were over and gone, and a situation which promised great usefulness and respectability was opened to him. The hesitation, and trembling anxiety with which I know that he entered upon his office, appears, by retrospection, to have been ominous of his mournful destiny. His solicitude was obvious to all the congregation; but all did not, could not, know how much of that solicitude regarded purely their welfare, nor how tender a heart they had attached to their interests. In him every one of his people, however poor, had a friend; his hand and his heart, to assist, advise, and comfort, were ever open to all. Many there are whom he succoured in want and in affliction, and who will, I trust, keep his memory embalmed in their bosoms. His vigilance in the discharge of all his pastoral duties was most exemplary; but, especially, his attention to the sick and the dying was beyond all praise. He loved to smooth the brow of anguish; it was congenial with his nature to weep with those who weep, and to comfort the departing spirit by the heavenly consolations of the gospel. Such a character could not fail to command esteem and affection; and, accordingly, with all those who are susceptible of, and therefore can appreciate, the better emotions of our nature, to know him was to love him. We use no words of common-place when we say, that we feel for the society whose pastor he was, in the loss which it has sustained—a loss which, although it may not be irreparable, cannot easily be supplied. To his ministerial and pulpit, as well as to his pastoral, duties, he brought a heart of unusual purity and tenderness, and a mind gifted with talents well cultivated and of great promise. His intellectual qualities were rather of a sound than a bold, rather of a discriminating than an original, character. Yet the fervour of his emotions often invested them with that energy and glow which, though it may not be genius, is, for the purposes of the Christian ministry, frequently of more utility. The natural fervency of his feelings, and the intensity of his religious apprehensions, gave a charm and an energy to his addresses, which penetrated the bosom of a pious auditor, and found an echo in his heart. In a word, to the maintenance and the furtherance of vital religion his soul was devoted: for this he tasked the best powers of his mind and heart, and whether in his own pulpit or in that of others; whether his object was the pro-

motion of home or foreign missions, of education among the poor, or the extension of general knowledge, he always appeared and was recognised as the servant of God. The master affection of his soul was faith in God through Christ—a firm, vital, practical faith, which had grown with his growth and strengthened with his strength. He was one

“—in whom persuasion and belief  
Had ripened into faith, and faith be-  
come

A passionate intuition; whence the  
soul,

Though bound to earth by ties of  
pity and of love,

From all injurious servitude was  
free.

“This potent intuition, which, as by the power of a new sense, set before him realities invisible to common apprehension, guided his heart and conduct, and thence holy feeling had become spontaneous with him. To entertain pious sentiments never seemed with him the result of an effort; it was the natural impulse of the heart. Thus his pity and goodness were not gasty and tempestuous; true, they were warm, but not the less uniform and placid. Thus, also, his sense of duty was vigorous and prevailing. Like the prophet Samuel, he appeared to wait for the Divine command, and in the earnest pursuit of the will of God, his humble prayer was, “Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth.” Nor was he slow to execute what duty dictated: his feet were swift to do the will of his heavenly Father. With all his excellence, however, he is gone, and the world is so much the worse. He was one that the interests of virtue and religion could ill spare, and were there more like him amongst us, the condition of our race would be far superior to its actual state. Thus much, at least, is due to him, and to the interests of piety; less could not, more to his honour might, have been said. Even if flattery could sooth the dead, my tongue is unused to its dulcet notes, and I feel not a doubt, if on the present occasion I had attempted to use it, my heart would have refused its sanction, and made me feel that I was doing a dishonour to that sacred and pleasurable appreciation which I have of his character, and which, for one so young, I am sure can scarcely be surpassed. I must, however, tear myself from the subject of his virtue, on which the heart fondly lingers, as though it could compensate its

present deprivation by recollections of departed and highly-valued excellence.

O niveam quæ te poterit mihi reddere lucem,

O mihi felicem terque quaterque diem !

Mrs. MARY BRISTOWE.

July 17, at *Ringwood, Hants*, universally lamented, aged 38 years, MARY, the beloved wife of the Rev. J. B. BRISTOWE, which endearing relation she had sustained barely fifteen weeks. A bilious fever, which neither the power of medicine, the tears of affection, nor the prayers of piety, could subdue or arrest, carried her, in ten days, to the land of silence and of death. Of this excellent woman it may be justly affirmed, that she was rationally pious and devout towards her Maker; humane and charitable to the poor; and governed in all her deportment by a high sense of moral and religious obligation. Affable in her manners, and alive to the deprivations of the humbler part of mankind, especially at the time of sickness, she promptly and in various ways administered to their wants; and, in return, she was greatly beloved and is deeply regretted by them. She might have appropriated to herself, with great truth, a line in Virgil: "Non ignara mali, miseris succurrere disco." She was zealous for the prosperity, and delighted at the recent increase, of the congregation; and which has been attributed, in some measure, to the moral influence which her character and example, and the esteem in which she was held, naturally threw around her; but another cause\* lent its aid in the good work.

Had it pleased Divine Providence to prolong her life, there can be little doubt that she would have proved a very useful accession to the religious society with which she had become so intimately connected. She had formed a plan to visit the poor members *regularly*, with a view to ascertain their actual situations, intending to supply, from her own resources, or to procure from others, suitable relief: but the purposes of her heart were broken off, and her very thoughts are perished. During her severe illness, though she had hoped

and still prayed, "that God would not so soon separate her from the object of her affections, yet she was devoutly resigned to the Divine will." In this happy frame of mind she continued till she, at last, sunk under a disease with which her delicate constitution was unable successfully to struggle, quietly and placidly leaving this scene of uncertain happiness in the prospect of one more permanent hereafter. Her remains were deposited in the vault of her family in Ringwood churchyard, and the funeral service was impressively read by the officiating clergyman, himself deeply affected, having but a few short weeks before performed the *marriage ceremony*, when she appeared healthful, gay, and happy. An admirable discourse, in which a merited tribute was paid to her virtues and benevolence, was delivered on the melancholy occasion to a very crowded and sympathising audience, (increased by the Independent minister closing his chapel and attending in person, with most of his people,) by the Rev. E. Kell, A. M., of Newport, Isle of Wight, from James iv. 14, "What is your life?" &c. The service was concluded by the choir of the chapel giving, in a solemn and affecting manner, Luther's hymn.

B.

Mr. JOHN DAVY.

Aug. 15, at his father's house, *Fordton*, near *Crediton*, JOHN, the second son of Isaac DAVY, Esq. On the Sunday preceding the day of his decease, he had completed his 22nd year. But, though removed thus early, he had lived sufficiently long to give every promise of a character of solid worth, and a life of amiable usefulness. He knew but the language of truth, and his word was a bond. The rectitude of his heart discovered itself in his conduct; and the peace of an upright mind was stamped upon his brow. Worn down by the fatal malady, which endears while it bereaves, and beautifies what it destroys, his calm and manly resignation afforded a noble example of the ascendancy of the mind over a decaying frame. He died in his youth, but it was the death of the righteous. With no blemish of vice, and every promise of virtue, he was called to that Being who alone can know for what purpose the good are thus prematurely removed from a world which might have been benefited by their labours, and made better by their example.

\* The attention paid to the Sunday-Schools by some young persons lately settled at Ringwood, of the value of whose services in this department the writer of this article is duly sensible.

( 762 )

## INTELLIGENCE.

### *Provincial Meeting of Unitarian Ministers in Lancashire and Cheshire.*

ON Thursday, June 22d, the Annual Provincial Meeting of Ministers was held at Warrington. At eleven o'clock A. M., the religious services were introduced by the Rev. Mr. Tate, in the absence of the Rev. J. Whitehead, the appointed supporter. The Rev. C. Wallace delivered the sermon, from 1 Timothy ii. 5. In an energetic and perspicuous manner the preacher pointed out the inconsistency with reason and Scripture of the popular doctrine of the union of a divine and human nature in Christ, and the pernicious consequences which the doctrine tends to produce, by perplexing the mind of the devout worshiper as to the object of his worship. The clearness of argument, novelty of arrangement, and propriety of expression which were conspicuous throughout the sermon, excited in the audience high admiration and pleasure. After the service, the Rev. J. J. Tayler was appointed supporter to Mr. Whitehead at the next Annual Meeting, which will be held at the Paradise Street Chapel, Liverpool.

At two o'clock, P. M., about fifty gentlemen sat down to dine at the George Inn, of whom thirty-three were ministers. After dinner, the health of the King having been given, the Chairman (Mr. Wallace) gave, "Prosperity to the operations of the Provincial Meeting in its new character of 'The North Western District Association.'" The Secretary then read the report of the Committee appointed at the last Annual Meeting to form the Association and commence its operations:—from which it appeared,

That the Committee had made every arrangement that lay in their power to establish that union of the different minor societies already in existence for the promotion of Unitarian Christianity in Lancashire and Cheshire, which the Association contemplates.

That they had ascertained from the Committees of the "Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Missionary Society," and the "Manchester Unitarian Tract Society," that their operations were not so extensive nor so successful as they might be if co-operating under the direction and assistance of the Association; that in their present separate state, their operations cannot be made so important

as to induce the public to support them with that pecuniary assistance which is necessary to enable them to improve the numerous opportunities which already present themselves of extending their usefulness; that therefore a union with the Provincial Meeting, which would then become the central point of union and the general anniversary, seemed to them highly desirable.

That (being sensible that the unity of operation which would ensue from such a coalition would produce little advantage unaccompanied by pecuniary assistance) they had directed their efforts towards raising a general fund, to be at the disposal of the Provincial Meeting; without which the Provincial Meeting can offer no inducement to those societies which have funds, to unite with it.

That, although they had taken the best measures they could devise to effect this important object, they did not expect that it would be immediately accomplished, as they knew the objects of the Association were not yet sufficiently known to the public to ensure their general support; they therefore, although they had received several congregational and individual subscriptions, could not state that they had been so successful as to justify them in reporting the accomplishment of the object. But, believing that many suspended their offers of assistance from the cause already assigned, they begged leave to direct the attention of the Meeting to several other important objects, besides the great object before mentioned, in aid of which a general fund would enable the Provincial Meeting to extend essential assistance. Among several enumerated in the report, one most important object was the connexion of the Provincial Meeting, as a District Association, by an annual subscription, with the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, which has already experienced the benefit of coalition in an extension of usefulness and an increase of funds; a connexion which would, at a trifling annual expense, secure to the Provincial Meeting the assistance of those societies which have been formed for the protection of the civil and religious rights of Protestant Dissenters.

The report concluded with an abridged report of the state and operations of the "Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Missionary Society," and the "Man-

chester Unitarian Tract Society," and an earnest appeal to the members of the Association present, and to the public, to contribute their assistance in forming a fund, which appeared indispensable to the utility and respectability of the Association.

The Rev. J. J. TAYLER then moved, "That the ministers throughout the two counties of Lancashire and Cheshire be requested to contribute to the formation of a fund, to be at the disposal of this Meeting, by congregational collections, by grants of Fellowship Funds, or by any means deemed by each minister most desirable."

G. W. WOOD, Esq., urged the excellence of the principle of association, and the necessity of having a fund at the disposal of the present meeting to enable it to carry its benevolent designs into effect. He spoke of the benefits of association from very recent experience of its powerful effects. He had listened to the various reports which were read at the late Annual Meeting of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, with the greatest pleasure, and had imbibed from hearing them an increased desire to promote similar plans in his own neighbourhood. The motion was then agreed to.

The Rev. W. HINCKS moved, "That all ministers connected with congregations in the two counties be considered members, *ex officio*, of the committee of the Provincial Meeting for the ensuing year; and that the names of certain lay gentlemen, specified in the motion, be added:" which being passed by the meeting,

The Rev. J. GASKELL moved, "That the committee hold their meetings four times in the year: first, at the Cross St. Chapel Rooms, Manchester, on the first Thursday in October: second, at Salford, at the anniversary of the opening of the Green-Gate Chapel: third, on Good Friday, at the Annual Meeting of the Missionary Society, wherever it may be held: fourth, on the morning of the next anniversary of the Provincial Meeting, in the vestry of the Paradise-Street Chapel, Liverpool."

The business relating to the Association being concluded, the Chairman proceeded to give some interesting toasts, which called forth speeches from several gentlemen.

The Memory of the late venerable Mr. Yates was given, and received with respectful interest.

The health of the Rev. W. Hincks was given, and happiness wished him in his new and arduous situation as successor to the Rev. W. Turner, Jun., in Manchester College, York.

After thanking the Meeting for the kindness with which they had received the toast, Mr. H. said he could not sit down without rendering his tribute to the talent which Mr. Turner had displayed in the performance of professional duties so arduous and so various. And he could not but feel considerable anxiety under the prospect of succeeding to a situation which was perhaps more difficult than any other in any seminary, and which had been filled by Mr. Turner with so much talent and success. He proposed the health of the Rev. Wm. Turner, Jun.

The Rev. W. TURNER, of Newcastle, returned thanks for the honour done to his son. The venerable gentleman in the course of his speech mentioned the pleasure he felt in being at that Meeting, especially as it was held in that town, from which he had been absent 40 years, and with which so many interesting associations were connected in his mind, as having been the original seat of the Academy which now flourished at York; but though its tutors had been so eminent while the Academy flourished at Warrington, he thought he might affirm that the tutors who now adorn the institution were entitled to as high praise.

In the course of the afternoon the Chairman gave the health of the Rev. Mr. Fotheringham, of Boston, U. S. and our American Brethren in the Ministry.—Mr. F. assured the Meeting that the cordial feeling which they expressed towards his brethren in America was mutual. He was proud to be a native of a country in which the expression of religious opinion was as free as air, and where the profession of religious faith was biassed by no political establishment. He begged to return thanks for himself and his brethren in America for the kind feeling which the Meeting manifested towards them; and while he assured the Meeting that it was reciprocal, he proposed as a toast, "The friendly feeling which exists between the Ministers in America and England, and may it last for ever."

The toast was drunk with enthusiasm.

The Chairman gave the health of a very near relative of a staunch friend to civil and religious liberty on his left hand, (Ottiwell Wood, Esq.,) which he prefaced by reading an extract from a letter which he had received from him when at Geneva, whence he had recently returned to England. The extract contained an interesting account of a Ministers' Meeting in Geneva, at which the writer was present. The Chairman



concluded the extract by giving, The restoration to health of the writer, the Rev. S. Wood.

OTTIWELL WOOD, Esq., returned thanks for his son, whom, he said, nothing but ill health would have detained from so interesting a meeting as the present.

The health of Mr. Adam, and the cause of Unitarianism in Calcutta, was not forgotten. Nor did the Meeting forget to express their good wishes for the welfare and success of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association.

At five o'clock the Meeting broke up, voting their thanks to Mr. Wallace for the ability with which he had conducted the duties of the chair. Many of the ministers adjourned to Mr. Broadbent's house at Latchford to partake of tea, which was provided for them with the usual hospitality.

In conclusion, allow me, Mr. Editor, to inform the Unitarian public in Lancashire and Cheshire, that I have already received pledges of support in aid of the General Fund from some congregations, and subscriptions from individuals, since the Meeting, and in consequence of the explanation of the plans of the Society which were then made; and that I shall be happy to receive and transfer to the Treasurer similar assistance towards that object in behalf of the Provincial Meeting.

EDWARD HAWKES, Secretary.  
*Regent Road, Manchester.*

#### *Kent and Sussex Unitarian Christian Association.*

THE Fifteenth Anniversary of this Association was held in the city of Canterbury on Wednesday, the 4th July, at the Unitarian General Baptist Chapel, Blackfriars. The Rev. H. Green, of Knutsford, introduced the religious services by reading the Scriptures and prayer; after which the Rev. R. Aspland, of Hackney, delivered an eloquent, instructive and argumentative discourse from 1 Cor. iv. 13, "Being defamed, we entreat." The preacher particularized the various kinds of defamation to which Unitarians, like the primitive Christians, are subject; he afterwards enlarged upon the fundamental doctrines of the Unitarian faith, and described those minor principles upon which Unitarians differ; and concluded by a manly, charitable, and deeply impressive appeal in favour of the truth of Unitarianism, exhibiting its consistency, nay identity, with Scripture, Virtue and Human Hap-

piness. It is earnestly hoped that the preacher will consent to the publication of the discourse. At the close of the service, the business of the Association was transacted.\* Thanks were unanimously passed to the Marquis of Lansdowne and the other members of the two Houses of Parliament, for their unremitting attention to the wishes of the Dissenters in the late application for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts. Upwards of ninety friends to the objects of the Association afterwards dined at the King's Head Inn; John Brent, Esq., in the Chair. In the course of the afternoon various subjects were introduced, and much interesting information afforded by the different speakers: Revds. R. Aspland, L. Holden, B. Mardon, G. C. Pound, J. Farrin, R. Ashdowne, J. Martin, and Messrs. E. P. Fordham, J. Green, John Brent, Jun., &c. The company having testified their sense of obligation to their worthy Chairman for the able and efficient manner in which he contributed to the enjoyment of the meeting, separated highly gratified with the proceedings of the day.

G.

#### *Settlement Service at Maidstone.*

THE proposed religious service on occasion of the settlement of the Rev. B. Mardon, with the congregation assembling in Earl Street, Maidstone, took place on the 6th of July. It was an occasion of great interest; the several parts of the service were well calculated to answer beneficial and pious purposes, and the whole was so guarded from the possibility of savouring of or promoting superstition, that few could have attended without having their previous dislike to such services at least *softened*.

Divine worship commenced soon after eleven o'clock, with a hymn, read by the Rev. T. F. Thomas, of Chatham. The Rev. Lawrence Holden, of Tenterden,

---

\* The Report included some interesting particulars respecting the early propagation of the Unitarian doctrine in the Weald of Kent, so long back as the year 1700; also the recent delivery of six doctrinal lectures at Headcorn under the direction of the Committee; and the establishment of a depository for the sale of Unitarian publications at Maidstone, from which considerable good has already arisen, and more may reasonably be expected.

venerable for his years, and truly estimable and highly esteemed on account of the virtues with which for a long life he has adorned his profession, read a portion of St. Paul's second Epistle to Timothy, and offered up an earnest and truly Christian prayer for the divine blessing upon the connexion which had been formed. The gentleman appointed to represent the congregation, Robert Cooper, Esq., (grandson to the second minister of the chapel, whose services commenced here so long since as the year 1744,) then delivered to the elected minister an address, full of affectionate observation, on the interesting relation in which a congregation and their minister stand to each other, united with a manly sense of the duties which the latter is called upon to perform, and a just boldness in demanding from him attention and fidelity. This address directly disclaimed all right of interference on the part of one congregation with another, or on the part of a body of ecclesiastics claiming priestly usurpation over the consciences of men; it included a reference to the liberal and enlightened principles on which Christian worship had within those walls been conducted for nearly a century,\* and it concluded with a devout anticipation of the spiritual blessings which the connexion they met to celebrate might be hoped to produce.

Mr. Mardon, in his reply, acknowledged that he had no intention to attempt making any deep impression on the minds of the audience in favour of the truths and duties of religion. This, in the present service, devolved on far abler and more experienced persons. But he willingly expressed the joy which such an opportunity of Christian intercourse furnished, and his hope that by such a direct appeal to the blessing of Heaven, and the obligations of Christianity, something might be done to mitigate the harshness of censure, and enkindle the love of truth. He acknowledged, that from an early period of his life he had received an impression in favour of such a service from a circumstance related by the biographer of the late eminent and revered Timothy Kenrick, of Exeter, whose catechumen, for

a short time, he had the honour to be, that had that distinguished minister's life been prolonged, objecting as he did to the superstition often insinuating itself at ordinations, he intended to have engaged in such a service as the present. While he felt deeply attached to religious truth, and had devoted himself to its interests, he wished distinctly to avow an equal attachment to Christian charity, which he hoped to cherish as his life's blood. A confession of faith, especially after what had fallen from Mr. Cooper, he did not now intend to make. Such confession, he believed, he had long since made, from the first time that he participated in the holy communion; and also in the various ways which presented themselves to one who had already, for several years, laboured in the Christian ministry. He ventured to draw the outline of objects which he proposed to himself in the discharge of his office: To conduct with simplicity and seriousness the devotional services, to attempt to convey a short, yet perspicuous exposition of the Holy Scripture, to strive to enforce and inculcate the moral and religious duties of our common faith; to visit the sick and poor, and keep up an acquaintance with the people of his flock—and in particular, as that on which he would lay a chief stress, to furnish the minds of the younger members of the congregation with such methodical, gradual, and instructive information, as might enable them to attain to a satisfactory conviction on the great truths of religion, because this *personal conviction* he believed to lie at the basis of all subsequent improvement in virtue and piety.

At the conclusion of this address from the congregation, and reply from the minister, Mr. Holden re-ascended the pulpit, and, introducing his remarks with the words of Peter, (2 Epist. i. 13, 14,) "I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by putting you in remembrance, knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath shewed me," delivered a series of admirably pious and affectionate exhortations, exceedingly suitable to his own long experience and pastoral fidelity,\* and well calculated to excite to diligence and circumspection in the minister, and to zealous co-operation in the people of his charge. Mr. Holden would extend the usefulness of his practical address if he would consent to transmit it in an

\* The date which is inscribed on the front of the chapel, is A. D. 1736, when the congregation removed with their able pastor, Mr. Benjamin Mills, from what had been called the Dutch Church, and from that time it appears that the worship of the chapel has always been Unitarian.

\* See Mon. Repos., O. S., Vol. XVII. p. 709.

abridged form for the use of one of our Magazines.

After another hymn, the Rev. Robert Aspland proceeded to deliver the sermon, prefacing it by saying, that as the service had already been so well guarded from superstition, he should do no more than discourse on the several topics contained in the 4th chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, the 1st to the 6th verse inclusive. General observations of the most valuable kind followed from the consideration of the former clauses of this paragraph; but the preacher was disposed, in the existing circumstances, to dwell particularly on the verse which terminates it; pointing out in language which ought never to be mistaken, that there is but one God, the Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all.\* A leading principle which the preacher aimed, in this discourse, to establish and to illustrate, was the very general agreement among Christians in those doctrines which are maintained by Unitarians. Other denominations of believers have added to those doctrines, but those doctrines themselves they do not pretend to deny. This may justly be deemed a presumptive proof of the truth of Unitarianism; and in the way in which the argument was treated, it can scarcely fail to have left a very favourable impression of the reasonableness of our creed, and the scriptural authority of our worship. We have seldom heard a more ingenious, and altogether satisfactory, devotional discourse, and sincerely hope that the preacher will be induced, whether on this occasion or not, to add by the publication of it to the numerous

\* The writer of this account will here refer to the ingenious use made of this verse, before the celebrated Presbytery at Exeter, in the year 1719, by Mr. Parr (the ancestor of some of his early and highly-valued friends there). The love of interference with the faith of others had too plainly evinced itself, and several persons had been called on to remove the suspicion of heresy by the employment of some reputedly orthodox confession of faith. But when it came to the turn of that honest and scriptural presbyter to make *his* confession, his answer was to this effect: "The words of St. Paul alone I shall use on the present occasion—'There is one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all,' and I wish I could add—but the virulence of your temper prevents me from adding—and in you all.'"

obligations which he has already conferred on the inquiring public.

The afternoon of this interesting day was spent together by a large proportion of the congregation, Mr. Mardon in the chair. Many of the sentiments corresponded with those which had been recently expressed at the meeting at Canterbury; the kindest wishes for the restoration of health to their last minister, now travelling in Italy: a spirit of sober, grateful, Christian feeling pervaded the meeting. The truly apostolic addresses of Mr. Holden were here also heard with profit and delight. The preacher who had instructed us in the morning, in a more familiar manner now animated us to zeal and perseverance; several of the congregation caught the enthusiasm, and expressed their honest and zealous sentiments; and many more, we are persuaded, will long retain a pleasing recollection and a beneficial impression of this day, devoted to Truth and Virtue.

*Maidstone, July 20th.*

#### *North Eastern Unitarian Association.*

THE Annual Meeting of this Society was held at Wisbeach, on Thursday, the 12th July. Mr. Selby, of Lynn, preached on the preceding evening from *Psa. cx. 1.* On the Thursday morning, Mr. Tagart, of Norwich, delivered a discourse on the "true worshipers," from *John iv. 23*; and in the evening he preached again from *Matt. xvi. 16—19*, on the true church.

About eighty of the friends dined together at the White Hart Inn, Mr. Hursthouse in the Chair. Several appropriate sentiments were given; and the company was addressed by Messrs. Tagart, Selby, Smith, Stanger, and Walker, on the various subjects naturally suggested by such meetings. The different services were respectably attended, and a considerable interest appeared to be felt in the objects of the Association, which it is hoped will be permanent.

#### IRELAND.

##### SYNOD OF ULSTER.

(Concluded from p. 712.)

Thursday, June 28.

##### *Test, or Declaration of Faith.*

Mr. COOKE rose and said, that the Synod were called on to put on record their opinions regarding certain great leading doctrines of faith. With this view, he was prepared with a list of the members, and was ready to affix a mark

to each of those ministers' names whom he believed to be Arian. Mr. Cooke then read a Test or Declaration of Faith, which was in substance, "that the God-head is composed of Three Persons; that these Three are One, the same in Essence and Spirit;" and he proposed that all the members of Synod who were present, should be compelled to sign this Test, and those who were absent should be written to, and directed by the clerk to forward their signatures, to be by him affixed to it, previous to the printing of the Minutes. An honest man (continued he) is said to be the noblest work of God; and it would be the act of honest men for them to state to the world what was their belief, and to let their people know what their sentiments really were. It was surely worth while that the Arians should tell the world what their views were on the great question of their own and their congregations' eternal welfare. "If I could conceive," said Mr. Cooke, "that there was the slightest attempt to persecute for the sake of opinion, in the motion I have now made, I should be the last man who would put my hand to further such a measure. I have no right to institute any proceeding which might interfere with men's 100% or 150% a-year: it is not with that view that I have prepared the resolution I wish this meeting to sanction with their approval; but it is the blessed light of God which had opened my eyes to the danger, and which directs me to withdraw from those men whose views are not as my views, and whose hopes of salvation do not rest on the same rock as mine. Dr. Wright has expressed a wish that I should point out who the thirty-five or forty Arians are in this body. If he wishes for it, I am ready to go over the list of the Synod, and to put a mark opposite to those whom I believe to be Arians. The blood of Jesus is so precious to all who wish to be saved through him, that none who sincerely believe in him will deny him. Let us at once, then, lay hold of the truth, and openly, before men, say whether the Eternal Son of God be indeed the God of our salvation." Mr. Cooke concluded by reading his motion.

Mr. R. STEWART seconded the motion.

Dr. WRIGHT rose and observed, that he had been anticipated by Mr. Cooke, in the motion just placed before the house. A stigma had been cast on the body by the assertion of Mr. Cooke, and he was therefore clearly of opinion that that gentleman was bound to point out

the men who had departed from the faith as it was in the Lord Jesus. How Mr. Cooke knew them, he (Dr. W.) could not say: but although they were not bound to go all the lengths Mr. Cooke would lead them—for he had openly avowed himself anxious for a separation of that Synod. (*Order, order.*)

Mr. MONTGOMERY rose (amidst cries of *order*) and stated, that he was not at present going into an inquiry as to the merits of the question before the House, (although he was perfectly willing to enter on the subject of a separation of the Synod, or a code of faith for its members, at the proper time,) but he was opposed to an important measure of this description being discussed in a corner of the province. Besides, the laws of that body decidedly allowed proper time for men to reflect on the matter, and make up their minds on what course they should adopt, in case of its being carried. He wished the discussion to stand over till next year, and by that time they would have calmly examined the merits of the question; and then, when they should also have a fuller attendance of members, they would be able to come to a decision, which would not, by such a hasty and intemperate course as was now pursuing, fix a lasting stigma on the Synod of Ulster. For himself, he was totally regardless of what step should be taken—the Synod was all-powerful, and it could act in whatever way it pleased. Such a course would be but fair play, not only to absent members, but to those members of the body now present, who had been taken by surprise, by the adoption of a measure which was at variance with their laws, and which might be considered by many as very oppressive.

Mr. STEWART (Broughshane) would endeavour to shew that Mr. Montgomery's reasons against this measure being now discussed, were not good. Mr. Montgomery had said, that the Synod was taken by surprise—that the motion was oppressive, and that it was contrary to law. With regard to the members of Synod not having received notice of this measure, he would contend there was nothing uncommon in that. Similar conduct had been, in urgent cases, often pursued in that body; and he could shew that the present motion arose out of the proceedings of the two previous days. The measure could not be oppressive on any one, except the hypocrite who wished to cloak himself from the knowledge of the world. As to the assertion of its being contrary to



law, he denied that : if the Committee of Overtures chose, they could introduce any measure; and then it might immediately be passed. As the code contains a law declaring the belief of this Synod founded on the Westminster Confession of Faith, so the present was only a declaratory one arising out of the law of the code, and not a new law. The object was to shew to the world of what complexion that body was, and that the Arians might be distinctly known.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, in explanation, observed, that the Synod had repented of its conduct in its hasty procedure against Dr. Dickson, at the instance of Dr. Black. He acknowledged that the feeling in the public mind was, that they were a Calvinistic body; yet it never was the practice of Synod to enforce a subscription of faith. The code was also opposed to it.

[The MODERATOR remarked, that in 1724, a law had passed the Synod, which enacted a Code of Faith.]

Mr. MORELL conceived, that as Synod had passed a declaration in 1813, on a political subject, it would in no way be objectionable to do the same now, on a religious one.

Mr. PORTER said, that the declaration passed in 1813, on a political subject, had come through the Committee of Overtures. He implored the Synod not to be so hasty in the passing of a measure which must inevitably divide the body.

Dr. WRIGHT agreed with the doctrines contained in the Declaration : but other members might not yet have made up their minds on this matter. The pressing of this measure would inevitably split the Synod, whereas the course he would pursue might open the eyes of their Arian brethren, *as some men's had been opened.*

Mr. S. DILL pressed the motion.

Mr. CARLILE was satisfied that something should be done to clear them of the charge of Arianism; and with this view he had himself prepared a motion. The statements made abroad regarding the Synod, demanded an immediate disavowal; but as to making it imperative on every member to sign—[No, no, said Mr. Cooke, it is free for any member to refuse.] Mr. Carlile requested the Clerk to read Mr. Cooke's motion; after which, he objected to the wording of it. He objected to the word "essence" being in it, as an unscriptural phrase, and also to some other parts.

Mr. REID (Rathmelton) was of opi-

nion, in the early part of the present Synod, that such a declaration was not at present necessary. He had since changed that opinion, and therefore supported the motion.

Dr. HANNA felt that from the nature of the proceedings which he had witnessed since the meeting of the Synod, its members were called on to put on record a declaration of their disapprobation of Arian principles; yet he would have much preferred to have seen such a measure brought forward agreeably to the established rules of this body—he meant, through the Committee of Overtures.

Mr. PARK (Ballymoney) contended, that as a charge of Arianism has been made against this body, and as such a charge was so decidedly opposed to the belief they professed to entertain, and the religion they taught their congregations, they ought not to lose a moment in disclaiming the truth of the assertion. A charge of hypocrisy had been made against the members of Synod; and their usefulness amongst their respective flocks must be destroyed, unless the unfounded charge were distinctly rebutted.

Mr. PORTER begged to be allowed to correct, once more, some misrepresentations of his printed testimony, which he had again and again been obliged to correct since the commencement of the present meeting. "It has been asserted by Mr. Stewart (said Mr. P.) and others, that I charged Presbyterian ministers with preaching doctrines which they do not believe, in order to ingratiate themselves with their people. I merely stated, that ministers were so dependent on the people for support and comfort, that they were under a temptation to follow, rather than to lead, the religious opinions of their hearers. Is there a man in this house, who will stand up and say, under the sanction of a solemn adjuration, that he does not believe that such a temptation exists? I have stated in my testimony, that in my opinion we have more *real* than *professed* Arians amongst us. This has been represented as a charge of hypocrisy against the ministers alluded to—as an intimation that they preached contrary to their conviction. All I said, or meant to say, was, not that they preached what they themselves did not believe, but that they did not preach *all* they believed; and I vindicated them by adding, that they did not consider the points in dispute essential to salvation: therefore, they did not wish to perplex

the minds of their hearers, by introducing topics of discussion, which the great bulk of congregations are incapable of comprehending. In this statement I am borne out by Mr. Cooke, *who declared, on oath, twelve months before I was examined*, that of the thirty-five Arians who are computed to be in the Synod, **VERY FEW WOULD BE WILLING TO ACKNOWLEDGE IT.** If such ministers," continued Mr. P., "are guilty of hypocrisy, I do not see how our Saviour himself can be vindicated from the charge. We are told that he spoke to the people, as they were able to hear; and St. Paul speaks of withholding strong food from babes, and nourishing them with milk. When men are under the influence of strong prejudices, an abrupt and premature declaration of the *whole* truth would in some cases but confirm them in error." With regard to the test which it was now proposed to impose on the members of that body, he would beg leave to remind the advocates of that measure, that attempts at uniformity of opinion in matters of faith had been the cause of all the contentions, persecutions, and schisms, which had taken place in the Christian Church. Such attempts had invariably been abortive. They might, and must, produce hypocrisy, but they could never produce unanimity. So long as different men had different degrees of natural understanding, and so long as they were reared under the influence of different prejudices and prepossessions, there were certain subjects on which they would always disagree. If a doctrine were true, it would, under the Providence of God, ultimately become prevalent. If it were not true, the most rigid test by which it could be enforced would not prevent it from gradually coming to nought. As well might they attempt to arrest the progress of the incoming tide, by opposing to it the puny dykes which children sometimes form of the sand on its shore, as attempt to stop the progress of truth, (if truth were on their side,) by any Synodical declaration or regulation. They had proofs in abundance of the utter inefficiency of Synodical acts, when opposed to the temper of the times. The Antrim separation was caused by a strict enforcement of subscription to the Westminster Confession; and, until very lately, they had upon their books line upon line, and law upon law, requiring unqualified subscription to that formula. What was the consequence? In the course of time, those laws ceased to be enforced, and sub-

scription was very generally laid aside. Calvinism was held, by different men, with different degrees of strictness. There were shades of difference in opinion amongst the gentlemen who were for imposing the present test. Would every one of them be willing to declare, at that moment, his belief in all the doctrines of the Westminster Confession? Some of them would not. Yet, on the very same principle on which the test was supported, those men might be called on by their more rigid associates, either to declare their entire approbation of that formula, or subject themselves to the odium of the ignorant multitude, by declining to do so. Would not they think it hard to be reduced to such an alternative? Let them do unto others as they would wish to be done by. As for himself, he had no personal interest in this matter. His sentiments were well known, and he could incur no additional reproach by declining the test proposed. On general principles, he declared himself hostile to all human tests in matters of faith. Presbyterians were in the habit of boasting that the Bible, and the Bible only, was their creed, and of maintaining the full sufficiency of the Scriptures for bringing men to the knowledge of all needful truth. Then, where could be the necessity for any human exposition of faith? God never left his word for man to mend. Mr. P. looked on all such tests as the present, not only as restraints on freedom of inquiry, and consequently injurious to the interests of truth, but as presumptuous encroachments on the authority of Christ, who was the sole legislator in his own church. For men to usurp his peculiar prerogative, was an act of spiritual rebellion. No doubt, every religious society had a right to inquire into the character and qualifications of those persons who wished to enter it, either as ordinary members or as ministers. But in judging of those qualifications, the society, or church, must be altogether regulated by the rules laid down in the gospel. They ought always to keep in mind, that whatever might be the case with other churches, theirs was not a civil society, governed by the laws of man, but a religious body, which was, or at least ought to be, under the exclusive controul of laws enacted by Christ. Neither the Presbyterian Church, therefore, nor any other church, had a right to act as if it were a civil society. If they looked into the gospel, they would find the test of admission into the Chris-

tian Church exceedingly simple. Every one who confessed that Christ had come in the flesh, was to be received. Belief in the Lord Jesus Christ was the profession of faith which Philip required of the Eucharist. They were told, that in every nation he that feared God and worked righteousness, would be accepted—that is, would be worthy of being received into the Christian Church; for that was unquestionably the primary import of the phrase. If they took the gospel for their guide, they might join in communion with those whom they could not join in opinion on certain articles of belief. In Mr. P.'s opinion, all the members of that body were agreed with respect to the essential doctrines of the gospel. A lamentable change had of late years taken place in the character and complexion of the Synod of Ulster. Formerly, the old and the new-light members of the body met together with feelings of cordiality and kindness. The points on which they differed were kept in a state of abeyance. Pastoral addresses were given up the moment it was discovered that they were likely to lead to doctrinal differences. At present, as much anxiety seemed to be discovered to excite discord, as there formerly was to prevent it. Questions were annually brought forward, the discussion of which must necessarily excite division,—and if the moderate and aged Calvinists did not come forward to repress these mischievous attempts, *separation must take place*. The peace which once prevailed amongst them, had been called “the peace of the grave,” but even that peace would be better than the discord of Pandemonium. Another gentleman (Mr. Dill, of Donaghmore, Mr. P. believed) had said, that Arianism necessarily led to Atheism. In another part of his speech, he called them Atheists, in plain terms. Be it so. With such Atheists as Sir Isaac Newton, Locke, Milton, Whitby, Lardner, Clarke, Abernethy, Leland, Benson, Bishop Hoadly, and Bishop Law—with such Atheists as these, they were very willing to be classed.

Mr. HAY observed, that if he did not apprehend an attempt would be made to divide the ministers of the Synod, as a body, he would not be so very anxious for a delay of the present motion until the sentiments of absent members could be fully ascertained. For himself he had nothing to fear: he was no Arian. But he really thought this measure a matter of so much importance, and affecting so deeply the interests of the Synod of Ulster and the principles of

Presbyterianism in general, that proper time should be given to reflect on its consequences and discuss its merits.

Friday Morning.

Mr. BROWN (Tobermore) rose to propose an amendment to Mr. Cooke's motion, which he prefaced in an address of considerable length; in the course of which, he urged the impolicy of dividing the body, and thus distracting the best interests of Presbyterianism in Ireland. He would gladly fight under Mr. Cooke's banners; but in this instance the views of that gentleman were too narrow and contracted to enable him to do so. A gentleman yesterday had advised the cutting off the diseased limb; but they had in the Bible medicines sufficiently powerful to cure the gangrene, without resorting to the lopping-off measure. They had medicine efficacious enough to heal even Deism. He then moved an amendment, to the effect—“that the doctrines of the Christian religion are contained in the writings of Calvin and Knox, and in the Westminster Confession of Faith; and that these are the doctrines of this body.”

Dr. WRIGHT seconded Mr. Brown's motion, for reasons similar to those urged by the mover. He took a learned review of the Christian church from the days of Constantine till the present period; from which he drew the conclusion, that all the divisions which took place had only served to retard the ultimate establishment of the Redeemer's kingdom. He observed, that early in life he had joined the Bangor Presbytery, because he could not then conscientiously sign the Westminster Confession of Faith; since which period, he had changed his opinion on that subject. He then put the question, whether a similar change might not take place in the minds of the brethren of that body, who now thought as he had once thought.

Mr. CARLILE expressed his astonishment at hearing any sensible man proposing such a measure as that which had just been submitted to the house by the two last speakers. (Hear.) Was Dr. Wright, or any one present, prepared to say, that he had read the whole works of Calvin and John Knox? Or, if they had, were they prepared to subscribe to those writings? For his part, he was not. After some other remarks in favour of a Declaration, and opposed to a Test or standard of the Synod's faith, he stated himself not prepared to go all the lengths of Mr. Cooke's mo-

tion, although the principle of it had his entire concurrence.

A debate now ensued of considerable length, between the orthodox ministers, relative to the terms which should be applied in denoting the persons of the Trinity. Mr. STEWART (Broughshane) said, that any word in high Dutch or low Dutch would to him be just as intelligible as the term "essence." Mr. ELDER wished the word "Godhead" introduced. One member wished the term to be "Father, Word, and Spirit;" another, "Father, Son, and Spirit;" another, "Father, Word, and Holy Ghost;" another, "Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."

Mr. MONTGOMERY here rose and observed, that surely it was but fair that brethren of humbler capacity should be allowed some licence in deciding on these nice points, when the Calvinistic fathers themselves could not agree about the very epithets which should be applied to the Deity.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Templepatrick) said, he had reflected with seriousness on the speech he made a few evenings before. He had been writhing under the lashes he received, and no wonder, for they were laid on with a heavy hand. Since the delivery of that speech he had been shunned by all his fathers and brethren, as if there were something pestilential about him, and as if whosoever came within the halo must have his mind infected. In vindication of himself, he felt called on to make an exposition of his sentiments. (Here there was a cry of Order, order; No creeds, no creeds. Mr. Campbell, being permitted, proceeded thus.) [Mr. C. went on to give a confession of his faith, for which we have not room. He concluded as follows:—] "Let not the thought, then, be entertained for a moment, that I am a Deist or an Infidel, or a denier of the divinity of the Redeemer; but it is on the momentous subject of the Supreme Deity of Christ that I hesitate; and I candidly confess that I have not arrived at a satisfactory conclusion on this deep and inscrutable mystery; nor can I give my declaration in favour of it, unless I could be convinced of what a gentleman, who has lately published sermons, seems to consider an impossibility, that the Sender is the same as the Sent, or that the Lord, in sending his Angel into the world, sent himself; and, therefore, let me not be denominated an Arian, while I demur, till I have better evidence, to subscribe myself a Trinitarian."

Mr. CARLILE again declared his opposition to the framing a test for this body.

Mr. BUTLER was in favour of signatures.

Mr. ORR (Portaferry) would have no hesitation in putting his signature to the doctrine in the motion, for it was his belief, and what he taught in his congregation; but, through fear of ulterior measures, of which they knew nothing as yet, but of the consequences of which danger should be apprehended, he would prefer that the general declaration of the Synod should pass without the roll being called, and persons' names, voting on opposite sides, being published.

Mr. COOKE rose to defend himself from the charge of the want of candour. Ulterior measures had been spoken of, and dark hints thrown out of consequences which might follow. He would now tell the members all the ulterior measures he had in contemplation, and thus, he hoped, enable those doubting and hesitating persons to make up their minds on the subject of the present motion. One object was, to prove that he was right in stating that there was a large body of Arians in the Synod; and, next, to devise some means of saving the congregations placed under those Arians from being contaminated by the baneful disease under which their clergymen laboured. In the course of this procedure he would avail himself of much valuable matter contained in Mr. Carlile's sermon, who had told them that wolves in sheep's clothing had crept into the fold of Christ. Was it not notorious that ministers had long been hoodwinking their flocks—men who had crept into that body in false colours? The laws and regulations of the Synod had not been sufficiently strict to guard against young men getting into congregations after three or four trial sermons, without any strict scrutiny or pledge of their soundness in the faith. One of his ulterior measures was to guard against this, and if any young man should come among them with a mask on, to take it off him, and to let the world know and see what he really was. If, afterwards, congregations should prefer Arianism, why, in God's name let them have it; let them choose Arian preachers to be their shepherds, but let them not join in the work of hoodwinking the people. It was but seven years since a minister of that body heard two elders swear that a certain clergyman was truly orthodox, whom he (Mr. Cooke) knew to be an Arian. When



the people heard a fine dissertation on the mere morality of life, and a few neat and select passages introduced into a flowery sermon, they might be amused; but the true state of their soul's danger, and the truth as it is in the Lord Jesus, was left out; and they received none of that spiritual food which could make man happy in life and blessed in a glorious eternity. Another ulterior object was, to have a committee of Synod appointed, who would send missionaries into certain extensive congregations where the gospel of Christ had not been preached for many years. The committee's business would be, when they found a faithless minister neglecting to teach his people the truth as it is in the Lord Jesus, to suspend that preacher, to pray with him, and to exhort him to turn unto the truth. Also to pray with the people, to instruct them in those doctrines which had been left by Christ, to bring unto himself a chosen people, zealous of good works; to entreat them to renew a right spirit within them, and to abandon their mistaken course. If the minister, in due time, exhibited a spirit of repentance, then he should be reinstated in his pulpit; but if he still remained contumacious, then he was to be lopped off like a diseased limb, lest, through this member, the whole body became infected. Another object was, to preclude the members of that body from holding ministerial communion with the persons who thus differed with them on this most vital of all questions. Another ulterior measure was, not to attempt to split the Synod *this year*, but, with the blessing of God, he did contemplate that measure *next year*.

A considerable discussion ensued relative to the expulsion of words and introducing phrases into Mr. Cooke's motion, when

Mr. MITCHELL said, the present motion embraced two objects; one was to vindicate that body from certain charges which had been made against it; the other, to serve as a test of individual opinion. As far as that part went which related to vindication, he would vote for it, if he voted at all; but as to the test, he would protest against it, as an attack on individual liberty of conscience. It might lead many a weak brother into temptation, and it might do serious injury to many of his Calvinistic brethren around him, (who were resolved not to sign,) should the list go forth to the world without their names. The passing of this measure was laying a foundation for hypocrisy. He

would also venture to affirm, that it would fail as a test, because he knew many Calvinistic members who would resist this forging of mental fetters. It was introducing an inquisition into that body, which he never would submit to; he never would submit to be dragged into signing, as a test of his belief in the doctrines of the Scriptures, any formula of human construction.

Mr. MONTGOMERY spoke to the following effect: Moderator, in coming forward to address you on the present occasion, I cannot avoid feeling that I do so under many disadvantages. The man who has the multitude at his back, who sails upon the full tide of popular favour, has an easy task to perform in vindicating his opinions; for there is a sympathy in the breasts of his auditors which gives energy and life to all that he utters. But the individual who ventures to stem the current of public feeling, who goes forth in his frail bark against rolling waters, has only a cheerless and a hopeless prospect before him. Such is my situation at present; yet, although I may be driven back by the stream, or overwhelmed by the tempest, I cannot see the Synod of Ulster rushing forward, in the dangerous confidence of security, to what I consider destruction, without boldly pushing forth to warn her of the shoals and quicksands to which she is approaching.

A Presbyterian by education, and feeling, and conviction; a Presbyterian, because I consider the principles of our church essentially favourable to the great cause of civil and religious liberty; I should be unworthy of the privileges which I enjoy, if any contemptible view of personal convenience or temporal interest could prevent me from expressing freely what I strongly feel. I wish, however, to approach this important subject in a serious frame of mind, and in as calm a manner as the agitations of the last four days will permit. But as I am sensible that the ardour of debate, and the very nature of an extemporaneous address may carry me beyond those mild and decorous bounds which the character and station of this assembly require to be observed, I commit myself to the judicious correction of the Moderator. I feel it the more necessary to do so, as I, and those who think with me, have had our opinions treated, by several speakers, with terms of unmeasured obloquy and reproach. The gentlest epithet applied to us has been that of *heretics*. I never expected to hear the word used in a *Protestant* assembly, but

its reiterated application on the present occasion has taught me that no mode of faith can change the evil propensities of human nature, and that the hateful passions of men are never so malignant as when they put on the sacred garb of religion. Those, however, who have adopted this vulgar system of abuse, which only reflects discredit upon themselves and the cause which they espouse, have not the merit of originality in the course which they pursue. The attaching of odious names to opinions and persons marked out for persecution, has always been the favourite plan of the exclusively righteous. I feel unwilling even to allude, in this heated assembly, to the most glorious Being that ever appeared upon earth; but we all know that the Redeemer of the world was brought to the cross under the accusation of *blasphemy*, and the great apostle of the Gentiles was reviled as a *heretic* for preaching the truth dictated to him by the Holy Spirit. Paul "confessed that after the manner which they called heresy, worshiped he the Lord God of his fathers." I cheerfully make the same admission: I own, that after the manner which the majority here "call heresy," I do worship my Creator. But I am not the more in *real* error on that account, for I believe no member of the Synod will say that *numbers* prove "sound doctrine." If such a position were tenable, woe be unto Protestantism! Indeed, Moderator, except for the credit of this body, I care not by what name I may be called; neither shall I retort upon my opponents the invidious epithets which might easily be applied, being determined not to sacrifice the best part of Christianity, its spirit of infinite benignity and love, to the support of a party or the maintenance of speculative opinions.

Mr. Cooke has been courteous enough to compliment me as possessing "talents, acquirements, and eloquence, of no ordinary kind;" and to say, "that he thinks more highly of *my* abilities than I do of *his*." For the first part of his eulogium, however unmerited, I feel grateful, though probably I ought to consider it only as the *tact* of an ambitious general, magnifying the power of his enemy merely to enhance the glory of certain victory. With regard to our comparative estimate of each other's talents, I hope he is correct; for, knowing how highly I appreciate *his* abilities, I should be proud to stand even *higher* in the estimation of so competent a judge. But admitting his compliment to be sincere, in how awkward a situation does

it place himself in condemning my opinions! He grants me a mind *capable* of judging, and concedes that I possess literary acquirements adequate to enlighten and direct my judgment; and yet (most strange to say!) he declares that I do not understand the fundamental doctrine of the Gospel, which he avers is clearly revealed in every page of the New Testament! How this alleged force of intellect and extent of information can be reconciled with my alleged ignorance of the plainest proposition of Revelation, it is not for me to determine; but as I feel grateful for his courtesy, I freely give him the full benefit of his argument.

I am not, however, more surprised at Mr. Cooke's granting to me all the attributes which are usually considered necessary to enable a man to form correct opinions, and then declaring that I am in dangerous error, than I am at the humble estimate which he seems to make of his own talents, whilst he proposes to guide the opinions of others by a religious test or declaration. How a church that considered itself *infallible*, or an individual who believed himself *inspired*, could make such a proposition, I can readily conceive; but how any man, or body of men, admitting fallibility of judgment, and laying no claim to inspiration, can be guilty of such an audacious attempt "to lord it over God's heritage," (the conscience,) I do confess I have no faculties to comprehend. As there is a *possibility* of error, wherever there is human *fallibility*, in how awful a situation must those stand who either require or give assent to that which *may* be "the commandment of men," instead of "the truth of God"! It is vain to tell me, that "this is only a declaration of opinion, not a test of belief." It is a distinction without a difference; for, what a man *declares*, at the bidding of his fellow-man, he virtually *subscribes*. Now, I do say, without fear of rational or scriptural contradiction, that any body of fallible men who demand assent or subscription to any declaration or test of faith, in *human language*, under the fear of any penalty or the hope of any reward, are trenching, not merely upon the fundamental principle of Protestantism, "the right of private judgment," but also upon the sacred prerogative of the great Head of the Church. "Who art thou," saith the Apostle, "that judgest another man's servant? To his own master let him stand or fall." And elsewhere we are instructed, "that one is our master, even Christ, and all we are brethren." How dare those very

Presbyterians, that declaim most loudly against the usurpations of Popery, who call upon the Catholics to read their Bibles, to despise their priests, and to extricate themselves from the trammels of their church; how dare they, in the face of common shame and common consistency, to turn upon their brethren, and to attempt to place "the yoke of bondage" upon their necks! When I witness such an attempt, I blush for the weakness or the wickedness of man; but I will neither be a partaker in the shame nor in the crime. So truly do I detest all human interference in matters of conscience, and so awful have been its effects in the world, that were you this moment to lay before me a human creed, every word of which I believed, I would not subscribe it, lest I should thereby sanction the interference of man with the sole prerogative of the Redeemer. Indeed, what are all such attempts, but a manifestation of the impious vanity of man, pretending "to be wise above what is written," and to reveal the will of God *more clearly* than it has been revealed by the spirit of truth. Sir, I will subscribe no creed but the Bible; I will account for my views of it to no human tribunal but my congregation; and when this world and its evil passions shall have passed away, I pray to Him "who alone can keep me from falling," that I may not be altogether unprepared to answer for my faith to the great Head of the Church.

I admit that this body has the *power* to pass any declaration which it pleases, and to demand any submission of its members which it pleases; but I deny that it has any Scripture warrant for doing so. And if, Moderator, you should persevere, what will be the consequence? You may make *hypocrites* of the weak, and the crafty, and the worldly; you may make *martyrs* of the firm, the upright, and the sincere; but every child who hears me must know, that you cannot change the conviction of a single mind or alter the feeling of a single heart. Suppose you pass your declaration, and I refuse my assent or signature, which as an honest man I must refuse, you will probably say unto me, "We can no longer give you the right hand of fellowship;" but, if I *subscribe* your creed, though you *know* I do not *believe* it, then you will receive me as a brother in the Lord. How revolting then is this project to every virtuous feeling of the human heart! You will spurn the hand which is pure as the mountain snow, whilst you clasp, with

the grasp of friendship, that which is black with the stains of perjury! Woe be unto the Presbyterian church, if ever that day shall come in which falsehood and dissimulation shall be bonds of union, whilst truth and sincerity shall be cast out of her counsels!

And for what is all this tyranny to be exercised, this disgrace to be incurred, this wound to be inflicted on religion? Why, that we may not be liable to the accusation of having a "diversity of opinions amongst us"! That is to say, we do differ and we know that we shall continue to differ, but we will hold out false colours to the world, we will cast dust into the eyes of the multitude, and try to make them believe that "there is peace, when there is no peace." This may seem very fair in the eyes of some, but to me it appears to be rank Jesuitism and hypocrisy. Yet this alone can be the "*unity*" for which many are such strenuous advocates. I do not think so meanly of their understandings as to believe that they aim at any other kind of uniformity. *Uniformity of Faith!* Oh, that such a phrase had never been heard by the ears of man, that such a vain idea had never flitted across his imagination! What dungeons has it crowded! what tortures has it inflicted! what oceans of innocent blood has it shed! what tears of widows and of orphans has it caused to ascend in sad memorial before Heaven! Leaving its mightier horrors, what havoc of integrity has it produced in the ordinary walks of life! what lips has it sealed against the utterance of truth or opened to the utterance of falsehood! what private and political oppressions has it sanctioned! what barriers has it opposed to the progress of religion and the emancipation of a world! *Uniformity of Faith!* Why two of us can scarcely agree respecting the most ordinary occurrence of life. On the subjects of literature and philosophy, manufactures and commerce, government and laws, there is an endless diversity of opinions. And can we, then, possibly expect to be exactly of one mind on "the high and deep things pertaining to salvation"? So long as human nature is constituted as it is, varying in dispositions and talents, subject to all the influences of education, society, and interest, a vast diversity of religious tenets must necessarily prevail. Nothing less than the immediate interposition of Heaven could produce perfect uniformity. And when we consider that such uniformity never has been attained, it would be a libel on the Deity to suppose that it is

essential to the salvation of his people. Such an impious supposition would imply, that an all-wise and gracious Being had given a religion to his creatures inadequate to produce the effects for which it was designed. But I do not require to urge this upon Presbyterians, who spurn at the idea of "exclusive salvation," and rejoice to think, "that many shall come from the East and from the West, from the North and from the South, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God."

Were uniformity of faith, however, *desirable*, (which, to me, seems exceedingly doubtful,) I am persuaded that creeds and confessions, and other "devices of men," are not the means adapted to produce it. The very churches which taunt us with our varieties of faith, and reproach us for permitting the disuse of our "ancient standards," have as great diversities of opinion in themselves as prevail amongst us. We might fairly turn upon them and say, "Physicians, heal yourselves!" It is as notorious as the sun at noon day, that the Established Church, at this very moment, is divided into two great parties of Arminians and Calvinists, not to speak of minor divisions. I have seen a low Arian, if not Socinian work, written not many years ago, as I have been told and believe, by a dignitary of that church, turning the doctrine of the Trinity and Archbishop's Magee's view of the atonement into contempt and ridicule in the most indecorous manner. And we all know, that from Tillotson down to the present age, many of the brightest ornaments of that church have wished, that "she was well rid of the Athanasian creed." Do I mention these things from any invidious feeling towards the Established Church? By no means. I believe the clergy of that church to be a very respectable body of divines, many members of it are amongst my best friends, and some of the most pious Christians I ever knew were of its communion. But I consider the state of that church as a striking proof of my position, that uniformity of creed does not necessarily produce uniformity of faith. And when, on a previous day, I spoke of a few of the clergy as shewing themselves anxious about the dismissal of Mr. Porter from the clerkship, and interfering in the settlement of a Presbyterian congregation, I meant no reflection on the clergy of that church as a body. If some of them became "busybodies in other men's matters," I am convinced that ninety-nine out of one hundred of them would condemn such injudicious

interference as much as I possibly could. But, whilst I thus express my respect towards the Established Church, I trust I shall be pardoned for not falling into that extreme courtesy (so common amongst us of late) which would exalt her above the church to which I conscientiously belong. I should hold it disgraceful to continue a *Presbyterian*, if I preferred the doctrine, discipline, or worship, of *any* other church; and I freely confess, that I should place very little value upon a compliment from any man who told me that he considered *my* church superior to his *own*, whilst he remained in that which he disapproved.

If we turn to the Church of Scotland it will not afford us much stronger proof of the efficacy of a uniform creed. There the Confession of Faith reigns in all its glory; yet, I have been told, (and I speak under the correction of Mr. Carlyle,) that there is not on earth a body of men of more diversified religious sentiments than the ministers of the Church of Scotland. Nay, it has been more than hinted, that the very seats of learning are not free from heresy. Rumour tells a strange tale of a subscription scene in one of these venerable seminaries. When a professor was elected, who was pretty generally known not to be as orthodox as John Knox, the person who presented the Confession of Faith to him for signature, simply enough, asked him if he *believed it*? This, the learned gentleman very well knew, "was not in the bond." "You have nothing," said he, "to do with that: hand it here and I'll *sign it*." There may be persons who admire this mode of producing a uniform and orthodox faith; but to me it seems awful to think that a man would be excluded from the ministry, or any other office, for avowing the *truth*, who would be considered duly qualified for admission, by putting his solemn signature to a *lie*!

I was wrong, however, in saying that there is no church in which uniformity is to be found. There is one which, at least, boasts of being the same in every age, and clime, and country—the Catholic church. But are those who most strenuously press forward this Declaration, admirers of the beautiful uniformity of *that* church? I suspect, that whilst some of them would not join me in my cordial wishes to see the benefits of the British Constitution extended to our Catholic countrymen, they will all unite with me in admitting, that the uniformity of the Catholic church powerfully tended to bring on "the gross



darkness" of the middle ages, to retard the Reformation, to clog the wheels of science, and thereby to arrest the progress of civilization. The fact cannot be concealed; the uniformity of Catholicity has spread darkness over Spain and Italy; and the noxious weeds of Atheism and Infidelity have sprung up under its shadow in the fair and fertile regions of France. This, however, in my mind, would have been the effect, though probably in a less degree, of any other system of faith which had attained equal power and extension; for it seems to be an ingredient in the nature of all churches to delight in the exercise of authority where they have power; and to follow as a natural consequence of uniformity of faith, that inquiry should cease, and the independence of the mind be annihilated. The truth is, controversies and discussions, which can only arise from diversity of opinions, seem to be as necessary to preserve the knowledge and energy of religion, as the motion of the waves to purify the waters of the ocean; but the misfortune is, that in "the strife of words" the spirit of the Gospel is too frequently lost.

I put it then to the Synod of Ulster, whether, in the pursuit of a shadow, a visionary uniformity, they will trample upon the right of private judgment, the very foundation of their church, and wilfully "lay a snare for the feet of weak brethren." A curse lies upon him "who causeth a brother to offend;" and I ask, is there a man in this house who does not believe, that if this Declaration be passed, some will assent to it with the lips, but not with the heart or with the mind? I beseech you to pause before you commit an act which must "cause some to fall." "Lay not the flattering unction to your souls," that the sin will lie solely at the door of him who shall make an insincere declaration. Every man who is concerned in passing it will be "a partaker in his sin." I can readily conceive what a struggle of nature there may be in many a heart, where the best feelings of humanity will be dragging the unhappy victim different ways. If he assent to a creed which he believes not, he is for ever degraded in his own estimation; he shudders in the presence of his God. But he is a husband and a father, and if he resolve to put on the high, unbending port of a martyr, and to utter that which will make a bigoted multitude expel him from his congregation, what must be the conflict of his spirit! Unqualified for any other profession, perhaps in the

wane of life, "to die unable, and to be ashamed," he sees, in prospect, his comfortable home made desolate, the partner of his bosom in tears, the children of his affection crying to him for that bread which he can no longer give! I ask any person, that has in his bosom "a heart of flesh," can he wonder if the most powerful feelings of nature should overcome the stern commands of conscience? Can it create surprise if the unhappy man should say, "I will not leave HER desolate, whom in the fond fidelity of my heart I solemnly swore to protect; I will not leave the pledges of our love without the sustenance of nature, without the means of education. No: I will make this hateful Declaration; I will cast myself upon the mercy of Him who knows the pangs of my heart; I will wear my knees in secret prayer; I will wet my pillow with tears of penitence; and if all be too little to procure pardon for my offence, I may die without hope, but not without the consolation that I have sacrificed myself for objects dearer to me than life!" Oh! let us not call such a man a wretch, or a hypocrite; he is a husband and a father! Let us rather make the case our own, and not "cast a stumbling-block in his way." Let us not send him into that place from which nothing but the voice of sincerity and truth should ever be heard, with a heavy conscience and a falsehood upon his soul! If we do, his blood may be required of the authors of his crime.

But it may be alleged, that I under-rate the firmness and virtue of our ministers. Possibly I may. And what is the reward proposed for those that will maintain their integrity? Why, you will kindly cast all the odium you can upon them in these fanatical times; you will distract their congregations, turn them adrift, if you can, and give them the charity of the world for their portion. But you will not have many thus to endow. Those may be courageous who are free from danger, and very upright, who have nothing to forfeit by their integrity. But I shall recall to your minds a passage in the history of a man with whom no individual here would dare to put himself in competition. I allude to the virtuous and illustrious Cranmer, the father of the Reformation in England. In the awful reign of Mary his love of life prevailed over his integrity, and he was induced to sign a paper condemning the Reformation. This sacrifice, however, did not save him; for, having degraded, they resolved to de-

stroy him. Being led to the stake, and the devouring flames kindling around him, he stretched forth his right hand, and held it in the flames till it was consumed, repeatedly calling out, in the midst of his sufferings, "O that unworthy hand!" Who then shall boast of the firmness of ordinary men, when he who was bold enough to rebuke the Eighth Henry, yielded for a season to his fears?

There will, I admit, be a few honest men whom you may have the comfort and glory of exposing to inconvenience or injury. But your triumph will be very limited; for if you pass your test, I calculate that many will very soon perceive their errors. Amongst the first to rush forward to sign it, I suspect, will be a man who told me if worldly interest and popular applause ran as high in favour of New-Light, as of Old-Light doctrines, he did not believe there would be above *half-a-dozen* Orthodox ministers in the Synod. This may be an erroneous estimate, but he is proud of being a particularly accurate man in his calculations. Next to him, in the race, will come, I should suppose, another eminent divine, who yesterday accused a better man than himself of blasphemy, but who has, nevertheless, a very comfortable idea of the compressible nature of a ministerial conscience, as I have heard him declare, "that he only required to know a minister's congregation, in order to tell his creed." Oh, what a pure body the Synod of Ulster will soon be, and how much of one mind, if you but give them a good confession!

But I have been told, that all this is proposed in pure kindness, in order to bring back the stray sheep into the true fold. This, I am bound to believe, is all true, as the principal promoters of the plan are, no doubt, superior to ordinary Christians. But whilst the *motive* may be approved, I must say the *means* seem but ill adapted to the end. There is a kind of resistance in human nature to the exercise of authority where no title to exercise it appears. There are some minds not very accessible to the logic of majorities, and which cannot comprehend the meaning of a threat from their equals. I tell you plainly and sincerely, if you think us in error, you must take other means to convert us. Uncharitable denunciations and unwarranted attempts to coerce our consciences, will rather wed us to our opinions. I shall venture to tell you a fable in proof of this position. In ancient

times, as the *sun* and the *wind* were chatting together, they beheld a traveller passing over a plain with a cloak over his shoulders. Just for a frolic, they laid a wager as to which of them could soonest deprive him of his cloak. The Wind was to have the lead: and, mustering all his strength, he blew East and West, North and South, in the most violent and ingenious manner. But although the poor traveller was nearly blown down, he would not part with his cloak: the stronger the blast, he just wrapped it the more closely about him, and held it with the more determined grasp. At length, the Wind exhausted himself with puffing, and gave up the task; when the Sun, who had retired behind a cloud, gently and gradually looked past the skirt of it upon the traveller, who held his cloak tightly for a while, remembering the rough usage he had experienced. But as the storm was past, and as the day became genial, he gradually relaxed his hold; the Sun put forth stronger beams; the cloak was thrown open; the traveller paused; the Sun poured forth the full tide of his splendour and his heat; the cloak gradually descended from the shoulders of the traveller, and he stood, subdued and melted, in the glorious presence of the God of Day! The Wind is the fury of persecution: the Sun is the genial influence of Christian love. The cloak of error, if such there be, will only be held more tenaciously in the hurricane; but in the gentle calm of kindness, in the hour of friendly intercourse, it may be laid aside for ever. There is a pride in the human heart which resists compulsion, though it will readily yield to love.

I see, on the other side of the house, a gentleman who has long been a leading member of this body, and who has lately distinguished himself both from the pulpit and the press. I refer to my friend Mr. Stewart, whose sermon in defence of Orthodoxy I hold in my hand. In the preface to this discourse, he tells the world, what I knew long ago, that he was first a Calvinist in his boyhood, that he was afterwards very sceptical on the doctrine of the Trinity, and that it was only in the year 1825, he turned his attention to the Bible to see if it contained what he *now* calls the fundamental doctrine of the Scriptures, which, unless a man believe, he is on the very verge of Atheism. Now, had the proposed declaration been brought forward in 1824, Mr. Stewart, as an honest man, could not have signed it. He might then

have been "cut off as a rotten branch," and that very act of severity would, in all likelihood, have confirmed him in error. But see the happy consequence of kindness and moderation! He who might have continued an Arian, a Heretic, a Semi-Atheist, peculiarly dangerous on account of his talents, is now the zealous champion of orthodoxy, and one of the powerful enemies of Catholic error! What *has* been, *may* be. In two years, if you do not "lop us off," Mr. Porter, or myself, may be edifying the world with dissertations against our present opinions!

But consider farther, if you pass this declaration, you must extend it to probationers as well as ministers. Now, you tell the people that they have a right to choose their own pastors: but if they should not like a Calvinist, where are they to procure a teacher? I presume they must either submit to your dictation, or remain without a minister, which would be rather a singular way of consulting their rights and privileges.

Mr. Cooke and others have been pleased to denominate those who differ from them, as "wolves in sheep's clothing." This implies that we have assumed a false character. So far as I am concerned, I treat the insinuation with contempt. But, I do admit, there are in this body "wolves in sheep's clothing:" men who have lived with us in Christian communion, who have pretended to entertain for us Christian friendship; but who now, when they are confident in numbers, turn upon us and would devour us. These are the *real* wolves.

But we have also been compared to soldiers entering a garrison for its defence, and afterwards turning our arms against our companions. Surely Mr. Cooke intended this as a hit at himself and his partisans. I came into the garrison with the same colours which I now wear; I have always kept them flying; and whether I remain in it, or be driven from it, I shall keep them aloft, so long as I have an arm to bear them. There are, however, traitors amongst us: men who came into the fortress on the avowed condition of mutual toleration and forbearance, and who engaged with us to defend it against the common enemy. But now, that they think *themselves* able to maintain the bulwarks, they treacherously turn their arms against their comrades, and would drive them out defenceless upon the world. These are the *real* traitors.

Mr. Cooke's similes are only to be

equalled by his charity. He has given us a new version of Christian unity. He has talked a great deal about unity of the Spirit, meaning unity of the Spirit's testimony. These are idle words which sound in the ear without conveying any idea to the mind. Every ignorant enthusiast, down to the lowest dregs of fanaticism, talks most presumptuously of "the testimony of the Spirit," and appeals to his own feelings as a proof that he is right. But when Mr. Cooke says that he is only to love those of his own creed, and to view those who differ from him as he would regard robbers, I tell him, that he is listening to the testimony of his own passions, not to the spirit of truth. There were persons of old, who loved only their own tribe and nation, "who trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and despised others;" but our Saviour shewed that the poor Samaritan understood the nature of brotherly love infinitely better than the priest and the Levite. It may be said, this was only an act of charity to the body; but surely, if we are bound to love "that which perisheth," we are much more constrained to love "that which endureth for ever." It is one of the greatest evils of our unsanctified contentions, that they tend to restrict the charity of the gospel, which enjoins us to "love *all* men, and to do good unto *all* men,"—even that charity which the apostle declares to be superior even to faith and hope.

I have not entered into any defence of my peculiar tenets, though I believe them to be capable of a rational and scriptural vindication, because I know that such a course would only widen a breach which is already too large. But I can assure you, that whatever my opinions are, I hold them in great humility, under the most profound sense of my weakness and liability to go astray. In coming to the conclusions at which I have arrived, I can truly say, that I have sought light and direction where alone they are to be obtained. I have never read the Scriptures, with a view to ascertain their meaning, without first imploring the gracious assistance of the Divine Spirit to free me from prejudice, presumption, and error, and to lead me to a right understanding of the truth. Neither have I ever sat down to write a sermon, or any religious discourse, without praying to God that I might be enabled faithfully and truly to interpret his holy will, and to instruct his people. And I can farther say, in perfect since-

rity, that I never enter a pulpit without a profound sense of my responsibility; nor do I ever venture to address any people, until I have secretly and fervently intreated the protection and guidance of Heaven. I may not have asked with becoming humility and devotion and faith; but I trust I have asked in sincerity. And if I be yet in error, I believe God will enlighten my mind: if I be right, I trust he will grant me fortitude to maintain my integrity, in despite of unmerited obloquy, and "to speak boldly the whole counsel of his will." For myself, and those who think with me, I feel that I am entitled to claim at least the humble merit of being *sincere*. The world may consider us *fools* for not conforming to its maxims and pursuing its gains, but it would require the malignity of a demon to call us *knaves*. I believe, though many of my brethren be in error, that simple error is not a condemning sin; and I sincerely hope, that the great Shepherd may collect his sheep from many folds. If I thought that all who differ from me were to go down to destruction, I could not enjoy one hour's happiness.

I conclude by entreating you not to enter upon a measure at variance with the true principles of your church, and which must eventually end in division and weakness. For myself, I have, as you all know, nothing either to hope or to fear. But "for my friends and brethren's sake, I would say, Peace be within your Zion." Arianism has been persecuted, frequently unto blood, for fifteen centuries, which must prove that it cannot be subdued by mere human power. This, however, is certain, "if it be of men, it will come to nought; but if it be of God, ye cannot prevail against it."

Mr. S. DILL now rose to reply to Mr. Montgomery, and had great difficulty in obtaining a hearing. He sat down once or twice, in expectation of the agitation occasioned by Mr. M.'s speech subsiding; it was in vain; the storm had passed over the waters, but the heavy swell still remained. Mr. Dill, however, persevered, and went over Mr. Montgomery's arguments *seriatim*; replying to each in a strain of great energy and much ingenuity. In the concluding part of his reply, he addressed some strong epithets to the clergymen of an opposite belief—such as "Atheists," "Mahomedans," "Infidels," &c.; and for so doing was called to order. At the conclusion of his address,

Mr. BLACKLEY (Monaghan) expressed his desire that the declaratory part of the motion (as modified) should pass, and that the clause requiring signatures should be omitted. His reasons were, that the object of clearing the Synod of the charge of Arianism would thus be effected, without pointing out to popular odium those persons who could not conscientiously give their signatures to a declaration such as was now proposed. He felt no fear of the consequences whether he signed or not; his flock knew his principles to be orthodox—and he would not allow any Arian minister to preach in his pulpit—but yet he was opposed to a measure which partook so much of a spirit of persecution.

Mr. HOGG (Armagh) agreed with the sentiments of the last speaker.

Mr. DENHAM, Sen., thought it right that the Synod should pass a declaration, clearing themselves from the charge of Arianism, but he trusted that body would never adopt such a resolution, which would be a complete fetter on the human mind. He implored his orthodox brethren to bear with their weaker brethren, and not enact a measure which would pave the way for the introduction of Popery into the Presbyterian Church.

#### Saturday Morning.

Mr. MAGILL (holding in his hand a copy of the Commissioners' Report) proceeded to rebut the arguments of Mr. Montgomery on the preceding evening. He commenced by saying, that although Mr. Montgomery had advanced many arguments against that body's signing a test or declaration of its faith, yet he was prepared to prove that Mr. Montgomery had already signed a Confession of *his* Faith, in putting his signature to the evidence he had given regarding the religious opinions of this body, in his examinations before the Commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry. [Here Mr. Magill read, from the examinations of the Commissioners, Mr. Montgomery's evidence.] That was a public testimony, given before a Commission of the House of Commons. Now, where was the difference between the ministers of this Synod signing a declaration of their belief, and Mr. Montgomery signing his? If there were any difference, it was in this—the one declared that Christ was God, and the other that he was not God. In the code also, Mr. Montgomery sanctioned subscription. Mr. Montgomery called on young men to sign, in the books of the Bangor Presbytery, their



belief in certain doctrines, and yet he would oppose a declaration on similar principles from the members of that body.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I do no such thing. We require them to declare their opinions, and this Synod may make fifty such declarations if it please.

Mr. MAGILL. Well, then, surely we have a right to sign this declaration, without injuring Mr. Montgomery, or taking from him his congregation or his stipend. For the struggle has now come to that point, that by this declaration the Synod must stand or fall. The contest is now between Arianism and truth. (No, no.) Yes, it is; for I do believe, from the bottom of my heart, that the doctrine of Arianism is utterly false. Let Mr. Montgomery deny his Divine Lord and Master—(hear, order, no)—I mean to say, (said Mr. Magill,) let him deny the supreme Divinity of Christ—we, at least, will not desert our Heavenly King and Supreme God of our Salvation. With regard to the high reputation which certain ministers of this body have given to the great leading Arian characters, let us inquire into the truth of their statements. Sergius the Monk assisted Mahomet in composing the Koran—he was an Arian;—for Mahomedanism is erected on Arianism: they are the same. Newton has been quoted as an Arian example. Newton was not an Arian: Newton was a great philosopher who came to illumine the world, and give new light to the views of mankind.

“God said, Let Newton be, and all was light.”

Mr. CARLILE. Moderator, I rise to order; this is absolute blasphemy.

Mr. MAGILL. It is a quotation from Pope, one of our greatest poets; the quotation has not been given right, however; it is,

“Nature, and Nature’s laws, lay hid in night;  
God said, Let Newton be, and all was light.”

Surely this is no blasphemy. But I am willing to be put right. Newton was not an Arian—Locke was not an Arian. Abernethy has been quoted: now Abernethy took from this Synod the very meeting-house and congregation in Antrim, at present under the care of the Presbytery of Antrim. Mr. Magill then went on to describe the overthrow of Arianism in the South of Ireland. After some further remarks, he quoted the passage from the Gospel of Matthew, “Any man who will deny me, him will

I deny before my Father, which is in heaven;” and said, now is the time to avow Christ—now let the servants of Jesus Christ acknowledge their master.

“All hail the power of Jesus’ name!”

“Bring forth the royal diadem,  
And crown him Lord of all!”

(Order, order.)

Mr. CARLILE. I do protest against this display of Mr. Magill’s eloquence—it is perfect profanation.

Mr. M’KAY (Portglenone) supported the original motion.

Mr. BARNET was favourable to the Test.

Mr. LEONARD DOBBIN (an Elder) had no objection to the general bearing of the declaration, although the words did not exactly meet his approbation; but he was decidedly hostile to subscription. He considered any act of that description infringing on their dearest privileges as Presbyterians, and trenching on the right of private judgment. If the Synod once adopted the principle, it was impossible to say where it might end; as many cases were likely to arise in which differences would occur. In debating this question, *ministers seemed to have forgotten their congregations*, as such proceedings would be spurned by the great body of the people represented by him.

Captain S. ROWAN (an Elder) would, in opposition to the last speaker, support the original motion.—The congregation which he represented (Killileagh) had very nearly been destroyed, in the time of a former pastor, in consequence of its members not having had the doctrines of their religion truly preached and explained to them.

Mr. DILL (Knowhead) urged a variety of arguments in favour of subscription.

Mr. REID (Rathmelton) said, that the Synod was in such a situation, that its members were called on boldly and fearlessly to avow their religious opinions. Not to perform this necessary duty, would do serious injury to the Presbyterian religion in Ireland. The doctrine of the Trinity was the basis of the whole Christian fabric—remove it, and the entire system must crumble into ruins. Yet, although he conceived this avowal absolutely necessary, he did not see the same necessity for subscription. If, however, it were necessary to authenticate the measure, he would certainly put down his signature.

Mr. COOKE, in speaking to the amendment, said he had little of importance to add to his former arguments; but an

assertion had yesterday been made, which he could not allow to pass without giving to it his decided negative—it was, that the Church of Rome had put forth an unanswerable argument against the Protestant religion. This was a weak, flimsy cobweb, which, feeble as was his (Mr. C.'s) hand, it could tear into a thousand pieces. Mr. Cooke now entered into a long criticism on the writings and arguments of the principal Romish theological writers, in which he endeavoured to prove, that the Church of Rome had been as often and as widely divided on points of faith as any other church under the Christian dispensation.

Another gentleman had asserted, that creeds and confessions had led to the divisions and overthrow of the Christian Church in the East. Mr. Cooke took an extensive view of the rise, progress, and downfall of the seven churches of Asia Minor, and, after instancing the fact of a portion of the Church of Christ still existing in Abyssinia, he stated, that just so far as Arianism had spread itself in the East, Mahomedanism had arisen on its ruins.

They had heard it asserted, in one of the most brilliant speeches ever delivered in that, or probably any other assembly, that the present measure was an infringement on the rights of private judgment. This he (Mr. Cooke) denied, although he was aware that the influence of that most eloquent address was still operating on that body. He readily admitted that the gentleman who delivered it was a man of much more talent than he was; but there was left to him the consolation, that God had hidden many things from the wise and the learned, and had revealed them unto babes. Mr. Cooke next proceeded to refute the former speakers, who had argued that the present measure was not calculated to preserve “the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.” He quoted many portions of the epistles in support of his arguments.

They had also heard it asserted, that this was a persecution of the Arian members of this Synod. In the first place, there never was a more persecuting church than the Arian one; and, in the next place, he would be glad to know what persecution there was in a man simply declaring his opinions on a matter of belief?

He had heard it asserted, that the present declaration would make hypocrites of many members of this body. It was surely a curious compliment to gentlemen's friends, to say, that the

putting down their signatures, would make them hypocrites. Those who are honest would not hesitate to sign; and those who are dishonest should be known. They had also been delighted with a fine piece of splendid imagery about the sun and the wind, and a traveller and his cloak. But this cloak he would liken to a cloak which wrapped them round, and hid them from the knowledge of the people; and which prevented the glorious beams of the sun of righteousness from heating and warming the frozen hearts of unbelief. They did not know these travellers who wore such cloaks; perhaps these were the cloaks that could make, or had made, those hypocrites, so much dreaded by certain eloquent speakers. Perhaps it was these cloaks that hid from their view those clergymen who were regularly in the practice of importing from London a certain work called the *Christian Moderator*—a work established with the view and for the very purpose of sapping and undermining the means of salvation, as conveyed from our Lord Jesus in his divine word. He knew the men who received this work and distributed it extensively in the congregations of that Synod: he knew the shop in Belfast to which it came; and he knew the direction of every parcel as it arrived. These were the men who wore the cloak to preserve them from the wind and the rain; and they were calling out, “Let us alone—we are dying a natural death.” But should we let these men in cloaks alone, whilst they were stabbing the dearest interests of their souls' salvation in the most vital part?

Mr. MONTGOMERY begged to set Mr. Cooke right regarding his use of the fable of the traveller and his cloak. He never said that the Anti-Trinitarian members of the Synod wore a cloak of hypocrisy, as Mr. Cooke had endeavoured most unfairly to insinuate; but that, in Mr. Cooke's estimation, and that of some of his friends, they were wrapped round with a cloak of error. Mr. Cooke would also please to explain who this ally of the *Christian Moderator* was; and whether he meant to say that he (Mr. Montgomery) got parcels from London of those books.

Mr. COOKE.—The other work I alluded to is *The Pioneer*, printed in Glasgow; and is no way behind its London compeer, in its erudite labours to rob our Lord and Master of his crown of eternal glory and power. I do not believe Mr. Montgomery is one of those persons who write and distribute these

precious books, but I could name them if I chose.

Mr. MONTGOMERY—Really Mr Cooke's grounds of belief cannot be very tenable, when such contemptible trifles as he would represent those publications to be, affright him so horribly.

Mr. COOKE wished to impress on the house the real danger to be apprehended from these "trifles." An ignorant man who went into an apothecary's shop, might take up a medicine which, to a man of skill, who knew how to compound it with another medicine, might prove harmless when swallowed; but if taken in its crude state by the ignorant, would be certain death. So it was with these works—they might be "trifles" in the hands of the skilful, but death to the untaught. He (Mr. Cooke) would endeavour to shew what effect these "trifles" would produce. One "trifle" was to shew that the Bible did not contain the great leading articles of their faith. Another "trifle" was to prove Christ to be a mere man, such as he now saw before him. Was *this* a "trifle"? Another "trifle" was to represent Jesus Christ as an exalted angel, and the Holy Ghost a nonentity. That was no "trifle," for it took away from mankind the blessed doctrine of the atonement.

Mr. MONTGOMERY said it was most unfair in Mr. Cooke to confound and mix up the doctrines of Arianism and Socinianism, which he well knew were so essentially different. Such a course could only be pursued to mislead the public mind, and to create unmerited odium.

Mr. COOKE—They are twin brothers; *par nobile fratrum*. The gentleman who so eloquently addressed you yesterday, made a powerful appeal to your feelings as husbands and fathers. The picture was painted in lively colours, to produce effect, and to strike the eye of the superficial inspector. But suppose all that he said prove reality, should such consequences drive them from the discharge of a duty they owed to their Heavenly Master? Let them not dread any consequences—let them disregard even the tears of their wives, and the cries of little children. (Hear, Hear.) Yes, it is evident the gentleman knew how to enlist the weakness of humanity on his side; but the whole was the work of the hand of a conjuror, which lighted the candle that gave a momentary power and effect to the phantasmagoria of his imagination.

Another gentleman had said yesterday, that if they made an article of faith, they attempted to mend the Bible. Now this

argument looked well at first sight; but turn it and examine it, and it proved a meteor that gleamed for an instant, and disappeared for ever. Did not these very gentlemen preach and exhort from the Bible in their pulpits? Was this mending the Bible? No, it was illustrating the doctrines of the Bible, by applying them to the principles of their belief, and letting them know the opinions of each other. It had been stated that they were once a happy and a fair church; but he doubted it: they more resemble the image which Nebuchadnezzar saw in his dream, with the head of gold, arms of silver, thighs of brass, and feet part of iron and part of clay. This is a true picture of that body, and he entreated the Synod to separate the iron from the clay, lest the statue should crumble down and fall into dust.

Dr. WRIGHT made some general remarks, relative to the impropriety of the procedure. He hoped this Synod would pause before it adopted any measure that would tend to disturb and distract the body.

Mr. F. BLAKELY said, after the eloquence and arguments which had been used by Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Montgomery, Mr. Denham, and others, he did not intend detaining the house, more especially as their time was very precious. But he felt bound, in justice to himself, to make a few observations. His opinions were so well known, at home and elsewhere, that he had nothing to dread from the issue of the present question. He was not a Trinitarian; and he was aware that his sentiments had been caricatured; and that it had been said by misguided people, that he had no Saviour; but though he might labour and suffer reproach, he would trust in the living God, who was the Saviour of all men. Many might set up to be masters over him, but one was his Master, even Christ, and all his sincere disciples, of every church, he would consider as brethren. He might be charged with depending on his own righteousness for salvation; but he was too well acquainted with his own weakness and imperfection to trust to such a false principle, and so well, he thought, with his Bible, as to know and believe that he must trust to the grace and mercy of God in Christ Jesus. His brethren who assisted him on sacramental occasions, knew that he spoke fully and freely his sentiments to his congregation. He would not be a hypocrite, in the Synod or out of it; and after all that had been said about a cloak, there was no man who would venture to charge him with requiring

any. He had heard, with much pain, misrepresentations of sentiments from different quarters; but was certain that truth, more than triumph, should be the aim and object of every Christian. As for the propositions contained in the motion, he would not sign them, even if he believed them; because it would be giving up his right of private judgment, and suffering others, no better than himself, to influence him by threats. It was admitted by all who were intimate with him, that he was as well acquainted, if not better, with the subjects under consideration, as any of his brethren of equal standing. He had carefully read and studied his Bible under the influence of prayer, and could see no reason for changing his opinions.

Mr. HERON said he had no objection to the declaration now proposed, for it contained his doctrines. But he would not subscribe it as a test, because he never yet saw either the Calvinistic or Arian creed to which he could give his name: his creed was to be found in the Bible, and to no test of human formation would he give his signature.

Mr. STEWART, (Broughshane,) as the seconder of the motion, rose to reply to the preceding speakers.

Mr. CARLILE addressed the assembly at some length, in a most eloquent appeal to their judgments and their feelings, as men and as ministers of the gospel of peace, on the want of Christian charity which had been manifested throughout the whole of this discussion. He had witnessed with pain, epithets the most opprobrious, insinuations and assertions the most uncandid, and sarcasms biting and bitter; the whole of which proceeding was strongly opposed to the lessons given by our Lord and Master to his disciples and followers. There was an evident want of Christian charity in the hearts of many speakers who had addressed the house; and their sentiments and conduct were calculated to do every thing but promote brotherly kindness and true Christian charity.

After several attempts of other members to address the house, it being understood that that part of the motion which required signatures should be omitted, the clerk prepared to call the roll, each member to stand up on answering to his name.

Mr. MONTGOMERY and several other members now retired.

The roll being called, 117 ministers and 18 elders answered, "I believe the doctrine;" 2 ministers answered, "Not;" and 8 declined voting.

The next day the following PROTEST was handed in, signed by a number of ministers and elders, against the decision of the Synod in passing a *declaration of faith*:

"The undersigned protest against the proceedings in this case for the following reasons:

"1st. Because we regard this measure as being, in its introduction and progress, a direct violation of the law of Synod, which requires that 'all matters originating before the Synod shall first be submitted to the Committee of Overtures, and remain upon the Synod's books for at least one year.

"2nd. Because it is obvious, and has been so admitted by the friends of the measure, that it cannot assure the Synod of the sentiments of any individual, even for a day, and is therefore nugatory.

"3rd. Because we cannot give our sanction to a proceeding, which, especially under the popular odium now so generally excited, evidently creates a temptation to insincerity.

"4th. Because we do not approve of the practice of bearing solemn testimony to a mysterious doctrine of pure Revelation—in the words of man.

"5th. Because, as put and carried, this measure operates directly as a test of individual faith; is strictly inquisitorial in its nature and effects, and such an infringement on Christian liberty, as is without a precedent among us, and wholly inconsistent with the fundamental principles of our church.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

THE New Monthly Magazine has paid the Monthly Repository the compliment, or done itself the honour, of transferring to its pages some of its poetry. To this the Conductors cannot object, provided the respectable Editor of the former work acknowledged the source from which he copied.

Several communications have been received.

## ERRATUM.

Page 637, line 4; for "Astme," read *Astrae*.