

THE MONTHLY REPOSITORY

AND

REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, No. XXVIII.

APRIL, 1829.

STATE OF THE CURATES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.*

THE Church is in danger! Such is the fact, as asserted by competent authority. Of Dr. Parr it is reported by his biographer Mr. Field, "He was dining some years ago at Hatton in company with several clergymen; and among them was an Irish dignitary, who talked long and loudly of 'our excellent Church,' of 'our venerable Establishment,' in whose fair face, it should seem, he could discover 'neither spot nor wrinkle, nor any such thing.' Having suffered him to run the whole length of his line with no other interruption but a smile now and then of pity, or a frown sometimes of displeasure, Dr. Parr rose at length from his seat, and after puffing in clouds for a moment or two, laid down his pipe; then resting one arm on the table, and enforcing all he said by the ponderous movements of the other, he broke out into a vehement declamation on the state of the Church, painting in glaring colours the grievances under which 'it was sick, though he hoped not dying,'—especially in the unequal distribution of its revenues—in the mysticism of some parts of its creed—in the absurdity of some of its articles—in the servile spirit too prevalent both among its higher and lower clergy, and in their obstinate resistance to the most reasonable and desirable improvements. He insisted that the Church was fast losing ground, both in the esteem of the more reflecting part, and in the affection of the great body of the community. 'Unitarians,' said he 'multiply and calmly persevere—Methodists multiply and rage and swagger—High-Churchmen hate and abuse both, and deny the necessity of reforming themselves. *The Church is in danger*; I own it,' said he; 'but let *them* look to it who have brought it on, and who will not adopt the only method for saving us. Reform!' cried he, 'Reform, I say, is the only safety for our Church. As sure as the uprooted tree must bend, or the tower undermined must bow, so surely our Church must fall, unless it be refixed in the good opinion of the people.' Then turning to the reverend dignitary, 'Sir,' said he, 'I give you your choice—reform or ruin: and mark my words—within twenty years that

* The State of the Curates of the Church of England: a Letter addressed to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. By a Parish Priest.

choice, whichever it be, must take effect.' ” Of similar import is the testimony of the “ Parish Priest.”

“ I consider the Church to be in danger, but more from internal than external enemies ; and I conscientiously believe that it may be truly predicated of her, that her most dangerous foes are those of her own household. She has no bulwark but her moral strength ; and I am persuaded that things cannot go on much longer as they have done, without imminent peril to her best interests, if not to her very existence.”

Once more, then, the Church is declared to be in danger. We must confess that we have no such love for her as to feel alarm at the outcry, nor any such reliance on the declarations of her doctors as to expect a speedy dissolution. We rather fear — to use a phrase of hers, the application of which has often puzzled us no little — “ as it is now, so it shall be, world (corruption) without end : ” that is, as long as Church and State are united. We have begun to suspect the symptoms of dissolution which the Church is from time to time said to manifest ; and though those who are admitted to her privacy assure us that she has for a long while laboured under periodical returns of the *falling* sickness, there is too much reason to think that the old lady feigns ill, and imposes upon her medical advisers, in order to excite our sympathies and awaken our pity, that we may bear with her many frailties, and soothe her maladies with the cordial of *gold*. There are some hundreds in this kingdom who obtain a comfortable living by exposing to their fellow-subjects a misformed limb or a half naked body ; and the Church of England is not less informed than other beggars of the means of moving the compassion and opening the purse-strings of “ a generous public.”

We are not surprised that the lame, the halt, and the blind, of the fraternity of beggars should find the means of taking from our pockets wherewith to subsist. These we see in their own proper persons — their defects we may behold — their distresses we may scrutinize — their wailing we may hear : in a word, they are flesh and blood — visible and tangible realities. No one but a Berkleian can question their existence. But who, what, or where, this said Church is, we never could learn. What is its gender we know not ; and we had almost thrown our pen down in despair of discovering whether to nuncupate the Church he, she, or it. Nor does our ignorance arise from lack of inquiry. We have searched for ourselves ; we have consulted the learned ; but we are profoundly ignorant whether the Church be masculine, feminine, or neuter. It is somewhat strange, if the Church be a real *ens*, that no one should have been favoured with a sight thereof ; but such, upon inquiry, we learn is the fact. In our days of ignorance, we thought, with the Scriptures, that the Church was a body of Christian people ; but we find we were wrong. Next, we imagined it was a steeple-house ; but this would not answer the descriptions given thereof. Our American brethren made us hope to find the Church even amongst the Unitarians of their land ; but the bishops of England were shocked at the idea. We have, in a word, searched every where, and searched in vain. That about which so much noise is made — whose name is with millions a powerful and stirring charm — which by turns flourishes, declines, and threatens dissolution — we are bound to believe, even amid our ignorance of its nature, is a real existence. Perhaps, deep hidden from the vulgar gaze in the archiepiscopal palace of Canterbury, the Church may be preserved in a shrine over which, as upon that of Isis, is inscribed, “ I am *all* that has been, is, and ever shall be ; no mortal has ever raised up the veil with which I am covered.” Being thus unknown, how comes it to pass that the Church excites so deeply the pity of the people, or

awakens their rejoicings? Alas! men are swayed by names; and this same unknown and unknowable Church, like the idol deity of many a savage tribe, receives the adoration of its worshipers, because so it was before we were born, and a superstitious fear precludes the thought of its being otherwise. We have sometimes thought that Church might mean Churchmen—and the interests of the Church, the glebes, the stalls, and the larders of the clergy. To this idea we have been led by analogy. Philosophers talk of body and substance; but what are body and substance when qualities are taken away? They discourse very luminously of an abstract idea of a triangle; but then “it is neither oblique, nor rectangle; neither equilateral, equicrural, nor scalenon; *but all and none of these at once.*” * With Bishop Berkeley, I have to beg “that the reader would fully and certainly inform himself whether he has such an idea or not.” If not, then, I imagine, I have some authority for thinking that the word Church is Churchmen written short. Of substratum apart from qualities we know nothing; of abstract triangles we are profoundly ignorant; and in the same way we think, with all due modesty, that a Church without clergy, emoluments, and dignities, is a word without a corresponding reality. We say this with all due modesty, for we fear it is a heresy to identify Church and Churchmen. Leaving every one at liberty to think as he pleases, we return to inquire wherein the danger of the Church lieth, and what are the remedies proposed for its cure.

The Church, it seems, is unsound within; her constitution is decayed and corrupt. We put it to our author whether it would not be more merciful to let the old lady die in peace, undisturbed by the nostrums of this or that empirical practitioner. No! says the Parish Priest; “I would say of her from the bottom of my soul, *Esto perpetua!*” may she live for ever. And therefore our author feels, and very properly feels, the necessity of her having a good constitution.

We believe that the Parish Priest is among the most respectable friends of the aforesaid Church. He himself informs us,

“I am no radical, no enthusiast, no speculative reformer. I belong to no party; I am connected with no society; I am neither Whig nor Tory, Orthodox nor Evangelical, High-Church nor Low-Church, Calvinist nor Arminian, Liberal nor Bigot, according to the perverted signification in which these terms are used; but I am really and truly a staunch member of the Church of England, a loyal subject to the King, and I trust an humble and laborious parish priest.”

The vouchers to his character are in his work. The pamphlet is evidently the production of an honest, independent mind. From such a writer we may hope to learn wherein the Church is indisposed; his statements are worthy of credit, his prescriptions worthy of consideration.

The pamphlet of the Parish Priest was occasioned by the perusal of a work entitled *Horæ Catecheticæ*, the production of a clergyman named Gilly. In this work Mr. Gilly insists on the necessity of public catechising in church, in imitation of the Roman Catholic clergy, whose uniform practice, we are informed, it is, both abroad and in England; and in imitation also of the foreign Protestant clergy, in whose hands public catechising is said to produce the most happy effects. It places the rising generation in the view of the minister; it gives them in their tenderest infancy the advantage of his paternal protection, and causes them to be sent to church, to be publicly instructed

* Locke.

by him in faith and morals. The time proposed for the catechetical lessons is immediately after the afternoon service, when there can be no interruption to the congregation, and the time employed may depend upon circumstances. If the children and by-standers shew no weariness, it may be lengthened at pleasure. Catechising with Mr. Gilly is instruction communicated by asking questions, and hearing and correcting the answers. It is a service in which the questioning and answering must be mutual, and the catechist does not do his duty by the catechumen unless he gives him an opportunity, not only of repeating the lesson, but of asking for explanations, and of returning the sense as well as echoing back the sound of his instructor. It is not a mere formulary, but a preaching conference. It is, in fact, requiring of the catechist to lead his young charge to employ their thoughts about themselves, to tempt them to think, and to prevail on them to exercise their minds upon that which they have been reading or learning. In addition to these duties, Mr. Gilly requires the exercise of all those endearing pastoral duties which attach the people to their ministers. It is the argument of an active life, he shews, that convinces common understandings. He adduces the practice of the foreign Protestant clergy, who follow their congregations to their houses, and, extending their pastoral care to old as well as young, ask for an account of their studies and meditations in the bosoms of their families. He considers the clergyman obliged to give much of his time and attention to the internal management of Sunday and weekly charity-schools; to devote private as well as public attention to the young. The benefits of pastoral and catechetical instruction are not to be confined to the poor and children in charity-schools, but are to be extended to young persons of higher degree, to servants, to apprentices, to the high and low, the rich and poor.—This outline of what a good master-builder might erect upon catechising, the Parish Priest admires; but he also strenuously contends that the plan is impracticable in the present state of the working clergy. He is firmly persuaded that curates never can perform their duty until they are better remunerated for the labours which are required at their hands; until, in fact, they are in a condition to abandon every secular employment, and to devote themselves in earnest to their high and engrossing service.

To make Mr. Gilly's system truly beneficial, it must, he contends, be acted on, not only in large towns, but in the small and quiet village also; it must be pursued, not only amongst the dense population of the manufacturing districts, but it must work its way too among the scattered hamlets of our agricultural counties. But its adoption in the country is, in the present state of things, impossible. A great number of parishes in the country are under the spiritual care of curates appointed by pluralist incumbents, who allow them for their services a sum that is often barely sufficient to keep them from starvation; in many cases, where they have families, it will not do it, and they are consequently obliged to serve more than one curacy, to take private pupils, or to keep a day-school, to augment their miserable stipends, and to maintain themselves with some *outward* decency and respectability. As this is no uncommon case, how can the minister find time to give the young that preparatory training which is essential to the success of public catechising, or conduct with satisfaction the catechetical exercises of his class? Besides, two full services, often in large churches, and several miles' hard riding, fall to the lot of many country curates; and after the mind and body have been thus fatigued, there are few men who would be able (even were it safe to do so) to descend from the pulpit in a state of perspiration to catechise the children, in a damp and cold church. The body would be hardly

fit for the exertion, and much less the mind, which it is necessary to have in a calm, quiet, and intelligent state, to be able to perform the duty to advantage.

This duty cannot, then, be performed while things remain as they are. If the curate be a married man, and the generality of curates are, he will be compelled by his necessities to devote the greater part of his time to his pupils; six of the best hours of the day will at least be employed in this manner: he must eat, drink, and sleep; he must be studious in reading and learning the Scriptures, and in composing sermons; he must walk for the benefit of his health; he must visit the sick, baptize the living, and bury the dead; and when all this, and often more than this, is done, what time will remain at his disposal for training the young, the rude, and the ignorant, in the principles of religion? If it is not intended to restore Popish celibacy amongst us, the working clergy must be better paid, or they cannot perform the duties of their sacred office.

The Parish Priest further maintains, that the principles of justice and equity most certainly require that curates should be fairly and honestly remunerated. If, he says,

“If one class, and that a large class, of the ministers of any church be by their poverty, or rather *by the selfishness* of the other class, deprived of the means of fulfilling their obligations, the welfare of the Church is not duly consulted, nor its character sufficiently maintained.—That the case which I have supposed is a just representation of the actual state of the Church of England, no unprejudiced man will pretend to deny.”

Whence he argues it is the duty of Churchmen

—“to wipe out the foul blot which has so long sullied the fame of the Church,” and “take away the reproach which the Dissenter and the Roman Catholic have so long cast in our teeth, that our beneficed clergy regard the fleece far more than the flock.”

He continues:

“The hopeless condition of a great many of the curates might be insisted on—the necessity of their maintaining their rank in society might be stated—the almost impossibility of their emerging from the poverty and privation in which they are placed, might be urged—the desolate state of their families—the time of superannuation, sickness, and death, to which they must come, and the want of temporal aid and comfort in these distressing seasons, might be mentioned—as too many glaring proofs of the absolute necessity of some amelioration of their circumstances.”

To the state of Church patronage the Parish Priest then turns. Unless the curate has influential friends and powerful interest, it matters nothing to him that there are rectories and vicarages, and comfortable parsonage-houses, and snug prebendal stalls. He sees them, it is true; but it is like the land of promise, afar off. He may labour diligently to deserve them; but his labours will be in vain. Does he look to private patronage? He will look in vain, except he has claims on the wealthy, the noble, and the powerful. To episcopal patronage? Of this little will remain by the time the sons, brothers, nephews, cousins, sons-in-law, chaplains, and college friends of a bishop, are provided for. To public patronage? This channel is more closed against him than any other. For though the Lord Chancellor disposes of nine hundred benefices, yet “were even the purity of an angel, the piety of a saint, the labours of an apostle, the energy and zeal of Peter, the learning and eloquence of Paul, the wisdom and gravity of James, and the benignity and love of John, all united in his own single person, they

would not avail him a hundredth part as much as a vote at a contested election, interest in a close borough, the introduction of a county member, or the friendship of a noble lord." The curate may have laboured diligently for years in the important duties of his vocation; he may have won the esteem and love of his flock; he may have employed his talents successfully in the service of religion and learning; he may have defended boldly and ably the truths of the gospel; or he may have adorned his station by that humble and modest merit which shrinks from observation; and yet a life thus spent "shall not be able to place him in the stead of the deceased incumbent; but he shall have the mortification to see a rich pluralist or a titled stripling lifted over his head, and he himself driven in his declining years to seek a shelter from the gathering storm, and to find a resting-place for the sole of his foot."

"At twenty-three a gentleman may take holy orders with a nomination to a cure; and at seventy-three he may die a curate as he first set out; die perhaps in want, in debt, with a spirit broken by neglect, and his last thoughts perplexed by the agonizing reflection that the partner of his heart, and the children of his old age, must be left dependent for bread upon the cold pity of an unfeeling world."

The conclusion of our author from these facts is, that the condition of curates ought to be amended. The subject has, indeed, already occupied the attention of government. The late Clergy Act enjoins that a curate's salary shall in no case be less than £80 per annum; and that such salary shall not be less than £100 per annum in any parish or place where the population, according to the last parliamentary returns, shall amount to three hundred persons; where the population shall amount to five hundred persons, the salary is not to be less than £120 per annum; and £150 per annum if the population shall amount to a thousand persons. But there are in this act two exceptions which nearly disannul and annihilate the purpose for which it was passed. The incumbent who was instituted *before* 1813, or who is legally resident, that is, resident without doing duty, is permitted to fix the curate's stipend at his own pleasure. To illustrate the evil which hence arises, two cases are mentioned. In the first, the population consists of 1300 souls; the duty two services on the Sunday, reading prayers at the poor-house, visiting the sick, superintending a Sunday-school, and performing all the surplice duty; the living is worth at least £1200 per annum: the incumbent, a young man, has been instituted since 1813, is resident, does no duty, and besides this living has two others of considerable value, and a good prebendal stall. The curate is a married man with a family, has no private property, and the stipend of the curacy is only £105 per annum, and out of this he has to pay £40 per annum for furnished lodgings, the residence of the incumbent depriving him of the parsonage. In the second case, the town contains 6000 persons; the duty similar to that before named; the income of the living £2500 per annum; the incumbent was instituted *before* 1813, is resident, and *does no duty whatever*. The curate is a married man with a large family, and the stipend is £100, without a house. These are two instances out of many. In the first case, the dignified incumbent, by his legal residence, deprives the curate of a stipend of £150 per annum and the parsonage-house, and thus diminishes his income one-half. The second case is worse than the first; for in this instance, be the incumbent resident or not, the curate would be no better for it, since institution to the living took place *before* 1813. To remedy these griev-

ances, the Parish Priest proposes to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury to bring into Parliament a bill to give to all curates the stipends awarded by the Act, whether the incumbents have been instituted before 1813 or not, and whether they be resident or not. In contending for the propriety of this measure, he is led to enunciate a truth which we wish all his brethren would recognize :

“ On the ground of equity the measure is defensible, *since the clergy can have no vested rights but such as are for the welfare of the Church and the good of the people.*”

But this is not the only remedial measure which he deems necessary ; for even where the stipends allotted to curates are just and adequate, and where the exceptions of the late Clergy Act do not interfere, its provisions are in numberless instances evaded, and its designs defeated, by the cupidity and dishonesty of unworthy incumbents. This is a notorious fact ; and

“ — to enumerate all the paltry evasions, the scandalous misrepresentations, the crafty subterfuges, the shuffling expedients, the mean tricks, and the direct lies, by which the plain and benevolent intentions of the Legislature have been defeated, would be disgusting to any candid mind, and would furnish ample materials for another volume of Mrs. Opie’s ‘ Illustrations of Lying in all its branches.’ ” — “ Your Grace,” continues our author, “ is aware that amongst the ministers of truth, evasions which would fix indelible disgrace on men of any rank in society, however low, are not uncommon ; that giving ‘ a Title for Orders,’ is seized on as a common pretext for considerably abridging the rightful stipend to the curate ; that a rent is often exacted by non-resident incumbents for the curate’s occupation of the parsonage-house, to which he has a legal claim ; and that notes of hand, to repay a part of the sum promised, are often required from the curate, before or after his nomination, to secure the incumbent, in case payment of the full sum due to the curate should ever be demanded.” — “ But your Grace will, perhaps, inquire how this crying evil is to be remedied, and will ask what measure can be adopted entirely to prevent these shameful evasions of the provisions of the Act. My Lord, if men will not be honest of their own accord, we must endeavour to make them so ; if Christian ministers, some of them pluralists and dignitaries, will not be actuated by Christian principles, will not freely and of their own accord allow such salaries to their curates as are sufficient and reasonable, they must be compelled to do so ; and, however painful is the reflection that legislative enactments should be required to make the clergy act honestly by each other, yet we must enact them, if it can be proved that they are needful.”

The author then propounds his plan for the rectification of the shameful abuses which he points out (of which we have only given a specimen). The plan consists in requiring of every curate, on his being licensed to any parish, a solemn declaration, under severe penalties, that he has not in any way agreed, nor will he in any way agree, to take less than the sum assigned to him by Act of Parliament. Every curate, we are assured, would be glad to sign such a declaration ; for though they are parties to private bargains with their incumbents, their necessities, and not their wills, have consented to it, and they have reluctantly yielded to the conviction “ that half a loaf is better than no bread.” In this way, and in this way alone, have the weakest gone to the wall. This plan the author deems competent to the removal of the evils of which he justly complains. It would, he also thinks, take away the reproach of selfishness, which is constantly cast upon the beneficed clergy by Roman Catholics and Dissenters ; and cast, it should seem, from the statements in this pamphlet, with some show of reason. He thinks,

moreover, but thinks on insufficient grounds, that his plan of securing to the working clergy the full amount of their legal claim, would remove the objections of Dissenters against the enormous revenue of the dignitaries of the Church. We allow that we should think less ill of the dignitaries if they allowed those whose exertions mainly teach the people, in so far as they are taught, and mainly support the Established Church, a sum sufficient to support existence; but we boldly declare that nothing can reconcile us to the enormous revenues of the hierarchy, that nothing can reconcile us to the union of Church with State.

As to our author's plan, we mean not to examine it in detail. We think we could suggest a far more efficacious remedy. The evils complained of evidently arise from a superabundant supply. Curtail this; and, the demand remaining the same, the price of labour will rise. This would prove an effectual remedy; but it is not, we know, likely to be acted on. While there are so many good things in the Church, the portals will be crowded with aspirants. All, it is known, cannot enjoy a well-foddered stall, or a luxuriant rectorship, or a princely diocese. But a few prizes will cause thousands to risk their all in this lottery; for who knows, thinks each, but that I may be the happy man whom the king will delight to honour? But the Parish Priest may, we fear, rest assured, that as it is now so it will be. Literally, "unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance; but from him that hath not, shall be taken away even that which he hath."

We ground our fears that our author's plan will prove fruitless upon the knowledge of the past. The history of Church Property is a history of fraud. Its acquisition, in almost nine cases out of every ten, has been effected in opposition both to the laws of man and the laws of God. In vain have legislators tried again and again to arrest the fraudulent practices of the clergy; political wisdom was outdone by ecclesiastical intrigue. Tithes were at first free-will offerings, but the clergy soon converted custom into right, and charity into compulsion. The legislature of the various Christian kingdoms they got to sanction their nefarious appropriation; and this effected, they proceeded to take to themselves the whole of that contribution of which one-third alone was their due. But with this they were not satisfied; the terrors of the invisible world were wickedly brought to bear on minds originally weak and harassed by a consciousness of crime, and most valuable bequests were extorted from the terror-struck religionist—extorted by a subtle blending of hope and fear in articulo mortis. In vain, as we have before said, did the Legislature try to check the growing evil. Provision after provision was made to no purpose, so great was the bad ingenuity of the clergy. In reference to the acquisitions made by the clergy it was that the various statutes of Mortmain were made; "in deducing the history of which," says Blackstone, "it will be matter of curiosity to observe the great address and subtle contrivance of the ecclesiastics in eluding from time to time the laws in being, and the zeal with which successive Parliaments have pursued them through all their finesses: how new remedies were still the parents of new evasions; till the Legislature at last, though with difficulty, hath obtained a decisive victory." There is one class of men, and the sole class, benefited by the nefarious practices of the clergy—the lawyers. Some of their most lucrative contrivances they owe to ecclesiastical sagacity. The clergy had the honour of inventing those fictitious adjudications of right known by the name of *common recoveries*. And when they were driven out of all their former holds, they devised a new method of obtaining pro-

perty in trust ; and, says Blackstone, “ it is to these inventions that our practisers are indebted for the introduction of uses and trusts, the foundation of modern conveyancing.” By these and other equally disgraceful means the clergy had acquired possession of one-third of the gross property of this kingdom.

Nor let it be supposed that these mal-practices were going on only during the reign of Papacy in this kingdom. Our Church-of-England clergy have proved themselves legitimate descendants of their worthy predecessors. When Henry VIII. had made himself the head of the English Church, the first-fruits, i. e. the revenues of each benefice for one year, and the tenths, that is, a yearly rent of one-tenth of the proceeds of all preferments, which had previously been paid to the Pope, were now taken possession of by the King. These revenues were appropriated to the use of the Crown till the reign of Anne, who gave them in trust to a corporation, for the augmentation of small livings. But the poor clergy reaped little of the Queen’s bounty, and her Majesty was over-reached by her cunning priests. The clergy contrived so as to have to pay their contributions, not according to the actual value of their livings, but according to a valuation made as far back as the reign of Henry VIII. Still something remained after this trick for the increase of the livings of the lower orders of clergy ; and by far the greater part of what was thus left, was distributed *by lot*. After this it is superfluous to say any thing of the regard paid to the greater or less urgency of claims, the greater or less amount of duty, the greater or less number of hearers. It is a fact, however, that in many cases the money fell where it was least wanted. It would be folly to expect that the dignified clergy who distributed the bounty, and with whom the principle of *the less work the more pay* had become not a speculative but a practical axiom, should so far forget the doctrine in which they had been so long trained, and which for them, at least, worked so well, as to think of allotting remuneration in proportion to the amount of duty. Accordingly we find that this most equitable mode of distribution *by lot*, has, in the diocese of Chester, given to the rectory of Hurdham, which, in 1811, contained eighty-nine people, six augmentations, or £1200 ; to the vicarage of Sellington, with forty-eight people, six augmentations, or £1200. In the diocese of Salisbury, one place containing fourteen people, another of twelve, received each an augmentation of £200. Take these instances as specimens of what was done for the assistance of the *working* clergy by the well-intentioned but shamefully perverted bounty of Queen Anne.

Semper eris pauper, si pauper es, Æmiliane ;
Dantur opes nulli nunc, nisi divitibus.

Of the Protestant Church in Ireland we might, if time permitted, relate instances similar in iniquity. We, therefore, despair that our author’s plan will prove effectual. In the first place, the higher clergy will not consent, if they can avoid it, to yield the prevailing and gainful system of grinding down the journeymen parsons, as they are called in derision. If they appear to consent, experience teaches, we should the more suspect them.

Quidquid id est, timeo Danaos et dona ferentes.

The chances are, that instead of giving they will take ; leaving undiminished the difficulties of their inferiors, and augmenting their own power and affluence. The power is in their hands, and they have shewn the will, of making all things subservient to their own aggrandizement. Legislative enactments may be tried—they have been tried—and yet the clergy have

found a way of escape. The last act framed expressly for the benefit of the curate, we have seen, they have most effectually evaded, and our impression is, that such will be the fate of every similar attempt.

Quo teneam vultus mutantem Protea nodo
Quid Pauper ?

What are we to say then ? The evils complained of exist in the Church beyond a question. They do. For the sake of those who suffer under them we regret the fact. We pity the curate most sincerely ; but our pity for him only augments our hatred of the system under which he suffers. In respect of the Church, we are not sorry, we are glad, that things are as they are. They give us hope that the Church is truly in danger ; they are most effective co-operators with us in the great work of dissolving the connexion between Church and State. But what, in the mean time, are the curates to do ? Let them quit a connexion which gives them abundance in hard labour only—which owes mainly to them its welfare, and yet grudges them the means even of a scanty maintenance. Let them leave the Church, we repeat. There is no other remedy. We object to another farthing of the public revenue going towards the increase of the consumption of the clergy. That consumption is already enormous. Its extent almost surpasses credibility. It is, indeed, no easy thing to arrive at a just estimate of its amount, and the various accounts that have been published may either exceed or fall below the actual consumption ; yet, doubtless, the income of the clergy is enormous. The author of *Remarks on the Consumption of Public Wealth by the Clergy of every Christian Nation*, states that the expenditure on the clergy of England and Ireland amounts to £8,896,000. This his chief opponent, Rev. A. Campbell, denies, without, however, substituting any satisfactory sum in its place. Supposing the actual amount is not more than half of this—a supposition far, we are persuaded, below the truth—then four millions of money is annually expended for the spiritual instruction of about six millions of hearers : whereas, it has been computed that the clergy of all other denominations in England do not receive for the instruction of fourteen millions of hearers two millions of money. What a shameful disproportion do these statements shew !—illustrating what we have before said, that the maxim of the Church is, the less work the greater pay. If, however, we wish to see this maxim in all its latitude of absurd application we must look to Ireland. There we behold the astounding spectacle of twenty-two archbishops and bishops presiding over some eight or nine hundred inferiors, with flocks not amounting to more than 400,000 souls ; dividing amongst them, though their hearers amount not to a tithe of the population, the tithe of the land, independently of glebes amazingly large.

But under this intolerable burden our minds might be somewhat quieted did we know that the expenditure was requisite for the good education of the people. This cannot be pretended. What had the Church of England done for those who most needed spiritual aid and guidance when John Wesley laid the foundations, among the ignorant and the profligate, of the now lordly and ambitious sect of Methodists ? Nay, to speak generally, the success of Dissenters has been as much owing to the negligence of the Church, as to the intrinsic rectitude of their principles. The Church has been over-fed, and, therefore, it has not worked. Riches have introduced a spirit of worldly-mindedness, which has crushed the early intentions of many an ingenuous mind, and turned the heart from the love of souls to the love of lucre. But surely, it will be said, the Church has not been wholly

idle. No ; but those did the work, who had not the money—and what is truly grievous, as formerly, so now—the labourers have had scarcely whereon to subsist. The Church has not been wholly idle—but is it in the present day doing its duty ? The Parish Priest proclaims the contrary with a loud and fearless voice. Notwithstanding its more than princely revenues, the ignorant are uninstructed, the vicious are unadmonished.

“Your Grace,” says our author, “I am sure, can scarcely conceive the deplorable state of ignorance and spiritual darkness in which a vast portion of our agricultural population is buried ; and none but those who have been long and intimately acquainted with their habits and sentiments can at all describe it, or be aware of the baneful consequences which such ignorance produces. It must be witnessed to be believed. A single instance shall suffice, and I know it to be a fact. A clergyman in the country was not long since called on to visit an aged man, lying on his death-bed. He proceeded to inquire into this person’s spiritual state, but, from his lamentable ignorance of the first principles of religion, could get but little information. At length he asked him if he had ever heard of a Saviour, Jesus Christ, who came into the world to die for sinners. To his utter astonishment, a negative was given to this important question. The question was asked over and over again, but the same answer was returned. The clergyman then gave a brief history of the Redeemer, and pointed out the most remarkable particulars of his life, doctrine, death, and resurrection, with which he was evidently astonished and delighted ; and at the conclusion he made the following singular remark :— ‘I never heard of Jesus Christ before ; he seems to me to have been a very good man ! What, did he live here in—— ?’”

Such is the gross and palpable darkness in which the people are left, the clergy themselves being the vouchers. They have, therefore, betrayed their trust, and no project for increasing their revenues from the public purse can for a moment be entertained. Should such an audacious plan be mooted, the people of England would, we trust, rise indignantly from the south to the north, and from the east to the west, in the length and breadth of the land, to stay the work of spoliation. Still, what are the half-starved curates to do ? We again say, Let them come out and be separate—not “lest,” but because, “they partake of their plagues.” Let them come out, for it is the connexion between Church and State that is the cause of their grievances. The public have made an ample provision for them ; but power and political intrigue turn aside the bounty of the public from its proper channels into the pockets of those who can either, by their unscrupulous pen or their borough interest, serve the purposes of those who guide the State. Those who have the money of the Church, have also the ear of Government, and of their tenacity the working clergy have had sufficient proofs. But these things would not, they could not, be so, if the Church was severed from the State. Equity then would take place of injustice, and honourable dealing of artifice. But when shall this unholy union be broken ? Alas ! our wishes outstrip our expectations. Yet great changes have taken place, and greater may be in preparation. From the spirit of the times we hope much. “Whatever,” to use the language of a writer in the last Quarterly Review—language truly gratifying when heard in such a quarter—“whatever is for the general good, whatever is just and reasonable, will ultimately stand ; but unless they who shall be the depositaries of power, when the storm rages, are so qualified as to make it manifest that it is for the general good, and, therefore, reasonable, and just, and necessary, that they should continue in their hereditary station, they must fall. It is no wisdom to dissemble this ; the way to overcome the danger is to provide against it and expect it, and

meet it resolutely." We are not, we are free to confess, entirely disinterested in our wishes for a disjunction of Church and State. As ministers of Christ we desire it from principle, but we desire it also from interest. Already are the people of England, Dissenters as well as Churchmen, so taxed for the support of religion, that both the means and the will of the former to remunerate their own ministers are considerably diminished. The enormous wealth of the dignified clergy exerts an evil influence on the pittance of the poor Nonconformist, tending to check a liberal treatment of those who, among Dissenters, minister in holy things, and diminishing to them the amount of what is set apart for religious purposes. Their superfluity thus acts to our detriment in two ways—by appropriating to themselves that which in part would fall to the Dissenter, and by narrowing men's minds and hearts, and causing them to forget or to disregard the just claims of the labourer. When we call upon the labouring clergy to leave their well-foddered brethren—*fruges consumere natos*—we do not invite them to come amongst us, for they would be then further, if possible, from the good things of the world than they are at present. We wish them to leave, assured that then the Church would be really in danger, and that a breaking up of the present nefarious system might lead to each minister of Christ's receiving a fair remuneration for his labours. If we turn from the clergy of the Church of England to the ministers of our own body, we shall not, indeed, be pained with beholding gross inequalities in the emoluments of the clergy, for with few, very few, exceptions, they are all pitiably small. With scarcely an exception, certainly with very few exceptions, the stipends which they receive from their congregations are utterly insufficient for the maintenance of themselves and families, while, owing to the nature of their education and the society with which they are expected to mingle, their wants are greater than those of many other Dissenting ministers. Waving the last consideration, however, is the average amount of their stipends any way adequate for the subsistence and the education of a family? Will this average exceed £120 per annum, the kingdom through? If not, how is it possible that ministers can subsist upon their salaries, to say nothing of contributing to charitable objects, and procuring requisite nutriment for their minds? The consequence is, that other occupations besides the ministry are of necessity sought and pursued. No man can execute two things and fulfil two offices so well as he can one. The time and energy that might be directed to ministerial and pastoral duties, are now diverted from their proper objects into channels which often have no immediate connexion with the office of a minister. We do not say that our ministers are not usefully employed in teaching schools, or in literary engagements. But are they so usefully engaged *as ministers* as they otherwise might be? In the present state of Unitarianism, nay, in every condition of Christianity that has come to our knowledge, there are wanted, not schoolmasters, but active and energetic preachers and pastors; we want men who can devote all the energies of their mind to one leading object; men who are mighty in the Scriptures, both critically and practically; who will not suffer in comparison, either as to general information, or as to a knowledge on biblical subjects, with those who, as laymen or as divines, have enjoyed the advantages of an university education; while their devotement to one object shall enable them to concentrate on it the unimpaired vigour of their intellect, and the entire homage of their heart. As it is, however, our ministers in general are engaged during the whole of the week in the harassing occupation of teaching schools; in consequence, they bring to the composition of their pulpit ser-

vices jaded minds, and to the delivery of their compositions wearied spirits. The sabbath which comes to all, comes not to them; and they have to pursue one unvarying round of laborious exertion. It is evident that, under such circumstances, the duties of a minister cannot be performed so as to satisfy the preacher himself, or adequately to benefit his hearers. But where is the time for the discharge of those duties which are at least as important as the services of the pulpit—the duties of the pastor; or for that public advocacy of our opinions from the press, which, in existing circumstances, is essentially requisite? Will it be contended that the employments of a schoolmaster are not incompatible with the duty of a minister? We are willing to allow that teaching, when the time is devoted to private pupils and the communication of the higher branches of knowledge, may constitute a beneficial discipline of a minister's mind. Yet we can hardly doubt that persons who were competent for such an undertaking, and in consequence well-informed, would not, under the influence of a love of knowledge, pursue with their whole time and attention such subjects as might not only discipline their minds, but have also a more direct bearing on their professional duties. In such cases the discipline of mind that would ensue, would at least be equal to that acquired in teaching, while the amount of available knowledge would be much greater. But how few of our ministers are engaged in teaching of this nature, compared with those who are devoted to school-keeping! and we are entirely at a loss to imagine how the dull and monotonous routine of elementary education can in any way fit a person for the discharge of his ministerial functions. If it be rejoined that our ministers had better be employed in school-keeping than not employed at all, an imputation is thrown upon their characters which is not only unwarranted but unjust. We do not suppose them immaculate, but we do regard them upon the whole both as a highly respectable and a highly industrious body of men. We have as yet spoken only of those ministers who are engaged in teaching, but there are others to whom literary pursuits are a means of eking out a subsistence. Why should we be surprised if the engagement of the time and attention of these also, is such as to exert a prejudicial influence upon their professional duties; if a taste for literary or scientific pursuits ensues, so decided as to divert excellent talents into a direction where they are all but lost to the ministry? It is not merely our congregations, individually considered, that suffer in the actual state of things—our institutions also are affected. How can men who are engaged in the daily duties of a school quit their occupations to attend even the few association-meetings that we have? Many of our country ministers, we doubt not, are obliged to deny themselves the pleasure and the advantage of an attendance upon the annual association in the metropolis; many are obliged to abstain from similar institutions in the country, on account of their engagements as teachers of schools. It would be a wonder if, under such circumstances, the bonds of union amongst us were strong and efficient; it would be a wonder if a wholesome and vigorous zeal prevailed, when there is so little intercommunication and mutual prompting. Our ministers must be free to go whither the call of duty invites them, to see each other frequently, and to provoke each other to good works; and our congregations must feel themselves more closely knit together for mutual comfort and support, the strong to assist the weak, and the zealous to prompt the tardy, ere we can hope to see the work of God prosper in our hands.

J. R. B.

THE CREATION OF MAN.

“ And God said, Let us make man in our own image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air,” &c.—Gen i. 26.

“ But there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground. And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.”—Gen. ii. 6, 7.

“ LET us make Man!” Jehovah spake the word;
Inferior natures trembled while they heard;
Earth shook, the last great fiat to record;
And all creation waited for its lord.

Then thus, pavilion'd on th' o'erarching skies,
God speaks His will,—and round the world it flies:
“ Let Man our image wear, our likeness be;
And let him have dominion o'er the sea!

“ Be his the fowls that cleave the liquid air;
And let the beasts his yoke of bondage bear:
In Man let meaner things their sovereign know:—
His be the sea, the earth, and his be all below!”

He ceas'd: at once uprose, from earth profound,
A thick'ning mist, which water'd all the ground!
Through every pore the liquid current ran;
And from the moisten'd earth God fashion'd MAN!

Thus from his parent EARTH, Earth's sovereign came;
God breath'd within him life's ethereal flame:
Th' immortal spirit through his fabric stole,
And monarch “ Man became a living soul!”

Brighton.

J. C. W.

TO DR. CHANNING,

ON HIS SERMON, “ MAN THE IMAGE OF GOD.”

Go on, and prosper—man of lofty soul!
To God and thine own spirit nobly true:
Go—and before thee, while the dark clouds roll,
Spread out a wide horizon to the view:
Teach the dull eye to see! inform anew
The heart and mind, their aim, their pow'rs to know.
Teachers of old the listening numbers drew
To *their own* wisdom: not like them be thou.
O gently let the breathing influence fall
Over the soul—it sleeps, but never dies—
Spirit to spirit speak—O say to all,
“ The well-spring of deep bliss within ye lies;
“ Drink deep, and thirst no more.” Preach thus, and we
Shall hear the Master's voice again from thee.

E.

OBSERVATIONS BY THE REV. T. BELSHAM, OCCASIONED BY MR. BENSON'S REMARKS ON DR. PRIESTLEY'S SYSTEM OF MATERIALISM, MECHANISM, AND NECESSITY, IN A SERIES OF LETTERS TO THE REV. JOHN WESLEY. PRINTED AT HULL.

SIR,

Hampstead, Feb. 5, 1829.

IT is rather late to write upon this subject, but having accidentally met with Mr. Benson's work, I was tempted to set down my thoughts upon the question, which you will publish or not, as best comports with your design.

T. BELSHAM.

1. Dr. Priestley, with Mitchell, Franklin, P. Boscovich, and others, held matter to be destitute of the properties of inertia and impenetrability.

2. He thought that matter consists of active powers, of attraction, and repulsion, surrounding each other like the coats of an onion.

3. His *matter*, therefore, was much the same as Dr. Price's *spirit*; i. e. extension without solidity or impenetrability.

4. As thought was allowed to be a property of Dr. Price's immaterial extended substance, there is no reason why it should be denied to Dr. Priestley's matter, which is also extended, penetrable, active substance.

5. Man, therefore, upon Dr. Priestley's principle, *might* be *wholly* material, while upon Dr. Price's he *must* have a *spirit*, or *soul*, distinct from body.

6. Upon Dr. Priestley's principle, the *man*, the conscious being, is annihilated by death; the several particles being disposed of to make other *bodies*, or perhaps parts of other *souls*.

7. The stamina of one soul would not make the stamina of another, either from necessity of nature or by almighty power.

8. Upon Dr. Price's principle, the body is indeed resolved at death into its constituent atoms; and resurrection consists either in uniting the same soul to the same unchangeable stamina, or to a body similarly constituted to the original one; the identity of the man consisting wholly in identity of soul.

9. According to Dr. Priestley's principle, identity of man must, *strictly* speaking, consist of identity of *particles*, under *identity* of form. Identity of particles where form is wanting, would be no identity at all. Identity of form where particles are different, can produce only *similarity*, not *identity*.

10. Upon Dr. Priestley's principle, therefore, there can be no true resurrection but by a location of the original stamina in the original form. There may be a thousand cases imagined of exactly similar stamina placed in an exactly similar form, and producing exactly similar beings; but there is only one case of identity.

11. In order to make two similar beings equally happy, a similar combination of particles must be placed under the *same* or an equal process of discipline.

12. Nothing could insure the perfect happiness of Dr. Price's man, because with precisely the same discipline he might act a part the very reverse of what he does; which is very like an opposite effect from the same cause.

13. Every sentient creature is conscious that he possesses no power of self-determination, but to say that it involves a contradiction, and is in itself impossible, is more than can be warranted.

NATIONAL EDUCATION FOR IRELAND.*

SOME congratulation may fairly be given to the friends of education in this and the sister country on the appearance of so bold an attempt as this to infuse into the public mind a fresh spirit of zeal in the cause ; to inform that zeal, moreover, and to make it a more sensible and praiseworthy thing. — There are some points on which we cannot but differ from Mr. Bryce, yet on one important subject he is so useful an auxiliary, that we must not be hard upon him on any. He has made no new discovery : the impossibility of effectually carrying on the education of the people without a better educated set of teachers, is daily becoming more apparent to all who concern themselves about the matter. To meet the difficulty, Mr. Bryce's idea is, that of erecting Teaching into a fourth learned profession, by establishing a professor of the art in every university ; by requiring from those who study under him a good previous education, and, in particular, an acquaintance with the science of mind ; and by making a certificate of attendance on his instructions an indispensable qualification for every public charge connected with the education of youth, from the presidencies of our richest and most illustrious colleges, to the masterships of our humblest village schools. Mr. Bryce, who is President of the Belfast Academy, writes, it is true, for Ireland, and conceives it to be clear that all which he proposes, even to the establishment of three more universities, might be accomplished for one half of the sum which has already been expended in well-meant, but utterly inefficient, endeavours to improve education in Ireland. With regard to religious differences, his opinion is, that the plan recommended by the late Committee of the House of Commons is both objectionable in principle and impracticable in detail.

“ As far,” says he, “ as the south of Ireland is concerned, the plan of having two separate days for religious instruction, one for Catholics and one for Protestants, may do very well. It is liable to this objection, however, that it loses one day in every week. Only four days are employed in the work of ordinary teaching ; of the remaining two, one is given up to Roman Catholics, the other to Protestants. * * * But in the north of Ireland it would never do. The divisions of Protestants among themselves would, in some places, render three days at least necessary for them alone. The Protestants of the Established Church, the various bodies of Presbyterians, and the Independents, (who, however, are few and rare,) would never submit to the same system of instruction. * * * Besides, the religious instruction is to be given by the clergyman ; and how are we sure of him ? It is his duty to instruct the people, it is true ; but what if he chooses not to perform it ? Is he to be paid by government an extra salary for this ? Surely not ; and if not, how does the system of education lay hold on him ? ”

“ But we confess we despair of the success of any scheme for combining religious and common education in Ireland at present. It is much to be regretted ; but what then ? Because we cannot get all done, shall we refuse to do any thing ? Let us give ordinary education as a temporal benefit, as the means of helping the wretched population to earn their bread, on the same principle that we are commanded to feed the hungry and to clothe the naked.”
P. 48.

Again :

“ We are inclined to believe that, at present, by far the best way of proceed-

* Sketch of a Plan for a System of National Education for Ireland, &c. By R. J. Bryce, A. M., Principal of the Belfast Academy.

ing would be to make no regulation about religious instruction at all. Leave it to the feeling of each neighbourhood; and in the Act of Parliament constituting the schools, let not one word be said about it, either in the way of prohibition or regulation. Thus an opening will be left for its introduction, if the people be agreed about it; but, if they cannot agree, one of two things will happen; either they will omit it altogether, and the matter will fall to the charge of Sabbath-schools; or else they will divide into two parties, set up an opposition school, quarrel violently for a few months, and in a few years be as good friends as ever; and the country will have two schools in place of one."—Pp. 49, 50.

Mr. Bryce might have added, that teachers, such at least as he proposes to send up and down the land, ought to understand the nature of religious instruction well enough to communicate a great deal to their pupils without the probability of giving offence either to Catholic or Protestant. It is the least important part of that great business which does the mischief. Who would have the heart to expel a mild, affectionate, effective teacher, for bringing home to a child's feelings the beautiful lessons of pure Christian morality; or for making him acquainted, as far, probably, as his age admits, with the character of the Saviour, and the glorious purposes of his mission? We have often been made to regret the state of some of our Lancasterian schools, which, because a difference of religious sentiments in the members of a committee forbids the introduction of all religious books but the Bible, are subjected to a dry and uninteresting reading of that sacred volume, and learn little that they are able immediately to apply. But this would never be the case, let the restrictions on a teacher with regard to books be what they might, if a devotional spirit and a cultivated, well-instructed mind were brought to the task. The absence of books of direct religious teaching would in such a case force out a degree of extempore talent, of practical application, which might be in the end better for children than the indolent habit of trusting to what is written.

There is another favourite position of Mr. Bryce, in establishing which we wish him more success than, it is to be feared, he will easily meet with.

"The radical error," says he, "in all schemes of national education hitherto proposed is, that they are schemes *for the poor*. Now we say, that in order to have good teachers for the poor, there must be one common system of education for them and for the rich. We do not mean that the children of the rich and of the poor must necessarily meet in the same school to be taught; but that the same machine of national education must furnish teachers for both. The teacher who labours among the poor requires just as high qualifications as he who labours among the rich: he may not need the same extent of learning, or the same knowledge of the world, but he requires even more skill and dexterity in his art, because the minds on which he is to work are in an inferior state of cultivation. But scarcely any man of talent will take charge of a pauper school, though he will have no objection to a school with small income, and attended by humble pupils, if he is to be one of a profession, all whose members may claim a connexion with one another, so that honour is reflected on all from the respectability of those who are at the head of it."

"Curates," as he afterwards observes, "live upon very low salaries, and yet are men of education."

In the above we entirely concur. The most difficult part of the subject is the future, if not present, interference of Government in the appointment of teachers. For awhile the supply must precede the demand. There is no possibility of making the people feel a want of this kind, without first in some degree supplying it.

“The science of jurisprudence tells the legislator to excite, if he can, a demand for education where it is wanting: the science of political economy teaches him to leave the supply to be regulated by the demand.”

With regard to the influence of Government, however the case may stand with regard to England, it seems very certain that no progress can be made in education *in Ireland* without the aid of Government money: and it never should be forgotten, as has been well observed by an Edinburgh Reviewer, (Vol. XXXIV. p. 221,) that “the natural effect of the system is to increase, beyond all calculation, the power and energy of the people generally, and especially to furnish, in each individual instance, the very antidote most adapted to counteract any tendency which the mode of tuition might have unfriendly to perfect independence.” Mr. Bryce’s idea is, moreover, far less objectionable than Mr. Brougham’s in the rejected Education Bill; and he has the merit of perceiving, what seems to have escaped the cognizance of that keen-sighted man, the necessity of making provision for the instruction of teachers of the people. Mr. Bryce bestows great commendations upon the plan adopted by Lovell Edgeworth, Esq., at Edgeworth Town.

“About ten or twelve years ago, he established a school, intended at first merely for the poor of his town and estate.” He therefore made “the education so cheap, that the poor could count it no hardship to pay,” and he made “the education so good, that, without his ever having calculated upon such a result, the rich found it of no hurt to their children to send. Many of the most respectable persons in that quarter of the country, and even at a considerable distance, requested him to allow their children to attend: he fitted up a neat house adjoining the school for the reception of pupils from a distance, and placed it under the charge of a proper person, and it is generally full. There are, besides, boys of a very respectable description, who board or lodge in private houses through the town.”

Objections have, we are informed, been made to this plan, on the ground of the mixture of ranks in the school; but it is perfectly voluntary on the part of the rich; the boarders have no intercourse with the other scholars except during the lessons; and we cannot help thinking any possible disadvantages which might result occasionally from this mixture, would be more than compensated by the lessons which the richer members might learn respecting the necessity of mental exertion, and the worthlessness of mere external advantages in a field where mental and moral acquirements form the only ground of distinction.

Among the most necessary qualifications of a teacher, Mr. Bryce ranks that of an acquaintance with the science of the human mind—with “the few facts which have been ascertained concerning its operations, in order that they may be able to act rationally and effectually in their endeavours to manage and instruct the minds of their scholars,” (p. 15,) previously to all question of the best practical methods of imparting knowledge. “A good and solid general education” is also, very properly, insisted upon. Yet, on the whole, we are inclined to think that Mr. Bryce has laid rather too great a stress on mere intellectual education; that he expects a result from the mere communication of outward knowledge which experience does not warrant. While his general principle, which is that of giving all the knowledge we can to the poor as well as to the rich, may be a good one, we would say that, for the poor, no less than for the rich, do we desire to see less stress laid upon *acquisition*, and more upon *education*. If observation be attentively exercised upon the defects of our national character, surely it must be seen that the real want is cultivation of the domestic, religious, and social

feelings — cultivation of all those various powers, whether of heart or mind, by which the Deity has connected individuals with himself and with society. Hitherto, in defiance of all the immense varieties of character, constitution, and talent, the grand aim in our schools for the poor, and in some of our highest grammar-schools also, is to make all get through a certain quantity of learning, and there the discipline stops. In schools for the poor, we have also farther to object, that the whole mechanism is calculated to swallow up individual peculiarity, or to hide it from the master's eye; so that he really knows nothing of the actual state of mind or feeling of the various children under his charge. Now the principal problem which has to be solved in education is, what are the exercises most calculated from the earliest period to strengthen and develop *the whole compound character*. We may satisfy our minds as to the general solution of this problem, and so far, and no farther, do our querists often proceed; but, be it remembered, that there is a fresh problem to solve with every individual child presented to the schoolmaster, and that his general rules must not stand in the way of his particular investigations. As there is a peculiarity in every mind, (how or why arising we need not now stop to inquire,) there must be a modification of his previously-formed system probably in every case, if he pays due deference to the nature of the being before him. Yet there are gentleman pedants (we do not say Mr. Bryce is one of them) who propose to work out the reformation of the poor by means of the grammar and lexicon, and by crowding their minds with historical facts. Not so Dr. Channing. "The great hope of the world," says that able man, who sees the world and all things in it from the elevation of truly Christian virtue, — "the great hope of the world is in individual character: the grand lesson for men to learn is, that their happiness is in their own hands; that it is to be wrought out by their own faithfulness to God and conscience; that no outward institutions can supply the place of inward principle, of moral energy; whilst these can go far to supply the place of almost every outward aid." *

The value of the human character, we would add, is in the *proportion* which all its component parts bear one to another—in permitting every different power to occupy its just place in the system, and no one faculty to be the tyrant of the whole. Difficult and impossible as it may be for any individual not endowed with omniscience to mete out with perfect correctness the stimulus or the check which may be necessary for the formation of a well-proportioned mental and moral character, we surely ought always to be aiming at this point. We ought not, at any rate, to labour at increasing the inequalities which prevail. This, however, is too often the case with teachers. They seize upon that faculty which a pupil exercises with the greatest ease—the memory, for instance—and by it and with it they principally work; neglecting the obvious inference, that, if one power is particularly strong, another, probably, is in a state of weakness and depression, and requires especial attention, while the strong one has sufficient strength to maintain its ground till greater force has been acquired by that which is weak. Mr. Bryce has chiefly adverted to exercises of memory in a child's earlier years, and has never even mentioned the advantages of awakening its powers of observation upon itself and the objects around. Natural history is not once alluded to; and though a child is to learn to read at five years old, writing is not to begin till seven. What can be the reason for this ar-

* Thoughts on Power and Greatness.

rangement? Writing is one of the most valuable aids in education, not as an end, but as a means. The same may be said of drawing.

Enough has been written to give the reader a general estimate of a pamphlet, which, however, ought to be read for itself. With reference to all plans for the improvement of society, we are inclined to say, "If you would have the people wiser and happier and better, beware of the spirit of ostentation." This spirit has inconceivably retarded the progress of many good things in this country, and of none more than of education. When Lancasterian Schools were first introduced, those who took them under their protection were so pleased with the plan, and so shocked at the illiberality of those who opposed it, that they took it up almost as if it left little to be desired as a system of national reformation. They did not observe in how small a degree it bore upon individual character, and how nearly alike, to all intents and purposes, except in the knowledge of reading, writing, and arithmetic, a boy who had passed through one of these schools, and one who had never entered them, might be. The grand thing was to have large schools—schools for hundreds—"schools for all, and not for Churchmen only." They planned for the world. "Meeting in the very worst parish in all London, in St. Giles's, they listened to reports of the progress they were making with the new method—in St. Giles's? in any part of London? in the country? in Ireland? No; but in France, Spain, Poland, Russia, Finland—even on the shores of the Euxine and Caspian!"* There is a little of this spirit of dash in Mr. Bryce's pamphlet, in spite of its good sense and motive. But it must be regarded as a valuable contribution to the general fund, and, we hope, will lead to more serious consideration of the best mode of providing good National Education for England and Ireland.

THE BLACKBIRD.

BY THE LATE MR. GRIGG.

SWEET Blackbird, sing on: and I wish I could sing:
 Well mayst thou be gay, for with thee it is Spring.
 Thy season enjoy: that fair season was mine,
 And, Warbler, my note was as tuneful as thine.
 But now, I'm in Autumn, in Winter, for lo!
 Old Time on my locks has dropp'd fleeces of snow;
 And Winter's the season for pleasure to creep,
 The season for nature to sit down and weep.
 And let the tears flow—they can flow but a while;
 And yonder's a spring that for ever shall smile.
 If once yon deep river I safely get through,
 Gay songster, I'll warble it sweeter than you.

* Edinburgh Review, Vol. XXXIV. p. 235.

BISHOP MARSH'S TWO LECTURES, &c.*

FOR a considerable time, the diffusion of various kinds of knowledge has been attempted by means of *lectures*. Perhaps our own age and country employ this method of instruction with unprecedented frequency and zeal. That it is used indiscriminately, nor sufficiently understood, either in theory or in practice, we cannot, for a moment, doubt. It possesses, we admit, characteristic advantages: as certainly, however, it has appropriate inconveniences, even if we must not call them evils. In its facility of addressing numerous assemblages, it is an instrument of vast magnitude and effect: in the limits which unavoidably circumscribe its power of communicating full and accurate information, it labours under an essential deficiency, and, in some views, may be dangerous and hurtful. The external accomplishments of the lecturer, will often conceal from the majority of his auditors his superficial or incorrect learning; while the captivated hearer may too easily regard as his own acquisition the intelligence which he receives merely through the channel of the person to whom he listens. In many instances, the custom of delivering a lecture within a given circle, literary, commercial, manufacturing, ecclesiastical, bespeaks and promotes an *empirical* spirit, and may be ranked among the many ways in which candidates for the patronage of the public aim at obtruding themselves on its notice, and winning, if they can, its approbation.

If, indeed, lectures are multiplied at a time when books have become abundant, and if the demand for both is equal, or nearly equal, such a circumstance will be an auspicious token of the increase of a thirst for useful knowledge; especially among the manufacturing classes. We fear, nevertheless, that the coincidence is not quite so exact: we suspect that, in almost every department of society, a great proportion of the attendants within a lecture-room content themselves with the *opus operatum*, nor engage in that regular course of *reading* which harmonizes with such an occupation of, it may be, a single hour in the week, and is requisite to the due cultivation and improvement of the mental powers. Any degree of knowledge entitled to the name, is, we grant, better than ignorance: and we are not hostile to the habit of lecturing, while we intimate its defects, and suggest the necessity of its being exercised and encouraged with certain modifications, aids, and cautions. Censure, like praise, may be immoderate, and fail of its proper end. We can allow that the celebrated Samuel Johnson was hurried into an exaggerated reprehension, and a *caricature* description, when he said, "Lectures were once useful; but now, when all can read, and books are so numerous, lectures are unnecessary. If your attention fails, and you miss a part of a lecture, it is lost; you cannot go back, as you do upon a book. People have now-a-days got a strange opinion that every thing should be taught by lectures. Now, I cannot see that lectures can do so much good as reading the books from which the lectures are taken. I know nothing that can be best taught by lectures, excepting where experiments are to be shewn. You may teach chemistry by lectures—you might teach making of shoes by lectures."†

* Two Lectures on the History of Biblical Interpretation. With an Appendix. By Herbert Marsh, D. D., &c., &c. London: Rivingtons. 1828. 8vo. pp. 63.

† Boswell's Life of Johnson, [3d ed.,] Vol. II. 6; IV. 95; and Memoirs of the Life of G. Wakefield, I. 341, &c.

To this decision we cannot subscribe. In our own judgment, lectures may be advantageously delivered on a wider range, and a yet superior class, of subjects. But whatever be thought of lectures on other spots, and from other persons, we cheerfully acknowledge that within academical precincts, and in the hands of competent professors, they may be signally beneficial. Well framed, well conducted, and accompanied by the assistance of college, if not of private, tutors, of specific exercises and regulations, of preparatory and of collateral studies, of the very genius and atmosphere of the scene,* and of easy access to books and conversation, they will materially advance the progress of every assiduous hearer, and place many topics before him in a stronger and a more familiar light than books alone are capable of affording. Nor can we be astonished that works at once highly popular and intrinsically valuable—works, indeed, of surpassing merit in their respective departments,—have been lectures delivered officially within some one of the universities of the united kingdom. We are purposely silent concerning publications of this sort, which are extremely creditable to certain living authors. Of *Blackstone's Commentaries*, and of *Lowth's Prelections*, we may be permitted to say, that time cannot impair their deserved reputation. The intelligent and able, though too casuistical, lectures of the late Professor Hey, are worthy of being diligently perused by every theological student; while, among our contemporaries, Bishop Marsh honourably signalizes himself by those which he lays before his university and the world.

We have welcomed and noticed the several parts of his Lectures, as they have successively appeared. To their specific excellencies, in point of style, arrangement, intelligence, and reasoning, we have not been insensible: and we have marked, firmly, yet, we hope, with becoming candour, what we deem their omissions and their blemishes. Altogether, we consider them as meriting no scanty commendation: we regard their author as one of the most accomplished theologians of his age; and we, in proportion, hail the two supplementary Lectures and the Appendix, which are now to pass under our review.

They take their fit place after the lectures on the principles of biblical interpretation: †

“The *principles* of biblical interpretation,” says his Lordship, “having been explained in the ten preceding lectures, it now remains that, agreeably to the plan proposed in the first Preliminary Lecture, we take an *historical view* of biblical interpretation, according to the different modes which prevailed in the different ages of Christianity. In describing the criticisms of the Bible, the historical view preceded the rules of criticism, because a history of criticism is a history of *facts*, and the rules of criticism are founded on those facts. But a history of interpretation is a history of *opinions*, which may properly follow the principles of interpretation.” ‡

From the Jews, “the earliest interpreters of Scripture,” we here learn what to avoid rather than what to imitate; they perpetually sought for remote and mystical meanings in their sacred books, nor, in their expositions of them, were governed by rules applicable to other writings. Philo's at-

* Sir Joshua Reynolds' Discourses, &c., No. I., and Lowth's Letter to Warburton, p. 65.

† Parts III. and IV.

‡ P. 3. It will be remembered that by “a history of criticism,” Bishop Marsh means “a history of whatever regards the *text* of Scripture.”

tachment to the new Platonic philosophy, gave him an additional motive to the use of allegorical interpretation.

Among Christian authors of the first century, Barnabas interprets the Old Testament in the same mystical manner : and his expositions are so many examples of the Jewish Medrash. * Contemporary and immediately succeeding writers afford little matter for a history of biblical interpretation, because their quotations from Scripture are generally unaccompanied by explanation. †

In the second century, Justin Martyr, who, before his conversion to Christianity, had been a Platonic philosopher, considered the words of Scripture, especially in the Old Testament, as containing mystical meanings, which were concealed from the view of those who regarded only the literal sense. His works abound in instances of this sort of exposition ; shewing alike his feebleness of judgment, and the absurdity of his principles of interpretative criticism.

Irenæus justly objects to the allegorical interpretations employed by the Gnostics, although his own interpretations are sometimes as fanciful as those of his opponents. But the principle of interpretation upon which he chiefly insists, is a kind of *tradio hermeneutica*, to which he appeals as *authority* for the interpretation of Scripture. He appeals also to a *Κανων της αληθειας*, or *regula veritatis*. A formulary of faith laid down by him accords in substance with the corresponding articles in the Apostles' Creed : and with this formulary his *regula veritatis* was identical.

The *Recognitiones Clementis*, written by some author of the second century, declare the sentiments which then prevailed in the Latin Church respecting biblical interpretation. This author speaks of the *veritas tradita*, and the *regula suscepta ex divinis Scripturis*. "It was not an authority," says Bishop Marsh, "distinct from Scripture, but Scripture itself interpreted by authority."

Clement of Alexandria, being greatly attached to that species of the Platonic philosophy which prevailed there, had a strong predilection for allegorical interpretation, and carried it so far as even to put a mystical or allegorical sense on the precepts of the decalogue. The fifth commandment, for instance, relates, according to Clement, not to our natural parents, but to our *heavenly* Father, and the divine *Gnosis*.

Still, notwithstanding his regard for the Greek philosophy and his propensity to allegorical interpretation, Clement, like Irenæus, appeals to *Κανων της αληθειας*, which he terms also *Κανων εκκλησιαστικος*. This was professedly founded on Scripture. ‡

We come now to the Latin fathers of the end of the second century. Of these Tertullian is the most ancient, and one of the most important. He was not addicted to allegorical interpretation. The rule by which he appears to have been chiefly guided in the interpretation of Scripture, is that which he calls the *regula fidei* : not the tradition of the Church of Rome, not the *doctrina tradita*, which is called by Bellarmine, *Verbum Dei non scriptum*, but a rule which has no other foundation than in Scripture, and by which in controversies of faith the sense of Scripture should be determined. §

In the third century the most distinguished among the fathers were Origen in the Greek Church, and Cyprian in the Latin.

Origen had really but two modes of interpretation, the grammatical and

* See Buxtorf. Lex. Rabb., &c., in verb.

† Pp. 4, 5.

‡ Pp. 5—14.

§ Pp. 14—18.

the spiritual; notwithstanding that he speaks of spiritual interpretation under three different names. Whenever grammatical interpretation produced a sense which in his opinion was irrational or impossible, he then *departed* from the literal sense. At the same time, he admitted that historical or grammatical interpretation applies in many more instances than mere spiritual interpretation.

In a note to this part of his Lectures the Bishop of Peterborough suggests that the celebrated exclamation of Tertullian, 'Certum est quia impossibile!'^{*} may have reference to an impossibility resulting from a test which Tertullian disregarded—to an imagined, not an actual impossibility. So, in the opinion of Dr. Neander, † this language is "only an exaggerated mode of declaring that a Christian readily admits, on the authority of revelation, what men who rely solely on the conclusions of their own reason, pronounce impossible." The conjecture is ingenious, and has even an air of probability. ‡

Cyprian professed to follow Tertullian, but was much more inclined than his master § to depart from the literal sense of Scripture. Witness his famous exposition of the clause, *et hi tres unum sunt*, which follows the words *spiritus, aqua, et sanguis*, in 1 John v. 8; a comment, which, it seems, Facundus adopted on his authority. ||

Proceeding to the fourth century, we find that the influence of Clement and Origen on the Greek fathers Eusebius, Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Apollinarius, Basil of Cæsarea, Gregory of Nazianzum, Amphilochius, Gregory of Nyssa, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Chrysostom, and Cyril of Alexandria, disposed them all, with the exception of Theodore, to recommend or use allegorical interpretation. Another kind of interpretation prevailed together with it; that called *κατ' οἰκονομίαν*, the interpretation of *management*, of *accommodation*, the practice of expounding, perhaps we should say explaining away, Scripture, by making it bend to human creeds and speculations. Thus, it having been objected to the term *ἄμωσιος*, that our Saviour had declared his ignorance of the day of judgment, ¶ the answer was, that his words are to be understood *κατ' οἰκονομίαν ὁρ οἰκονομικῶς*.**

Among the Latin fathers of this period, Arnobius was a decided adversary of allegorical interpretation. However, it was not rejected by Lactantius, who found a proof of the Millennium in the first chapter of Genesis. Ambrose of Milan and Hilary were powerfully attached to mystical meanings. Jerom, too, though highly gifted as an interpreter of Scripture, has not unfrequently fallen into the error, which he condemns in Origen. Of Augustine's rules for expounding the Scriptures, that which relates to grammatical and allegorical (or as he terms it, figurative) interpretation, is the following: *Iste omnino modus est, ut quidquid in sermone divino neque ad morum honestatem neque ad fidei veritatem proprie referri potest, figuratum esse cognoscas.* Yet Augustine, like Tertullian, appeals also to a *regula fidei*. The will of God, according to Augustine, must be sought in Holy Scripture: and when he speaks about the authority of the church, he means only an authority to

* De Carne Christi, § 5.

† Bishop Kaye's Eccles. Hist., &c., [ed. 2,] Pref. pp. xxix. xxx.

‡ Pp. 18—23.

§ Cyprian was accustomed to speak of Tertullian as his *master*. Bishop Kaye's Ecc. Hist. &c. p. 6.

|| Porson's Letters to Travis. No. V.

¶ Mark xiii. 32.

** See a famous passage in Tertull. adv. Prax. § 3.

determine the *sense of Scripture*, which in controversies of faith is claimed by every church.

“He affords,” adds Bishop Marsh, “no support to the Romish doctrine of tradition, as an authority *independent* of Scripture. And even were it true that a *doctrina tradita* existed, the discrepancies which prevailed among the fathers of the four first centuries, would shew the uncertainty of the vehicle by which it is supposed to have been conveyed.” *

This concluding remark is just, weighty, and comprehensive. But we cannot approve of his Lordship's criticism on Augustine's direction, that where any man doubts the sense of Scripture, *consulat regulam fidei, quam de scripturarum planioribus locis et ecclesiæ autoritate suscipit*. Whence are we to derive this rule of faith? Bishop Marsh replies, “from two sources—a comparison of difficult with plain passages of Scripture—and ecclesiastical authority.” If we further ask, in what ecclesiastical authority consists, we shall be told that it means “only an authority to determine the *sense of Scripture*, which in controversies of faith is claimed by every church.” *Claimed* indeed it, unhappily, is: and should we proceed to inquire, by whom it has been conferred, how it has been exercised, what have been its decisions, and what its fruits, we fear that the answers would be any thing but satisfactory. It is not possible that church authority can be a just and safe rule for determining the sense of Scripture. So far, all churches making pretensions to it stand on the same ground; nor is it very material whether nominally they possess a *doctrina tradita* or not, the discrepancies of the *regula fidei* being nearly as great, and quite sufficient to shew the uncertainty of the principle. Indeed, the *regula fidei*, the *analogy of faith*, or by whatever name it is called, can be no principle of exposition, since it merely informs us what are the expositions of other men.

To those Protestant writers who, not very consistently with the spirit of Protestantism, are strenuous advocates of church authority, the indefinite and somewhat ambiguous language of certain of the early fathers, of Irenæus, for example, in respect of the traditions of the church, has been sufficiently embarrassing. At a future time we may have a more favourable opportunity of entering into the discussion.

As we have now reached the conclusion of the former of Bishop Marsh's Supplementary Lectures, it is natural to look back on the wretched methods of interpreting Scripture, which prevailed even during the first, second, third, and fourth centuries of the Christian æra. Allegory and the *regula fidei* were the rules in vogue. The false philosophy of the schools, and attachment to church authority, introduced wild and visionary expositions of the sacred volume. An historical review of such causes and such effects will have answered no important purpose, if it do not warn the present age and succeeding generations against the danger of falling into the same or similar errors of speculation and of practice; if it do not illustrate the necessity and value of a sound judgment, of correct learning, and of personal and impartial examination, to the public teachers of religion.

In the remaining lecture, the Bishop of Peterborough continues his historical sketch. He begins with the fifth century, and proceeds down to our own times. But the narrative is conducted, avowedly, on a limited scale

* Pp. 23—30. See Paley's *Evid. of Christ.* [ed. 8,] Vol. I. pp. 206, &c., and Bishop Kaye's *Ecc. Hist.* &c., p. 290.

and in a summary manner; on scarcely any other account is it objectionable.

Little was done in the fifth century for scriptural interpretation. It was facilitated, indeed, by some mechanical divisions of the text. Nevertheless, even Theodoret and Isidore of Pelusium retained allegorical interpretation.

Andreas, Bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, wrote, at the beginning of the sixth century, a commentary on the Apocalypse, which abounds in mystical meanings. Still, his commentary is of some use in the *criticism* of the Bible, because it is accompanied with the *text*. In this century, as original commentators began to decrease, it became the fashion in the Greek church to make collections from former commentaries, and to arrange them under the portions of Scripture to which they belonged. These collections acquired afterwards the name of *Σειραί*, or *catenæ*, in which the individual writers were considered as so many links.

From the end of the sixth to the middle of the eighth century, the only Greek commentator of any note was Johannes Damascenus. In the ninth century we find Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, whose writings, however, as far as we know them, contain but little of biblical interpretation. The tenth and eleventh centuries place before us Œcumenius and Theophylact as annotators on Scripture; in the twelfth we meet with Euthymius, a Greek monk at Constantinople, as a commentator on the Psalms, the Gospels, and the Epistles; and there are those who very highly extol him as a judicious and accurate interpreter.*

To these commentators may be added the unknown authors of the Greek Scholia; † nor, in a history of interpretation, should we omit the Greek Glossaries, especially those of Hesychius and Suidas. ‡

Returning to the Latin church, in the fifth century we find Tychonius, Vincentius Lirinensis, Eucherius, Gennadius; and in the sixth century, Cassiodorus, Facundus, Vigilus Tapsensis, Fulgentius, Primasius, Junillius, Isidore of Seville, and Gregory the Great. But it would be a waste of time to examine their writings in the expectation of meeting with any thing useful for the interpretation of the Bible. The original languages of Scripture were unknown to them, grammatical interpretation was consequently disregarded, and mystical meanings were adopted without control. §

The seventh century produced no biblical commentator in the Latin church: nor did Italy produce a biblical commentator during many ages. But in the eighth century, and in England, Bede published commentaries on the Latin Vulgate, which were principally derived from the works of Ambrose, Jerom, Augustine, and Gregory the Great; while his good sense and solid judgment induced him to adhere, especially in the New Testament, to literal interpretation, though it must be admitted that he has sometimes *deviated* into mystical meanings. The works of Alcuin, a native of Yorkshire, contain various remarks on Scripture, which are chiefly taken from former writers. Rabanus Maurus, a disciple of Alcuin, wrote commentaries on the Latin Bible. But, like Origen, he maintained a four-fold, or more properly a two-fold, sense of Scripture.

* Pp. 30, 33. See Matthai's Greek Test. and Lardner's Works, [1788,] V. 332.

† Specimens of which may be seen in Matthai's edition of the Greek Testament.

‡ In this view, we should recommend to the student's care Alberti Glossarium Græcum, 1735.

§ Pp. 33, 34.

In the ninth century Walafrad Strabo* compiled a commentary on the Bible, which was called afterwards *Glossa ordinaria*, on account of its general adoption. Druthmar, too, a monk of Corbie, wrote a commentary on Matthew. Being well acquainted with the original, he was better qualified than most other Latin writers to investigate the grammatical sense; and he forms a remarkable exception to the then prevailing taste for spiritual meanings.†

During the tenth and eleventh centuries, there arose no commentator in the West of Europe that is worthy of notice. In the twelfth century, the most distinguished writer was Petrus Lombardus, who, from the work which he composed, acquired the title of *Magister sententiarum*. He wrote observations on the Epistles of Paul, which were principally taken from Jerom and Augustine. In the thirteenth century we find Thomas Aquinas: he was eminent as a scholastic divine, but contributed little to the interpretation of the Bible. Hugo de St. Caro, in the same century, adopted Origen's views of interpretation, and composed a Concordance, and divided the Vulgate into the chapters which are now in use. Albertus Magnus attempted to unite the Aristotelian philosophy with an allegorical interpretation of Scripture; and Bonaventura was a most extravagant advocate of mystical senses and expositions.

The scholastic theology, so prevalent at that period, had a most unhappy effect on the interpretation of the Bible.

“A theology which could establish points of doctrine by the aid of dialectics, necessarily tended to bring the Bible into disuse; and the church of Rome derived advantage from the substitution of dialectics, in proportion as doctrines were introduced, which had no support in the Bible. Thus, when Berengarius and his followers denied the doctrine of Transubstantiation, they were silenced by arguments derived from the scholastic theology.”

This statement is correct; and we may apply the spirit of it to other churches than the church of Rome, and to other doctrines than the doctrine of Transubstantiation. The substitution of ecclesiastical authority, of metaphysical creeds and formularies, countenances and even prescribes tenets which have no support, tends to bring the Bible into disuse, and impedes the progress of truth and reformation in communions nominally Protestant.‡

While the subtleties of logic and the fancies of mysticism thus perverted Scripture, there existed in the South of Spain many learned Jews, who devoted their attention to the study of the Hebrew Bible. It will be sufficient to mention the names of Aben Ezra, David Kimchi, and Moses Maimonides.

In the fourteenth century Nicolaus Lyranus was, among all the Christian interpreters who either preceded him or lived at the same time with him, the most distinguished for his knowledge of Hebrew. The same century was likewise characterised by the attempts put forth both in England and in Germany to make the Bible known to the people at large. Wickliffe undertook soon afterwards to translate it into English. About the same period translations were made into the German language; and, though they were only from the Latin Vulgate, they opened the Scriptures to the common people, who had long been kept in darkness. Those German translations were among the earliest books printed by Fust and Schaeffer.

At the beginning of the fifteenth century the revival of literature prepared

* Porson's Letters to Travis, pp. 357, &c.

† Pp. 37, 38.

‡ Pp. 38—41.

the way for the study of the Bible in its original languages. In 1488 the whole Hebrew Bible was printed at Soncino: and about the middle of the century Laurentius Valla had made contributions of real value to the criticism and interpretation of the Greek Testament.

The sixteenth century is adorned by the great names of Erasmus, Luther, and Melancthon. By them and by their learned contemporaries * a method of enlightened interpretation was at once exemplified and defended. In the seventeenth century there appear writers still more eminent who were advocates of a single sense and a literal exposition: J. and L. Capellus, F. Spanheim, Louis De Dieu, Pricæus, Lightfoot, Arminius, Grotius, Episcopus, Le Clerc, are a few among the number.†

Bishop Marsh takes occasion to remark, in a note, that "it would have been fortunate, if they who agreed in opinion that Scripture had only *one* sense, could have further agreed in adopting one and the *same* sense."

"Fortunate," nevertheless, as he may deem this uniformity of interpretation and of sentiment, he must be aware that, in the circumstances, and at the period, of which he treats, the approaches to it were necessarily and particularly faint. Nor would its existence be an unmixed good; nor would there be any difficulty in assigning the reasons why, even at the present day, it cannot be attained.

"Towards the close of the seventeenth century," says the Right Reverend Professor, "an effort was made by Coecejus at Leyden, and by some German divines at Berlin and Halle, to restore the *manifold* interpretation of Scripture, which the Reformation had banished. During a period of many years their efforts were attended with success; but good sense and good taste gradually restored the Scriptures to the same mode of interpretation which is applied to classic authors. And with a few exceptions, which it is unnecessary to mention, the same kind of interpretation has continued to prevail. Here then I will conclude, without further remarks, the historical view of the modes which have been adopted in the interpretation of Scripture from the earliest ages of Christianity to the present day."

We should have been more satisfied if he had not here concluded: for at least one additional lecture ample and interesting materials were at hand. We should have been glad if Bishop Marsh had noticed those divines, both of his own church and of other communions, not excluding the Romish, who, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, have given proofs of their practical acquaintance with the true principles of Scriptural interpretation. In particular, we wish that he had directed the student to the best works illustrative of the subject, whether in the way of precept or of example; nor can we hold him justified for attempting little or nothing of this kind by the plea that selection would be difficult and invidious.

Is the following statement designed for censure or for praise of the state of theological learning in England?

"Since the year 1800, the explanations of the Bible, which have been published abroad, are not generally such as would recommend themselves to an English divine."

To a certain extent these Supplementary Lectures‡ are good and valuable. We lament, however, the scantiness of their limits, and of their references to

* Camerarius, Osiander, Chemnitz, Calixt, Zuingli, Bucer, Calvin, Beza, Isaac Casaubon, Drusius, Scaliger, &c.

† Pp. 41—49.

‡ First printed in the new edition (1828) of the Lectures on the Bible.

books. The style, too, exhibits occasional marks of negligence; and the lecturer, in sketching a history of interpretation, finds it somewhat difficult to repress his feelings as a Protestant controversialist.

His Appendix is by far the more curious and excellent part of his pamphlet. In these concluding pages he aims at vindicating the opinion which he formerly expressed concerning the Received Version of the Bible; and his success is complete. He does not inform us in reply to what work of periodical criticism his observations are made: we believe that it is the *Quarterly Review*.

The M. Professor shews, with great historical exactness, and by an ample induction, that in the Public Version a considerable regard was paid to preceding English translations, one of which, in particular, [Tyndal's,] was taken in some degree from Luther's. Of King James's Translation he thinks that it was as faithful a representation of the original Scriptures as could have been formed at that period; and that it is most unjust to accuse him of representing this version as a compilation of *second-hand* translations: its revision he strenuously recommends.

We cannot, by any abridgment of his remarks, place before our readers with sufficient clearness his proof of the fact that Tyndal adopted *Germanisms*, some of which are still retained in our authorized version. An extract will be preferable:*

"It cannot appear extraordinary, if an English translator, who followed Luther so closely as Tyndal did, should occasionally adopt a German idiom. Now there is nothing which more distinguishes the structure of the German from that of the English language than the position of the nominative case and verb in affirmative sentences. To make this intelligible to an English reader, and at the same time to contrast the English with the German idiom, let us take some familiar English example: for instance, 'I rode yesterday from Cambridge to Huntingdon,' which might be expressed in German by 'Ich ritt gestern von Cambridge nach Huntingdon.' But if *Gestern* be placed at the beginning of the sentence, the German idiom requires that the nominative be put *after* the verb, though the sentence is not interrogatory, but affirmative. A German, therefore, would say, *Gestern ritt ich* von Cambridge nach Huntingdon, though an Englishman, if he began the sentence with yesterday, would still say, 'Yesterday I rode,' &c. And if he said, 'Yesterday rode I from Cambridge to Huntingdon,' he would use a Germanism.

"Now there are many such Germanisms in our English Bible, though their deviation from the common English style is generally overlooked, because we are accustomed to them from our childhood.†

"Examples which originated in Tyndal's Translation,‡ and were transferred to the King's are, 1 Cor. ix. 22, To the weak *became I*; xii. 31, and yet *shew I*; 2 Cor. vii. 13, exceedingly the more *joyed we*."§

Happy shall we be, if, continuing to deliver and to publish his lectures, Bishop Marsh affords us an early opportunity of again expressing our respect for him, in his character of Lady Margaret's Professor.

N.

* Pp. 58, 59.

† For ourselves we can truly say that our attention has been now called for the first time to this peculiarity. Newcome, indeed, in his *Hist. View of Eng. Bibl. Translations*, p. 328, notices many "unpleasing collocations of words," but does not seem to be aware of their source and nature.

‡ It will be a useful employment (we speak from experience) to compare together such examples, i. e. Luther's and Cranmer's and the Received Version.

§ Among the instances not pointed out by the M. Professor are, *Acts*. xi. 16, 25, xiii. 18, 44.

FROM THE DUTCH OF WITHUYS.

Een dag is let leven.

OUR life is a day-dream,
 A dream, and no more ;
 We laugh, sport, dance, play, dream ;
 A Midsummer's day-dream,
 With sunset 'tis o'er :
 The dawn of the morrow
 Brings sadness and sorrow,
 And mantles the eye ;
 The flying,
 The dying,
 The idle relying
 On days that flit by ;
 And vain is the trying
 To stop them ;—they haste
 Like winds o'er the waste ;
 Their bright hours
 Are night hours,
 Soon scattered about :
 And dark is the clouding,
 Life's solitude shrouding,
 Till storms thunder out.

The pilgrim o'ertaken
 By darkness and snows,
 Looks round as he goes ;
 Hope's dreams long mistaken,
 Youth's gaities fled,
 And sorrows awaken
 The clouds o'er his head.
 The rush and the riot
 Soon settle and cease,
 And evening brings peace.
 In the twilight's calm quiet,
 The sun shrinks from sight,
 Some marvellous fiat
 Has quench'd all his light—
 And 'tis night !

The pilgrim, arisen,
 Then ponders on youth,
 And virtue, and truth.
 His heaven-guided vision
 Earth cannot imprison,
 While memories soothe
 Of pleasures elysian.
 So onward he creeps
 In silence and meekness ;
 And soon doth his hand
 Dig a grave in the sand,
 And, sinking in weakness,
 He sleeps.

REASONS FOR MUTUAL ENCOURAGEMENT AND CO-OPERATION, IN PROMOTING THE KNOWLEDGE AND DIFFUSION OF THE GREAT PRINCIPLES OF UNITARIANISM ; WITH A SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

[This article, the conclusion of which will appear in the succeeding number, forms the chief part of a discourse delivered on the first Anniversary of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. The Preacher was requested by the Committee to print it, for the purpose of extending an acquaintance with the objects of the Association, and of showing the motives which, he thought, should influence Unitarian Congregations in general to unite with it, and individuals to afford it their pecuniary aid. The state of his health at the time, and for a long period afterwards, operated to prevent his compliance; but the views he then stated may not be deemed unseasonable now; and he submits them to the readers of the Monthly Repository, with the desire that they may contribute to promote that spirit of union and mutual aid, which he trusts is increasing among us, and which, united with the exemplification of the practical influence of our great principles, must extend effectually the knowledge and reception of them.]

THOUGH various errors, which once deformed the sacred system of Christianity, have yielded to the gradual progress of the human mind; and others have become extinct, or have lost much of their influence, through increasing knowledge of the Scriptures; still, the present period of the Christian church is not characterized by "the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God." We may, however, reasonably look forwards, with full conviction, to a time, when all men shall possess that knowledge which our Saviour pronounced to be life eternal, in the faith and obedience of the "ONLY TRUE GOD;" when in the name of Christ every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess him to be Lord, to the glory of GOD *even the FATHER*. To this issue the language of prophecy points; and so also does our best knowledge respecting the perfections of God. However much, in his unsearchable dispensations, error, and evil the offspring of error, may be made to bring about great and good ends, those means cannot in themselves be good; and under the all-perfect and all-powerful government of infinite wisdom and love, they must ultimately cease.

Whenever that period arrives, in which, on the great points of Christian doctrine, there will be unity of faith, then will there exist that union of spirit which unity of faith should ever cherish.—It is indeed a cheering and a just persuasion, that such union of spirit is more extensive than unity of opinion. The Church of Christ includes members of every denomination. Wherever there is the spirit of Christ—the spirit of love and piety and righteousness,—and it brings forth (as if genuine it must do) the fruits of a Christian life and conversation, there is a member of that holy community whose names are enrolled in heaven, and who will hereafter be found there, even if, through the narrow creeds of men, excluded from the "communion of saints" on earth. It is no slight recommendation of those views which Unitarians regard as the teachings of gospel truth, that they enable us to offer such a disciple (whether or not he can receive it) the right hand of Christian fellowship; and that they are hostile to that narrow bigotry which confines the affections, which warps the judgment, and which cramps the exertions of charity.

While we check in our own hearts, and if need be among each other, all approaches to that baneful disposition, have we no sufficient motives to strive earnestly to promote the progress of what we believe "the faith once de-

livered to the saints" ? If we will do nothing for what we deem the truth, while thousands around us are doing every thing they can against it, how can we claim a relationship to him who came to bear witness to the truth ? —God's time is doubtless best ; but he employs human agency to bring about his great and good purposes : and though that agency should be carefully directed according to his will, and guided by the pointings of his providence, yet ought we ever to be on the watch to observe and follow those pointings, and never to allow personal considerations of ease, of interest, or of honour, to cause us to slight or to neglect them.

The great principles which form the bond of union among Unitarian Christians, *may be* viewed as matters of barren speculation, interesting as truths, but unconnected with any important practical results. If this be just, then may we be permitted to leave them to work their way in the world, and give ourselves no trouble in disseminating them,—not even so much as in promoting and extending the discoveries of modern philosophy. But it is not just. The question at issue between the Unitarian and his fellow-christian is not one of names or strifes of words : it respects the attributes and dispensations, the worship and the requirements of Jehovah ; it respects the terms of salvation. It may appear unimportant to those who observe the devout, benevolent and holy lives of numbers who embrace prevalent doctrines ; forgetting that this is because the influence of those doctrines is overpowered by that of the great practical principles of the gospel, which Unitarianism includes, nay, in which it mainly consists. It may also appear unimportant to those who observe the inefficaciousness of those principles in the lives of many Unitarian professors ; forgetting that the moral influence of doctrines often bears little proportion to the convictions of the understanding, or even to their intrinsic excellence ; and that if this be an argument against Unitarianism, it will equally hold against the value of Christianity itself. And it may appear unimportant to those who view religion altogether with indifference, and, like Gallio, care for none of these things. But surely it cannot be thus viewed by him who observes how error leads to error ; and how much errors which appear, and perhaps are, harmless to one, are really noxious to others : who perceives that truth is, by the nature given to man by his Maker, healthful to the soul as light is to the body : who believes that revealed truth must be enlightening and sanctifying to the human race ; and that whatever obstructs the *reception* or the *influence* of it, must, in that proportion, be baneful. Nor can the question at issue be deemed unimportant by those who observe that it is not merely whether there are Three Objects, or only One Object of religious worship and supreme affection ; (though, whether viewed in itself, or in its connexions and consequences, this is an inquiry of great moment ;) but also, whether the Father of all is to be regarded as essentially merciful and the *sole* First Cause of our salvation ; or whether we owe all our inestimable blessings as Christians to *Christ Jesus*, as being procured for us by his appeasing the wrath of God, or satisfying his justice, or *enabling* him to exercise his mercy to the repentant sinner ;—whether or not religion consists in the vital, practical principle of godliness, or the fear of the Lord ;—whether or not faith in Christ consists in the cordial reception of his divine authority, operating to produce obedience to his laws, the imitation of his example, and grateful attachment to his service ;—whether or not we shall be judged according to our own works, and bear our own burden ;—whether or not in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness, (according to the light which Providence affordeth him,)

will be accepted by him.—On some or other of these points most of our brethren will be found to leave us, who leave the simpler faith that GOD is ONE, and HE ALONE to be worshiped.

Candid Christians, of all persuasions, if they would consent to keep close to the Scriptures, might unite together with mutual edification; and they would find that they are nearer than they had imagined: but with those who follow the creeds and systems of men, and guide their worship and their services by them, the Unitarian has too little common ground for the engagements of religious worship. Thus separated from the prevalent denominations of Christians, ought we not to cherish fellowship among each other? Is Unitarianism so frigid a system that the genial spirit of the gospel must lose in it its warmth and its energy? If so it is not Christianity.

We may learn much from those who, as we think, have less light than ourselves. It matters not *where* we see what is good; it should, if practicable, be our desire to imitate it. It should be nothing to us, whether the good example be set by the Wesleyan, the Calvinist, the Moravian, the Evangelical, or the Orthodox Churchman. If the *Unitarian* be not above the prejudices of names, he at least ought not to wonder that his *opponents* are not. I doubt not that the time will come when Unitarians, generally, will manifest no small portion of that zeal, which at present seems to exist most where, as we believe, it is most without knowledge; and when the Unitarian body, and its various individual communities, shall shew much of the genuine character of the Church of Christ in its best periods;—when they shall set that example which is now often set them, of zeal for the glory of God, of cordial union with their brethren, and of earnest desire to promote the best interests of all around them. That it is not so as yet, may be the subject of reproach, and sometimes of self-reproach, but not of despair. Within the recollection of those who have not passed the middle of life,—and still more of those who themselves laboured, (with others who have gone to their rest,) in comparatively dark discouragement,—the dawnings of a brighter day have increasingly shewn themselves in our horizon. But that it is not yet fully come, should operate to urge us to embrace all feasible plans which have in view to strengthen one another's hands, and warm one another's hearts. If sometimes these appear to cooler calculators (perhaps themselves too much biassed by the wisdom of the world) to be in a great measure the offspring of enthusiasm, let them, on their part, produce one thing great and good which has been achieved without enthusiasm somewhere: let them remember, too, that there is an enthusiasm which the understanding cherishes and approves; as well as that which is the wild-fire of the feelings and the imagination: and instead of chilling it with their excessive caution, let them, partaking a little of its generous glow, aid it with the direction of their soberer judgment.

The caution of benevolent prudence, and the cheering influence of faith and hope, must be united in all objects having directly in view the diffusion of truth and righteousness, as well as in all others which respect human well-being. The darkest appearances often are, in the order of Divine Providence, the precursors of results on which benevolence must dwell with delight. At that all-important juncture, when “from the sixth hour darkness was over the whole land till the ninth hour,” hope seemed ended, and to the eye of sense all was finished. It *was* finished, but in a far different import. As far as respected the personal services of the Saviour on earth, the work was done. The seed was sown. It was so sown that the genial influences of heaven might be confidently looked for. It was sown in tears, it was watered with blood; but he knew that it would be reaped in joy. He knew the great

purposes of his Heavenly Father; and he knew that they must be accomplished. And what has been the result? What baffles human wisdom, and yet cheers and animates the heart of Christian love.—Human wisdom, when it aims to penetrate the future, is often but folly: human strength, when it is exerted for purposes which, however good, anticipate the order of Divine Providence, is always weakness. Human wisdom would have anticipated that that which is so great a blessing would be communicated to all men, at once; and, like the light of the sun, would in quick succession visit every region of the globe to refine, to elevate, and to lead to holiness and to blessedness: and human strength would have put forth unhallowed weapons to force the reception of the seed where the ground was not prepared. He who said, “Let there be light, and there was light,” could, indeed, at once have given light to the soul, where the deepest shades of ignorance involve in gloom and wretchedness; but, in his infinite wisdom, He had appointed that the progress of spiritual light should be gradual, not only to the individual, but to mankind at large: He has made that progress depend on human exertion and benevolence: and in carrying on the great work to its termination, He has seen fit to make the exercise of faith and hope the mainspring of benevolent exertion. It is not alone those who are to be blessed, but those also who bless, that are to be disciplined. The seed of love is to be sown by the hand of faith. We are to watch and wait for opportunities; and even then we can merely sow the seed; we cannot command the weather or the soil: sometimes, even with the best directions of sound understanding and experience, it will prove to have been sown in vain. But where we have done our best, (not with the presumption of pride, but with simple desires to serve our generation according to the will of God, and to fulfil, in our sphere of exertion, the noblest prayer that the human heart can utter,—“Thy will be done,”) we may rest satisfied in the results, be they what they may; and where, notwithstanding the disappointments which benevolence must often experience, and without which it would be narrowed and debased, we go on with “the patience of hope and the labour of love,” our labour shall not be in vain. *We* may see no results: for a time there may be none apparent: but the momentous interests of truth and righteousness are silently but effectually advancing. It was the noble maxim of a noble mind, “No effort is lost;” and certainly no effort can be lost, in which good intention is guided by discretion, and supported by the higher motives of love and duty. The good intended may not be accomplished. Some unexpected evil may follow, even where the understanding has been enlightened and disciplined by religion. In the moral world, causes which at the time we do not comprehend continually operate in ways which we know not, and cannot with the utmost sagacity fully discern. But such efforts are like the prayer of the faithful, which, if not answered in the way desired, returns to his own bosom. Disappointment leads to self-discipline and self-correction. It leads to mutual forbearance and mutual aid. It “worketh patience, and patience experience, and experience hope, and hope maketh not ashamed.”

In some directions, hope will not be ashamed. The time must come when “the knowledge of Jehovah shall cover the earth as the waters do the channels of the deep.” The lines of providence and of prophecy all converge towards this glorious period; and whatever contributes to it, is deserving of our desires for its success, and of our exertions according to our abilities. Blessed, we may say is he, who, by his labours, his privations, his instructions, or (if this be all he can give,) what is the most essential of all, his

example, contributes to lead others to know the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent; and, in the practical possession of this faith, to walk in the ways of holiness here, towards eternal life hereafter. It may not be ours to witness personally the majestic streams which are swelling the ocean of divine knowledge; it may not be ours to direct even the smaller rivers in their course, to discern their moral grandeur, and behold the way in which they contribute, on the great scale, to the promotion of human worth and happiness; but there are few, indeed, who may not guide the fertilizing rivulet from that fountain which never faileth, from which all may derive the means of blessedness to themselves and others, whose waters are healing to the soul.

It is one of the bright features of the present day, which throw gleams on the distant prospect, that the power of individuals is incalculably increased by the resources for mutual co-operation, themselves so wonderfully augmented by the various means of mutual communication. Leaving out of view the external aid afforded by such co-operation, who has not felt the influence of its encouragement? The sympathy of those whose views have the same direction, often affords a cheering support to the heart; it is animating even where it is not needed to give steadfast perseverance. When the aged ambassador of Christ was approaching the great capital of the world, which he was about to enter in chains to be "brought before Cæsar," he was met at some distance by brethren from Rome; and the sacred historian, with the beautiful simplicity which so constantly adorns his writings, records, that when Paul saw them, "he thanked God and took courage." I appeal to the heart of every one who has been engaged in labours of love, whether this is not accordant with the truth of nature. Who is there among us, who labouring to promote the welfare of others, either in a wider or a narrower sphere, has not felt encouragement and strengthening comfort, when he found that in his work he was not alone; that others thought it good as well as himself; that he might expect their aid and co-operation in it; and at any rate be free from those chilling obstacles which sometimes sink the energies of the soul, and check those efforts which might otherwise turn to a full account?

Many services in the cause of truth and righteousness depend on the individual labourer almost alone: and there he must learn to go on perseveringly and faithfully, doing his best, and resting in no way on human motives, but seeking his encouragements in those views and prospects which Christian faith so richly presents; aiming to employ his means of usefulness with discretion as well as earnestness, but not sinking under occasional disappointments of his best efforts, or the occasional perception of error in his previous plans; taking care to correct, to limit, or to extend, as circumstances direct; but always *going on*, with simple aims and chastened desires; receiving with gratitude every indication of success, but satisfied even when hope is deferred; and trusting the Lord of the harvest, when sometimes it appears that the seeds of truth and love are dying in the earth.

But in a variety of instances, the great purposes of human improvement, both temporal and spiritual, cannot go on without the encouragement and co-operation of others. Every public object must have some individuals who shall make it their peculiar care, and watch over and direct it, and keep up its usefulness, and see to its interests; but even this, though essential, is not enough; there must be aid (pecuniary or otherwise as the case requires) from others who, perhaps, may not take the same degree of interest in it, or see its importance in the same strong light, or (if they did) have other

objects more peculiarly claiming their attention and exertion. Human life is short, and the human mind is limited. It is necessary that we should act *with* others, in order to enable *them* to do that which, even if it could be accomplished by the labours of an individual during a long life, can be better done at once by joint exertion. In order to do with our might that which our hand findeth to do, before the night of death closes our service—and to enable others to do the same—there must often be mutual acquiescence in the convictions of those who have entered into the subject, and perceive the whole bearings of it, and are prepared to give their efforts to carry the purposes of benevolence into execution. And then, by the arms of others, we may reach to do good where our own cannot. Through them, our little pecuniary sacrifices will tell to the best account; with their activity and intelligence, we may surmount obstacles which have baffled us; and we may possess and may communicate the consolation, (when it seems to the wearied head or the depressed heart as though we could do nothing,) that the work will go on, however humble and limited our own share in it, so as to promote its great purposes. And, in like manner, where our co-operation is cheerfully given to others, we may expect, or if we do not expect, we shall find co-operation from others. In this *present* state of existence, there is vastly more of retribution than can be discerned by the inexperienced.

In order to do as much good as we can, we must place confidence in others; and, where their motives are obviously right, and their judgment on the whole has proved to be sound, when they have plans of usefulness which, if successful, must be beneficial, and which cannot be successful without aid from others, we should not be too nice in scanning all the difficulties, presenting all the obstacles, and reckoning up all the failures; but *venture* a little. Our means are limited, and our *ventures*, therefore, should be well directed; but if we are too fastidious, or too fearful of success, we shall create difficulties and prevent it.

(To be continued.)

THE EAGLE'S DEATH.

I SAW an Eagle die—

A little star-flash trembled in his eye,
 And, as if some mysterious hidden power
 Had held it open to that mournful hour,
 And then had dropped the slowly-closing curtain,
 It fell—and darkness wrapped it instantly :
 His giant claws were stretch'd as if in sleep
 And crampish agony—intense—uncertain—
 And then—as still as any frozen heap :
 The wings which often on the mountain summit
 Flapped—battling with the clouds and winds of heaven,
 Had fallen to earth, as falls the senseless plummet ;
 And the proud plumage which with storms had striven
 Lay in vile clay polluted—ruffled—rifled.
 One gasp—another—and another ? No !
 'Tis over—death and senselessness have stifled
 All sound—all sense—all motion—and the king
 Of all aerial creatures is a thing
 For worms to revel in.

A.

THE WATCHMAN.

No. II.

“ Watchman, what of the night ? Watchman, what of the night ? The Watchman said, The morning cometh, and also the night.” Isaiah xxi. 11, 12.

SOME half dozen years since, a gentleman, not very distantly related to the writer of the Watchman, being then a student for the ministry, was on a visit in Devonshire to an uncle. At the request of his relative, who was a liberal Calvinist, he agreed to preach in a village near the town where his uncle resided. The use of the pulpit was readily granted to the nephew of Mr. A., and the day being arrived, the young minister proceeded to fulfil the wishes of his relative. He left early in the day, and his uncle was to meet him at the chapel. Arrived in the village, he was treated with the greatest kindness and hospitality. At last, seated at the tea-table, his host, a respectable farmer, with somewhat of the Puritan in his appearance and manner, thus addressed him, of a sudden interrupting the conversation that was going on : “ Well, preaching time is near ; but you have not told us what you are ; but suppose it is all right, as your uncle sent you. Are ye of the Church ? *Minister.* No. *Host.* All the better ; then ye’re a Dissenter ? *M.* Yes. *H.* Well ; are ye a dipper ? *M.* No. *H.* Are ye a free-willer ? *M.* No. *H.* Are ye a Calvin ? *M.* No. *H.* Well, what then ? *Why,*” suddenly bethinking himself, “ ye ar’n’t a Socinian, are ye ?” *M.* “ I am a Unitarian.” “ A Socinian !” exclaimed his daughter, a fine stout country girl that sat in a distant part of the room, listening to the dialogue with deep attention—“ A Socinian ! How can ye preach, then, and ye deny Christ ? O I’ll go and tell them there’ll be no preaching to night.” And away went the alarmist to frighten the poor villagers with the idea of this Socinian preacher. Such a thing had never been seen in the village before. In a quarter of an hour all was in a bustle. The host had enough to do to keep people out of the house. At length the minister of the chapel arrived. When he saw him, the young minister felt his spirits rise, for his appearance of body and countenance indicated that no superabundance of sectarianism disturbed the easy tenor of his days. “ He was glad to see his young friend ; he had no doubt his young friend could preach without giving offence. He had a great respect for his uncle ; his orthodoxy was unquestionable, and he would not have requested the use of the pulpit except he had known that all would be right.” While the minister thus spoke, in came the daughter. “ He cannot preach, he’s a Socinian. He cannot preach, every body says so,” she exclaimed. The minister retired with mine host into a private room. Meanwhile, the milk of human kindness which had an hour before abounded in all hearts, was curdled and soured. When the minister and his friend returned, they said, “ It was a pity the people had been alarmed, but as it was so, it would be better to have a prayer-meeting. In that the young gentleman could join or not as he chose.” This was determined on ; though the daughter intimated by her looks that she doubted if a Socinian could pray, as she knew he could not preach. As they went to the meeting-house, crowds came to gaze, looking with curiosity what this Socinian could be like ; but few were present at the service, fearing, perhaps, too near an approach to so frightful a heretic. Of all persons interested, the uncle was most disappointed, who had meant to give these ignorant rustics a practical lesson on the virtue of charity, intend-

ing to inform them after the sermon, which he had reason to believe would be such as they would approve, that the preacher was a Unitarian. This narrative relates facts which might be enacted in hundreds of villages in this kingdom. The public mind is poisoned; and the uninformed look upon Socinians and Catholics as two species of monsters. Why or wherefore they are bad, is not well known. The dislike of them is a matter of feeling rather than of judgment. Two things, it is true, they do iterate; the one "denies Christ," the other would "burn you;" or, to use the words of a Cheshire Squire, recently used at a county meeting, "would make beef-steaks of you." But beside these facts, their feelings are those of indistinct and undefinable aversion, much like the raw-head and bloody-bone sort of feeling with which we remember, in our youth, to have thought of ghosts and of a churchyard. And now that hobgoblins are getting out of fashion, being afraid of being caught by the schoolmaster, we should not be surprised to hear of honest matrons charming their infants to sleep by telling them, not "the old gentleman is coming," but "the Socinians will have you." A moral may be extracted from mirth, and the moral of our story is, that Unitarians must labour to enlighten the minds of the ignorant, and to check the misrepresentations of the interested. The latter is the chief point; for while the pulpit and the press are replete with injurious statements, Unitarians cannot secure the attention, much less the favourable regards, of the people. The functions of "the Watchman" are, therefore, most imperatively called for, and we invite the support and assistance of our friends.

It is highly gratifying to a mind that is wishful for the advancement of knowledge, liberty, and religion, the three great blessings of humanity, to hear of the progress which our American brethren are making. With them religious as well as civil liberty prevails, and occasions abundant happiness and prosperity. In the Constitution it is provided that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The illustrious statesman, Jefferson, with a full consciousness of the blessings he had conferred upon his fellow-citizens, ordered to be inscribed upon his tomb, "The Author of the Declaration of Independence and of the Statutes of Virginia for Religious Freedom." In America, accordingly; in no shape or form are they pressed down and crushed by the incubus of an Established Church. Two or three States, it is true, oblige every individual to contribute to the support of the ministers of religion, but leave it optional with him to select any church within the parish or district to which the tax shall be applied. For this exception we are sorry. We regret it because it is an infringement on liberty. Of the continuance of religion we have no fear in America, nor in any other country when left to itself. Its springs are too deeply seated in the heart to admit its being long neglected. Men marry without compulsion, and men will worship God without legislative interference; for they are no less religious than they are social beings. We regret the exception, because we have seen and felt the evils of Establishments, and because experience proves that in whatever form they have existed, they tend to evil, and eventually prove the greatest obstructions to religion and liberty. The state of religion in America proves beyond a question that full and unrestricted liberty is the element in which religion best flourishes. No people are more attentive to religious observances than the Americans; and so rigid are they in abstaining from all occupation and amusements on the Sundays, and in frequenting places of public worship, that travellers, while passing through some parts of America, have conceived

themselves carried back to the age of the Puritans. In America there are no drones in religion : those who work, and those only, are paid. And in no country are the working clergy paid so well. There are no rich livings, like those of Durham ; there is none of the poverty of the Dissenting ministers, nor of the penury of the Welsh clergy. In those denominations, where previous acquirements are deemed necessary, the salaries equal the ordinary income of members of the professions of law and medicine. And so would it be, as it ought to be, in this country, were the remuneration of ministers on the same footing as in America ; with no church eating up the fat of the land by compulsory exactions, and indirectly grinding down the industrious and honest Nonconformist. The most numerous sects, particularly in the Eastern states, are the Congregationalists or Independents, who, in Massachusetts, are supposed to be equally divided between Unitarians and Calvinists ; while in the other New-England states, the latter creed predominates. The Episcopalians have ten bishops and three hundred and ninety-four clergymen. Their duty is very different from the idle and fattening office of an English spiritual overseer. They have, of course, no jurisdiction, except in matters of religion, and this is confined to persons of their own religion, who voluntarily subject themselves to it. Catholics are found in many parts, but have ceased to be regarded with dread. In Michigan, a Catholic priest was a short time since elected a delegate, though nine-tenths of his constituents were Protestants, and the office in question was contended for by some of the most important individuals in the territory. A high degree of intelligence exists in the mass of the people, and the most liberal provision is publicly made for education. In New York, there were in the year 1825, without including 656 schools from which no returns were made, 7773 common schools, which were supported wholly or in part by the public, and attended by 42,500 scholars. Besides the means afforded for the lowest elements of education, the state of New York has a fund which has contributed largely to classical schools, and endowments to no inconsiderable extent have been made to colleges. Other provinces have been equally munificent ; and Congress in authorizing the admission of new states into the Union, has made to them distinct appropriations of public lands for common schools, and for the establishment of colleges. From a list which now lies before us, we learn that there are no less than thirty-six distinct universities and colleges in the United States, of which twenty-six have been established since the declaration of Independence in 1782, educating nearly four thousand students, under more than two hundred instructors. Of these, Harvard University, at Cambridge, Massachusetts, three miles from Boston, is the most ancient and best endowed classical establishment in the United States. Its list of benefactors is long and respectable, containing the names of some of the most distinguished characters in Great Britain and America. Its academical course is completed in four years, and the expense of board and education amounts to one hundred guineas per annum. Its library is larger than that connected with any other academical institution in the Union, comprising 34,600 books, besides a library of the students' including 6400. The whole number of *alumni* since its foundation is 4941, of which 1271 have been ministers. So rapid, however, has been the progress of Unitarianism in America, and so great has for some time been the demand for ministers, that the provision hitherto made for the education of ministers has been found greatly inadequate, and exertions are now making to educate a greater number, so as to meet the pressing and increasing demands of the present moment. Though we have intimated, yet it may be desirable for

some readers to distinctly remark, that this University is in the interest of the Unitarians.

Turning from America to our own country, we hail with inexpressible joy the measure of justice which will shortly, we trust, be effectually completed; a measure which rests on the broad and immutable principle that no one should be injured in his civil rights on account of any religious opinions he may entertain. In the recent agitation of this measure, the Methodists have taken that part which, from their principles, we were prepared to expect. Not content to remain at rest like the Quakers, they have sided with the favourers of exclusion. Methodist chapels have been made ready means of obtaining signatures to Anti-catholic petitions. Methodist ministers have volunteered their services to retain on the neck of their brethren the galling yoke of civil disqualification. There is no sect whose principles are, in our opinion, more hostile to the great cause of religious liberty, and there is none that requires a more vigilant watching. With the exception of this aspiring and domineering sect, the Dissenters, as a body, have done themselves great credit in the struggle. Some things, indeed, have occurred which call for animadversion; and they shall have it in due season. But the fitting time is not yet come.

The Bishop of London has revoked his decree. His Lordship was waited upon. It was told him, that the case of the remonstrants was already drawn up and in the hands of counsel. So soon as the Bishop saw this determined opposition, he also saw reason to change his opinion. His Lordship's, therefore, must be added to the catalogue of famous conversions which the last six weeks have witnessed. We confess we do not think his Lordship has added much to his respectability by his interference; but in retiring from the contest—a contest in which victory would have been a loss—he has shewn no little of that virtue of discretion which stands with many men in the stead of courage. The Bishop will do well for the future to listen to the old proverb, “Look before you leap,” and to keep watch over a disposition to meddle, which, we fear, he has in excess. The hierarchy have the greater need of discretion, since, as they tell us, their house is divided against itself. The Bishop of Bath and Wells, in a recent Charge, declares, “The Church, alas! instead of being at unity within itself, is sadly torn asunder by contentions and schisms. The rent, however, does not reach to the centre. The main difference exists with a class very respectable in number, highly respectable in character and conduct, and who are found in the bosom of our church. These, however, I would remind in the true spirit, I hope, of Christian charity, that it is always dangerous and delusive to trust to the imagination and feelings, instead of placing our belief and reliance on the sure, unerring word of the gospel. Fain, too, would I impress on their recollection, that an age of enthusiasm has always been succeeded by an age of infidelity. And to both parties I would observe, that ‘a house divided against itself cannot stand.’” These remarks are in themselves very good; but the fact which they set forth overthrows one position which the defenders of the Church are wont to take, viz. that articles and creeds are necessary to keep away schism. We knew well enough before, that they did not, and could not, and ought not, to effect such an object; but we prefer hearing the truth from the mouth of a dignitary of the Church. There is now in agitation another matter in which the authorities of the Church are divided. The incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, is possessed of a considerable number of slaves in the island of Barbadoes, from whose labour it has drawn large sums of mo-

ney, but for whose temporal or spiritual interests little, until recently, has been seriously attempted by it. What a monstrous inconsistency, that a society should exact money to spread the gospel from the degradation of human beings! Yet this it has done for one hundred and twenty years. To enlighten one portion of the heathen world, it has enslaved another; to save one portion, it has been the voluntary means of destroying another; for, in the opinion of its members, the slaves not being converted are eternally lost. This iniquity has been honestly exposed in the *Anti-Slavery Monthly Reporter*. Thereupon the wrath of the ghostly dealers in human flesh and blood was excited. They employed threats, they retained advocates, but all to no purpose. By this the matter was more agitated, and the iniquity more generally known, till at last the organs of the Church themselves that have a regard to character and consistency, avow their astonishment at the continuance of such an absurdity, as a Christian society drawing part of its funds from slave labour. "We have," says the *Christian Observer*, "urged the subject in vain for several years; it has now received a more full and public discussion, and must command the attention of the Society, of Parliament, and of the country at large." There are more iniquities in the Church than the people dream of, but the time is arriving to draw aside the veil. The public mind will soon, we trust, be comparatively free to look into abuses innumerable, both small and great, which require the day of reformation. It is no grateful, it is no lucrative, task to expose abuses, but a sense of duty will bear us up above these difficulties, and the readers of the *Repository* may be assured we will not fail to reveal the hidden things of darkness.

Are the principles of Nonconformity at present so well understood by Dissenters as they ought to be? Are they taught by ministers, to the young of their flock, as extensively as they once were, and as from their importance they deserve to be? Are not many, not to say the majority of Dissenters of the present day, Dissenters from habit rather than principle—rather because their fathers were so before them, than because they themselves are convinced of the necessity of Dissent? These questions must, we fear, be answered in the affirmative. We have been led to put them from reading in the *Leeds Mercury*, for Feb. 21, a letter of the Rev. Mr. Hamilton, of Leeds, in which occur the following words:—"When I recollect the learned and pious men who conceive Episcopacy a divine appointment, I would rather my tongue should cleave to the roof of my mouth than utter a word against them; of many such I can never think but I am reprovèd and shamed by their holy example and faithful ministry. Long may they adorn their present spheres." Mr. Hamilton, we believe, belongs to the Independents; and we know, and with pleasure allow, that they have, as a body, done much for the furtherance of religious liberty, which we consider as to no small extent identified with the progress of Dissent. But, however praiseworthy the body to which Mr. Hamilton belongs, that gentleman cannot shelter himself, nor do we believe he would wish to do so, under the cover of their merits. The tenor of the passage, we confess, greatly surprised us. Mr. H. will not speak against Churchmen, because they are good men. Does he not know that every good Christian wars, not with men, but with principles; and are principles to be screened from just and temperate animadversion because those who hold them are good men, or rather, because among those who hold them good men are to be found? The admission of this would prove the impropriety of all discussion, for scarcely can the religious doctrine be named that has not been held by some professors of

exemplary character. If Mr. H. is awed into silence as to the scriptural claims of Episcopacy, by the learning and piety of those who conceive it a divine appointment, will he, as he ought in consistency, allow transubstantiation to remain unassailed, or sheathe the sword and bid it permanently rest, heretofore drawn against Unitarianism? But so enraptured is this Nonconformist divine with the vision of piety and learning which has passed before him, that he exclaims, "Long may they adorn their present spheres." Again we affirm, with men we war not, but with systems, and the system of an established church is to us an abomination. Otherwise is it regarded, it should seem, by Mr. H. But what would the Nonconformists of other and better days have said to such a wish? Surely, an "esto perpetua" sounds oddly on the lips of a Dissenter. If dissent be justifiable, it is only on important principles; and if important principles authorize dissent, we cannot, as Nonconformists, wish the perpetuation of the established church. We frankly confess that we see not how Mr. H. can be acquitted of having, in this wish of his, forfeited his principles. Nor do we believe that such conduct can recommend him to the judicious among Churchmen. Consistency, even in what we deem a wrong course, is sure to secure the respect of opponents; but adulation, or a forfeiture, though it be only by implication, or a relaxation of principle, are discommendations both with those who are on our, and those who are on the opposite, side.

We would fain hope that the time is not very distant when the principles of Nonconformity will receive again at the hands of Dissenters the attention which they merit. This must be done if we wish to retain the ground we have gained; for the tendency in the mass of the people is not to the meeting-house but to the church; and so it always will be, while honour and emolument and fashion stand at the church doors, and offer their attractions and rewards. Nor should we forget that we have been invaded and weakened in our strong hold; that the Methodists have taken thousands from the poorer and middling classes of society, and, to say the very least, neutralized them. Let us then set forth the principles of dissent—a full conviction of their importance alone can effectually counteract the many and powerful interests which oppose us. But for ourselves, we confess, we are not content to rest satisfied with the ground already gained. More remains to be done than has been effected—abuses innumerable require exposure, and must be removed. The same neglect of their interests is not manifested by the church. They have thrown down the gauntlet, and, armed at all points, appeared in the arena. Amongst other champions, Bishop Burgess merits especial notice. He has lately published three catechisms, which have already reached the fourth edition, "on the Principles of our Profession as Christians, as Members of the Church of England, and as Protestants." Two positions which he maintains are truly amusing; these are, that the British churches were *Protestant before they were Catholic*. (A truly fair specimen of the ὑστέρων πρότερον, or in humbler phrase, "the cart before the horse.") The other, that "the Reformation (is) not a separation from the Church of Rome." This last position is in a note thus illustrated, with a gravity truly episcopal:—"A Papist once asked a Protestant, 'Where was the Church of England before the Reformation?' To which the Protestant replied, 'Where yours never was—in the New Testament.' Another Protestant being asked the same question, answered it by another question. 'Where was your face before it was washed?'" The catechist is thus instructed in this knotty matter:

“ Q. If the Church of England did not separate from the Church of Rome, what do you call our national *Reformation* ?

“ A. An *abjuration* of Popery, a *renunciation* of the Pope’s jurisdiction, a *rejection* of the unscriptural doctrines and usages of the Church of Rome, and therefore a reformation of the Church of England, and not a separation from the Church of Rome.”

Well, then, Dissenters are not separatists—what do they more than *abjure* Episcopacy—*renounce* the King’s jurisdiction—*reject* the unscriptural usages of the Church of England? But what new light have we here! I may *abjure*, I may *renounce*, I may *reject*, and yet not separate from that which I *abjure*, *renounce*, and *reject*. No, rather than allow that a separation took place, the good-natured bishop will bring on the Church of England all the charges that have been levelled at Popery. Before this reformation spoken of, this reformation of the Church of England, she, not the Papal church, was all that was bad and shameful; she, the Church of England, was idolatrous, the mystery of iniquity, and a number of other very naughty things, which our modesty forbids us to mention. This is to defend the church with a witness, and reminds us of the old saying, “ Defend me against my friends, and I will defend myself against my enemies.” Well may the church remonstrate with the bishop in the words of Hecuba :—

Quæ mens tam dira * * *
Impulit his cingi telis * * *
Non tali auxillo, nec defensoribus istis
Tempus (ecclesia) eget.

The Christian Remembrancer, in a review of a work entitled, “ What is the One True Faith ?” the author of which has the presumption to doubt if the doctrines of justification by faith, election and reprobation, original sin, and other kindred dogmas, are really and expressly taught in the Scriptures, remarks, “ There are other inconsistencies which we cannot find leisure to enumerate, but they are chiefly to be reconciled with the ‘ Book of Common Prayer’ according to the plan of the late Dr. Samuel Clarke, and some other Pelagian or Arian publications. The author says he commenced his subject in ignorance on many points, but whether or not his intentions are pure, he has sadly soiled his reputation as a biblical critic by slipping into the *mud of Socinian absurdity*.” There was little reason to cast a slur on the ignorance with which the inquirer set out. Provided his mind was teachable, ignorance was no impediment to the reception of truth; and that it was teachable, the inquiry on which the author entered proves beyond a question. Ignorance combined with docility is of all states of mind that which the Scriptures can most easily and most assuredly benefit. A tabula rasa is thus presented to the sacred penmen; on it they can inscribe what they will; there are no previous impressions to erase, or in remaining to confuse and confound their teachings. Ignorance! What teacher is there of any science that would not infinitely prefer an ignorant to a prejudiced disciple? The Bereans were ignorant when they searched the Scriptures daily to discover whether the things which had come to their ears were or were not the revealed will of God. But, perhaps, the Bereans would not be exactly to the taste of the Reviewer; for teachable ignorance is an abomination in his sight. But then there is a question whether or not the author was actuated by pure intentions. Raised by whom? The Reviewer. On what grounds? Diversity of religious opinion: this, from the language used, is the only supposable

ground. What an amazing stretch of charity, which contents itself with humbly doubting if a dissenting brother can have pure intentions! The times indeed are changed. Firmness of principle is lost; laxity pervades all ranks; even Churchmen are not exempt from its baneful influence. Why, in the good olden time, Calvin or Athanasius would have damned the author right heartily at once, not only to future but to present burnings! The Reviewer, afraid of incurring the charge of latitudinarianism, proceeds to mend his manners—and with what elegance of diction, what purity and propriety of allusion! Shades of Longinus, Blair, and Campbell, why are ye not at hand to immortalize with merited eulogy the exquisitely chaste and simply beautiful phraseology of our Episcopalian Reviewer! “He has sadly soiled his reputation as a biblical critic by *slipping into the mud of Socinian absurdity.*” Now, my Dissenting brethren, now may you fully learn the extent of your loss in being excluded from our venerable halls of learning. In vain would you try to reach the height of this great excellence. None but a son of Isis or of Cam is capable of such beauties; none can so admirably realize the *simplex munditiis*.

Most of our readers are probably aware that a separation has taken place, in America, between a very considerable body of Quakers attached to the teachings of the venerable Elias Hicks, and those who term themselves Orthodox. An attempt has been made in this country to create the belief that Elias Hicks and his followers are unbelievers. To this disgraceful object the Congregational Magazine has more than once lent itself. In the number for November last there are these words: “Not one Friend has been found in this country to avow his agreement in the sentiments, the *infidel* sentiments, as I need not hesitate to term them, of Elias Hicks.” Yet the writer convicts himself of falsehood in the very next sentence. “Your correspondent, a seeming exception, is, I suspect, no member of our society.” And why? Because he has been “disowned for the profession of Socinian principles.” On the writer’s own shewing, then, supposing his *suspicion* well founded that the correspondent and the “disowned” are the same, (which is supposing in a rough and random manner,) there is found one Friend to avow his agreement in the sentiments of Elias Hicks, and who for that avowal has been, we are told, “disowned.” Gentle reader, we reckon ourselves to be possessed of a most excellent temper. Scarcely any thing can discompose us; and on this ground, with all due humility, we commend ourselves to thee as good Watchmen. We carry a cudgel, it is true; but the brawl has not yet happened in which we have been provoked to use it, and now that we are engaged in thy service, we find our meekness doubly strong. And, in sooth, we have manifold need of all the meekness we possess; for at every corner of the street we are dubbed “Infidel.” On all sides our ears are saluted with these insulting sounds. From the mitred dignitary down to the starving curate the watch-word passes, and each, as he meets with an Unitarian, looks and wonders, and raises his eyes to heaven, and cries out, “Infidel.” And now, here is this grey-bearded and grey-coated, and verily, we doubt not, sleek and well-fed Quaker,—one who bears in his very name proofs of men’s injustice, and admonitions to deal fairly by his fellows,—this *Quaker* echoes, and echoes without hesitation, the hue and cry which bigotry has raised, and which ignorance and bigotry support. Protestations we know it boots little to make, and we reserve them for more worthy occasions. Nor shall this man of starch and parchment and oily visage excite our ire. He may have done it in ignorance, and those merit our indignation who, know-

ing better, cry out "Infidel," and give the cue to the ignorant or the bigoted. That his knowledge is not overburdensome we infer from another passage of his letter to the Editor of the Congregational Magazine. "The Society of Friends has *invariably* believed in the divinity of Christ, redemption through his blood, and the divine authority of the Holy Scriptures." The man who could make such an assertion (the italics in which *invariably* is written are his own) can know next to nothing of history, or must otherwise be actuated by a wicked mind. Before we go on to the proofs of his assertion, we beg our readers to notice the insinuation contained in the above citation, that Unitarians do not believe in the divine authority of the Scriptures. To this we might add, taking the words in their literal meaning, "redemption through the blood of Christ." Unitarians, whatever the Quaker may insinuate, believe both these points, and are not, as the Quaker intimates, contradistinguished by these particulars either from the society of Friends, or any other society of Christians. We are, we confess, in spite of all the exhibitions of a bad spirit or of culpable ignorance on the part of the orthodox, no little surprised to find a member of the meek-looking and meek-spoken society of Friends thus traducing his neighbours. We would recommend him to put off some of the outward and visible signs, in exchange for more of the inward and heavenly grace. In proof of the invariable orthodoxy of the society of Friends, "our American brethren," he says, "have collected quotations which make up a thick octavo volume." Out of this he makes some extracts. Let our readers judge how far the following proves that the Quakers, or rather that the writer, believed in the deity of Christ: "Jesus Christ, who is the express image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature, by whom were all things created that are in heaven and in earth." This quotation is taken from G. Fox, and is, we may suppose, the strongest that could be adduced. It proves, what? That Fox believed in the supreme deity of Christ?—that he was really and truly God? No; it proves that Fox was an Unitarian. Thus have believed and thus now believe thousands who have been branded with the name of heretic.

If any of our readers have the happiness to be acquainted with the Rev. J. J. Tayler, of Manchester, they will believe either that the writer of the following sentence has lost his wits, or that Mr. T. has recently undergone a metamorphose greater in extent and more grotesque in character than any found in Ovid. Thus speaks the Reviewer of Mr. Tayler's Sermon on Communion with Unbelievers, in the Congregational Magazine: "It is well that the great enemy of God and man" (that is, we suppose, Mr. Tayler, or Unitarianism in him embodied) "is not always permitted successfully to veil himself in the garb of an angel of light. In his attempt to put on the fleecy cloud which does not belong to him, and to etherealize himself to the view of mortals, the arch-fiend" (alias Mr. Tayler) "is often found to fail; and we clearly discern through the disguise the hideous and malignant features of the apostate spirit and the father of lies." (It is not long since we saw Mr. T., and then he looked as mild and as benevolent as ever: the writer must be beside himself.) He goes on, however, "We were led to this reflection in opening the pamphlet before us"—(what, in the very *opening* of it! Surely the writer has strange sights. We have just looked into the pamphlet, and we declare that it has a most bland and composed aspect)—"which we think is charged with the rankest distillation, the very quintessence of infidelity, under the colour of reason and Christian candour, the show of which we have often regarded as an engine of spiritual seduction adopted by the power of darkness of almost equal force with his accomplish-

ed invention of Papacy itself, though adapted to a very different class of minds." Such an outrage on all decency not even those of our readers who know how inveterate is the hatred which the Congregational bears to Unitarianism, were, we are assured, prepared to expect. We have sometimes wondered at the figure these calumniators would bear if they were confronted with the victims of their uncharitableness. How easy the conviction of the falsifier! how overwhelming the confusion of the reviler! Alas! that such as this indecent tirade should be the food with which self-called Evangelicals pander too often to the bad passions of men! Exposed they shall be; we wish we could expose them in their own quarters. But to them all access is barred. Could we face the enemy on his own ground, and expose his tricks to the eyes of his deluded followers, one vigorous effort might keep in a load of calumny, and a little perseverance utterly destroy these poisoned arrows of controversy. But excesses of this sort come of the practice of anonymous reviewing. Many a falsehood would never have seen the light, had the name of the author been required to accompany it. The dignified *we* of Reviewers is often prostituted to most unworthy purposes. Reader, if you are ignorant of the cause of all this unholy zeal in the Congregational, you may be told that Mr. Tayler was led to preach in the course of his ministry a discourse on Communion (that is, intercourse) with Unbelievers. The following week there appeared in a Manchester paper a garbled account of this discourse, intended to represent Mr. Tayler as the apologist of unbelief, written by a pragmatical lawyer of Manchester, who may perhaps know something of the penning of this truculent article in the Magazine (which is the organ of the sect to which the lawyer belongs). To prevent the misconceptions to which the unfair and mutilated statements of this article might give rise, Mr. Tayler thought proper to publish the discourse as it had been delivered. The discourse simply maintains that the only universal criteria of character are sincerity and moral rectitude: that where these are found, we need not trouble ourselves about the speculative tenets of their possessor: if the fruit is good, the tree cannot be corrupt. With virtuous unbelievers, therefore, it is lawful to have intercourse as circumstances may direct and warrant; and certainly, though they ought to take no share in the management of the concerns of a Christian congregation, they are not to be excluded from the services of the house of prayer, because for such conduct there is no warrant in scripture, liberty of conscience declares against it, and no less the moral benefit of unbelievers. Let them come—Christ did not reject the inquirer: let them come—we have no authority over the mind of man: let them come—their difficulties may be removed: at all events, it is hardly possible that they should receive no good from the devout services of the house of prayer. These things it is which have concentrated all the puny anger of the Reviewer. Alas! how little do such men know of the real spirit of Christianity! Well would it be for the interests of true religion if these words of the illustrious Bacon were graven on their hearts—"Men's minds should move in Charity, rest in Providence, and turn upon the poles of Truth." The general spirit of the discourse is truly admirable. It is refreshing to turn to the pure atmosphere of minds like those who, with Mr. Tayler, have left the sympathies of the world to imbibe the spirit of the gospel. We are free, however, to confess, that in reading the discourse we sometimes felt the want of that discrimination which separates unbelievers into two classes, the vicious and the good. We do not say that it is entirely absent, but it does not appear to possess a due degree of prominence. Unbelief, we doubt not, often arises from corrupt affections; and unbelief, we know, is

often accompanied by a bad life. In both cases, we know that no one would condemn it more unhesitatingly than Mr. Tayler, and doubtless, if the thought had occurred to him in the composition of his lecture, we should not have been compelled to make the suggestions in which, for the sake of truth, we have now indulged.

Nothing of this kind, however, can justify the abuse and licentiousness of the Reviewer; the gravamen of his charge against us is thus stated in his own words: "This is in short the nucleus of Unitarianism disburdened of its shell, and it amounts to this, that outward conduct is the only thing of which professed Christians have a right to take cognizance among each other." We thank the Reviewer for having condescended thus to fairly represent us. So rare an instance of justice merits a special notice. And if this be the nucleus of the matter, pray what must become of the flourish, the parade of figure, of infernal machinery, the grotesque assemblages and flimsy nonsense with which he introduces this most wicked of all sentiments? The premises warranted a more pregnant instance of diabolical turpitude; and the judicious reader will infer, from the want of correspondence between them, that the writer had more words than ideas, and more wrath than discretion. Sober argument would, we doubt not, avail little with a man of such a disposition as the Reviewer betrays; we shall therefore reserve reasoning for an occasion when there is some hope of its turning to a profit. But before we leave this calumniator, we would request him carefully to read over, once a week for the next twelvemonth, the 14th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, and then he may know and feel somewhat more of the genuine spirit of the gospel touching diversities of faith. In the mean time, not all the professions he can make, not all the rhetoric he may command, will exonerate him from the charge of being a persecutor. Men's characters are their dearest possessions, and he who attempts to asperse them as the Reviewer has shamefully done, is actuated by a persecuting spirit, and brings forth the fruits of persecution. Of such characters Burns, in a communion which is a twin-brother to that to which the Reviewer belongs, had ample experience, and has thus borne testimony to their spirit:

But gin the Lord's ain focks gat leave,
A toom tar-barrel
An twa red peats wad send relief
An' end the quarrel.

In condemnation of all who breathe this spirit we use the words of Jeremy Taylor, in that most admirable work "The Liberty of Prophecyng:" "But then, if the result be, that men must be permitted in their opinions, and that Christians must not persecute Christians, I have also as much reason to reprove all those oblique arts which are not direct persecutions of men's persons, but they are indirect proceedings, ungentle and unchristian, servants of faction and interest, provocations to zeal and animosities, and destructive of learning and ingenuity."

Loquitur the British Critic: "We have been led to the more particular notice of this valuable recommendation by the recollection of a circumstance which we once heard related, and which powerfully sets forth the usefulness of sitting down to the perusal of Scripture with a view to the elucidation of some one point. A believer in the doctrine of the Trinity happened to be attended in his last illness by a Socinian physician, and frequent discussions arose between them respecting the office and person of the Saviour. As the end of the Christian (notice how being a Christian is identified with believing in the Trinity, and is put in contradistinction to being a Socinian) was ap-

proaching, he told his medical friend that he was no longer able to endure the fatigue and exhaustion occasioned by those long arguments, and must, therefore, close their religious conferences with one suggestion, which was to be considered as his last and most solemn counsel. He adjured the inquirer to peruse St. John's Gospel attentively and repeatedly, without note or comment, and to retain closely in his mind throughout this perusal the following sentence, 'Jesus Christ is nothing more than the son of Mary, a mere mortal man.' By this method, said the dying patient, the Socinian hypothesis would be brought into perpetual collision with the sacred text; and if this incessant conflict does not satisfy you that either Socinus or St. John is in error, I should totally despair of your conversion.' What was the result of this advice in this particular case we are not informed, but we are unable to imagine how such a contest could well be carried on beyond the first fourteen verses of the first chapter. For we would ask with the Bishop (Blomfield), 'Would an evangelist, holding the Unitarian opinions of the present day, open the gospel as St. John does?' We have here a question which throws a strong light on the value of the counsel given to the Unitarian physician, and to us it appears that the mind which would escape from this assault must be utterly impassive to every weapon or implement in the magazine of reason; even though St. John should rise again from the dead and wield the sword of the spirit, such an intellect would remain invulnerable."—The readers of the *Watchman* will be at least indebted to us for the perusal of a number of stories derived from the abundant stores of the evangelical warehouse. Therein are tales innumerable, rivalling in number and merit even the treasury of the *Minerva* press; tales for the old and tales for the young; tales for the wise and tales for the foolish; but above all, a plentiful collection entitled, "Tales of Horror, or Death-bed Scenes, illustrative of the Effects of Socinianism; humbly dedicated to the old Ladies of the Three United Kingdoms." In days of yore the story-teller was a vagabond upon the face of the earth, much like his quondam friend and once faithful companion Master Punch; traversing the high-ways and by-ways in quest of an audience, and, posting himself "in the chief place of concourse, in the openings of the gates," he uttered his voice in the streets. But now he mounts the pulpit, disdaining his former lowly condition; he takes the chair of grave Reviewers, and associates himself not only with the ranting Methodist, but with the grave and evangelical divine. His condition is changed, his duty not diminished; his talents are in requisition in almost every religious sect, and abundant honours reward his industry. Thus it is in this world; it is not things, but their aspects, which change; and no one knows how soon Punch himself, though now left by his more fortunate brother to pick up a scanty and precarious subsistence, may receive a call equally dignified with that which the story-teller has heard and answered. But to quit this moralizing mood. The Reviewer furnishes his readers with an infallible recipe against all the evils of Socinianism. We fear that when investigated it will prove of no more worth than the following for the tooth-ache, given of old by John Heywood, in his "Four P's, a very merry interlude of a Palmer, a Pardoner, a Potecary, and a Pedlar."

PARDONER.

Nay, Sirs, beholde, heer may ye see
 The great toe of the Trinitie:
 Who to this toe any money vowth
 And once may role it in his mouth,
 All his life after, I undertake
 He shall never be vext with the tooth-ake.

This is the prescription ; in reading the Gospel of John, in order to keep out, if you are out, and to get out, if you are in, the errors of Socinianism, you must bear constantly in mind that "Jesus Christ is nothing more than the son of Mary, a mere mortal man." This being the teaching of Socinianism, the gospel will be in perpetual collision with the heresy, and you will pass safely through all perils and temptations. Now, can we admit with any appearance of probability, that the Reviewer was so ignorant as to believe that the description he has given of Jesus fairly represented the views entertained of him by Socinians ? He might believe that they thought him the son of Mary ; *could* he believe that they held him to be *nothing more* than the son of Mary ? nothing more in office ?—nothing more in union with God ?—nothing more in respect of divine favours ?—nothing more in being set apart to a work of stupendous importance, in being filled with all the communicable qualities of Deity, in being raised from the dead, exalted to the right hand of power, appointed ruler of his church, until all enemies be put in subjection ? Was it possible that any professor could be so ignorant as to represent Unitarians as holding, that he who has partaken of the immortality of the Father of the universe, was a mere *mortal man* ? Yet it is said that this opinion was held by Socinus—Socinus, who worshiped Christ. We cannot, without hypocrisy, ascribe to a writer of no despicable talents ignorance so gross. Whether he meant his representations to be taken as of Socinians or of Unitarians, he must, we really think, have known better. Otherwise, what blind leaders of the blind are permitted to write in the chief organ of the episcopal church ! But in this case, so plain, we cannot bring ourselves to think that blindness in part even hath happened to the revilers of the brethren. Well then the alternative follows that the Reviewer has knowingly and wilfully misrepresented our opinions.

E'en ministers they hae been kenn'd
In holy rapture
A rousing whid, at times, to vend
And nail't wi' Scripture.

If, as we fear, the British Critic has in this case in part verified the Poet's declaration, pity and not expostulation is our only resource ; not expostulation, we say, for this would be set down to the account of a mind not spiritually discerning.

We dispute not, therefore, the assertion, that the gospel would be in perpetual conflict with the statement of the Reviewer. But then, be it remarked, it is *his*, not our statement. To the plan which he proposes, if he will allow us the liberty of setting forth our own creed, we have no objection ; and let the reader take, instead of the groundless representations of the Reviewer, the following exposition of Unitarian doctrine, touching the person and office of the Redeemer. The Reviewer, we hope, will think none the worse of it (or of us) for being in the very words of Holy Writ : "Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God, by signs and wonders which God did by him." This is our creed—this and nothing less. Will this be in perpetual conflict with the language of St. John ? If so, it is not Unitarians and the Scriptures, but Peter and John that are in opposition. For our own parts, we should desire nothing more than that the merits of that part of the Unitarian doctrine which teaches the supremacy of the Father and the subordination of the Son, should be tried by an appeal to St. John's Gospel ; for it is our firm belief, that of all the sacred writings this gospel contains the most numerous and the most satisfactory proofs of the truth of Unitarianism. St. John's Gospel is emphatically the Unitarian Gospel. As to the brave words which the Re-

viewer lavishes in the latter part of his remarks, we make small account of them. They prove only his ignorance of the nature of evidence, or the nature of the human mind. To hear him talk, one would imagine that the deity of Christ was taught in the first fourteen verses of John's Gospel as plainly as any proposition in Euclid is demonstrated. So clear, full and express is the evidence, that he who sees it not must be actuated by malice prepense, or impassive to every weapon of reason. Nay, a miracle could not add force to the proof—St. John might rise from the dead and yet fail to convince of the deity of Christ him who had deemed the first fourteen verses of the Gospel obscure, or inadequate for the purpose for which they are alleged. Such pretensions have one effect—not to convince gainsayers—not to resolve doubts—hardly, we should think, can they confirm the initiated; but they expose the barrenness of the land and the poverty of the cause which they are fabricated to serve. No wise, no candid man would make them; for the mere fact of the diversity of opinion which prevails respecting the meaning of the introduction to John's Gospel—diversity which has existed in all ages of the Church, and amongst men of all varieties of opinion—proves, beyond a doubt, that the force of demonstration, that the certainty of moral evidence, that these at least are entirely wanting in the words of the beloved disciple. Nor, in order to complete the exposure of the Critic's pretensions, need I mention more than that the name of Jesus is not once mentioned in the fourteen introductory verses. If this can be disproved, we are content to be deemed dishonest men—if scriptural evidence, amounting to moral certainty, can be adduced to prove that reference is made to our Lord in the term *Logos*, we shall be thankful for information which we have sought for in vain; and further, this being effected, our Reviewer is invited to the equally difficult task of hence deducing the doctrine of the deity of Christ.

To enter and expose in detail all the bad-spirited speeches, allusions and statements that are made by the orthodox against Unitarians, would require more of our space than we can spare, and more of our readers' patience than we can claim. A constant fire is kept up against us all along the line of orthodoxy. From the elevation of the pulpit the signal is given, and every tiny member of the church militant that has a missile to cast, aims at the ill-fated Unitarians. True it is that we live and breathe notwithstanding, for most of the missiles prove a *telum imbellis sine ictu*. Yet, though life is safe, comfort is diminished. It is no pleasant thing to be bespattered with mud, nor can we, nor ought we, silently to endure the diminution of our influence which continued misrepresentation cannot fail to occasion. Under the lash of evil tongues we have long remained—in silence almost total we have borne the numberless petty attacks of those who think no epithet too harsh for a Unitarian; and we have gained nothing by forbearance. Misrepresentation has only become, on that account, the bolder. We may adopt the words of the ancient Britons on complaining of the severities they had to endure at the hands of the Romans:

Nihil profici patientia, nisi ut graviora, tanquam ex facile tolerantibus imperentur.

But it is natural and it is necessary for the injured to reply. For this it must, on the present occasion, and in reference to a few minor delinquencies, suffice to trust to the justice of our readers. We shall, therefore, do little more than transcribe one or two instances of injustice, hoping that publicity will serve for an exposure, and exposure be attended by a prompt reprobation. One of the first infant-schools in Dublin was chiefly founded by

Quakers and Unitarians. Some zealous clergyman established one in the same neighbourhood. The patronesses of the first school, seeing there would be no necessity for two distinct establishments in the same district, offered, through the rector of the most fashionable parish in the neighbourhood, to unite the two schools. At first all went on well—the rector was anxious for the junction. But soon the scene was changed. The rector had found out the alarming fact of the school being partly under the direction of Unitarians. On this he signified both his own and his wife's wishes, that the members of the committee of the first school should withdraw their names and superintendence, alleging as a reason that they could not act with Socinians, whom they considered worse than Roman Catholics. Of course the proposition was not listened to. The same lady declared that no children of Roman Catholics should be admitted into her infant-school.

The last number of the Congregational Magazine contains an article on the controversy respecting the Three Heavenly Witnesses. The writer, after stating the efforts of Porson, remarks, "We deplore that one of the ablest pieces of criticism and argument in our language should be the production of one whom no Christian can regard as an auxiliary or friend." Still bad as Porson was, there are worse. "Though Porson was not a man of serious piety, it is proper it should be stated, that he was not a Socinian." How then can Lardner, who was, alas! a Socinian, be regarded by any Christian "as an auxiliary or friend"? He evidently cared nothing about the matter, but his understanding was decidedly in favour of the orthodox creed on the subject of the Trinity. So that even a bad Trinitarian is something better than a Socinian, and a man may believe in the Trinity and yet be devoid of piety, and no friend of Christianity.

We were much pleased on looking into *The World*, a religious newspaper, to read the following words, reporting part of a speech by Dr. Pye Smith, uttered at a dinner after the ordination of the Rev. J. Young to the pastoral office over the congregation of Albion Chapel, Moorfields: "The Rev. Gentleman then adverted to the principles of union which had existed for so long a period between various bodies of Christians who entertained a difference of opinion upon some minor points. He could not but persuade himself that the time would speedily arrive when that event should be accomplished which was represented by a prophetic symbol, when the prophet saw two sticks and was commanded to bind them together and proclaim them to be but one." A gleam of hope was kindled in our mind that a better spirit was beginning to prevail. The language of eulogy was already on our tongue, and we pleased ourselves with the idea of duly commending, in the next report of the *Watchman*, the rising liberality of our orthodox brethren. But the same page dashed our hopes and extinguished the slender flame of charity which had been kindled. The Rev. W. Orme spoke next and told the meeting, that "the union referred to arose at a peculiarly interesting period of the state of religion, and he trusted he should not be considered as uttering a reflection, when he said, that it arose amidst such circumstances as, under the providence of God, called for a bold and decided testimony in favour of the doctrines of the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ: it arose at a period when Arminianism and Socinianism were in danger of eating up the vitals of Christianity." The Gentleman misnames us, intimates we are not of the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ, and declares that our doctrines tend to destroy the vitals of Christianity, and yet, good, easy man, hopes this is no reflection! We tell this good, easy man, and all who, like him, are wont to speak without knowing whereof they affirm, or without that candour which thinks no evil,

that "the best way," to use the words of Jeremy Taylor, "is to leave tricks and devices, and to fall upon that way which the best ages of the Church did use: with the strength of argument, and allegations of Scripture, and modesty of deportment, and meekness, and charity to the persons of men, they converted misbelievers, stopped the mouths of adversaries, asserted truth, and discountenanced error. And I would fain know why is not any vitious habit as bad or worse than a false opinion?" Nor do we doubt that the venerable Prelate would have deemed speaking ill of one's neighbours a "vitious habit."

THE CATHOLIC RELIEF BILL.*

THIS great and glorious measure is proceeding triumphantly, although a most deafening clamour attends every step of its progress. Our next number will, we expect, record its having become the law of the land, and then we may indeed congratulate our country upon taking her proper position among the nations of Europe. Religious equality will then be the principle of British legislation, and sectarian privilege the exception. Anomalies, numerous and odious, may still remain; but a fatal blow will have been struck at the root of the tree of intolerance, on which they grow, and they must ultimately wither and perish. Nor can we refrain from fondly cherishing the hope that the spirit of our legislation will tend rapidly to become that of social intercourse also; and that the divisions and animosities of sects will give place to justice, charity, and mutual tolerance.

The Relief Bill is really what it professes to be, and scarcely, in any particular, falls short of our wishes, while it far surpasses our hopes. There is a pettiness in so constructing one of its clauses as to prevent O'Connell's taking his seat as member for Clare, which might as well have been avoided; and the prohibiting of a Catholic priest wearing his robes any where but in chapel, is an abridgment of the privileges at present enjoyed by that order, which seems altogether needless and useless. But these are trifling deductions, and the latter, perhaps, merely accidental. The Bill itself, of which an epitome will be found in our journal of parliamentary proceedings, is a noble act of justice, and will be the glory of our Statute-book. It throws wide open the doors of the constitution, and declares that henceforth there is

* Catholic State Waggon. London: Cowie and Strange. Pp. 16.

An Appeal to the Plain Sense and Calm Judgment of the People, on the Question commonly called Roman Catholic Emancipation. By One of the People. London: Longman & Co. Pp. 49.

Freedom to Catholics consistent with Safety to the State. By a Protestant. Birmingham: James Drake. Pp. 24.

A few Words in favour of our Roman Catholic Brethren: an Address to his Parishioners: by the Rev. Edward Stanley, M. A., Rector of Alderley. London: J. Ridgway, and J. Swinnerton, Macclesfield. Pp. 16.

Letter to the Rev. William Thorpe. Republished from the Bristol Mercury, February 17, 1829. Bristol: Manchee. Pp. 8.

Report (taken from the Caledonian Mercury) of the Speeches of Sir James W. Moncreiff, Bart., Dean of Faculty; Dr. Chalmers, and other distinguished Individuals, at the Meeting held in the Assembly Rooms, on Saturday the 14th of March, 1829, in order to Petition Parliament for the Removal of the Disabilities affecting the Roman Catholics. Pp. 24.

neither Catholic nor Protestant, but that they shall alike enjoy the protection of the state, and may alike aspire to the possession of its dignities.

There is, indeed, no inconsiderable drawback upon our joy in the other measures, of which one preceded and the other accompanies the Relief Bill, and both of which seem to us gross violations of public right. The act for suppressing the already self-dissolved Catholic Association is, in fact, the erection of the Lord Lieutenantcy into a temporary dictatorship; while the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders visits patriotism with the heaviest punishment which has hitherto been inflicted upon the grossest corruption. The worst which can be said of these electors is, that they have sacrificed their independence to a spiritual influence in preference to a pecuniary influence. A poor plea for so delicate and dangerous a procedure as the annihilation of the right of electing by the persons elected! Still, as this is altogether a political and not a religious question; as the right of suffrage must ere long become the subject of discussion, and of revision and reformation throughout the United Kingdom; and as there is a distinct understanding that this "costly price" (as Mr. Brougham justly termed it) must be paid for securing the success of the splendid act of conciliation and union to which it is appended, we must stifle our regrets as well as we can, and look only to the mighty balance of good about, as we trust, to be realized.

The Catholics are behaving admirably. The prompt dissolution of that mighty machine, the Association,* was an expression of confidence in the Government alike judicious and generous. The forbearance with which the unpalatable accompaniments of their promised Emancipation have been regarded, is also most wise and honourable. O'Connell's request that the clause which disallows his wearing the legislative laurels of his Clare campaign should pass uncontested, is in the same spirit. Never has the victory of a party been more calm and dignified. Never have men shewn themselves more worthy of the freedom which they are at length to possess. If in the struggle they were intemperate and violent, it was because they were in the struggle: even while their chains are falling off the irritation ceases.

Why will not the Established Church save something of its remaining reputation by desisting from its opposition, or at least modifying and purifying the character of that opposition, to what cannot now be prevented? To put itself in opposition at all, is acting a most ungracious part. The quiet possession of the endowments and dignities of the Catholic Church might

* THE LATE CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION.—Upwards of fifteen thousand members, qualified to vote at its sittings, had enrolled themselves in this great national convention at the period of its dissolution. The qualification was cheap and simple. An annual subscription of 1*l.* sterling, or upwards, constituted a member, after he had been proposed *viva voce* at one of the weekly meetings. Amongst the members were included one thousand four hundred non-Catholics, four Catholic archbishops, twenty Catholic bishops, and two thousand six hundred Catholic clergymen. The voluntary contribution called Catholic rent, and by some invidiously termed "an inverted military bounty," is ascertained to have been paid (in sums varying from 1*d.* to 100*l.*) by not less than three millions of the people of Ireland. It reached the Association through the hands of eight thousand local collectors; and, apart from its usefulness as furnishing "the sinews of war," it acted as an instructive indicator of the public feeling, the periodical amount being evidently influenced by every temporary subject of excitement. Contributions to this fund were received, unsolicited, from Paris, Bourdeaux, Havre, Dieppe, Tours, Harfleur, Lisbon, Oporto, Rome, New York, Boston, Norfolk, Charleston, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Savannah, St. Louis, Quebec, Montreal, Newfoundland, and the West Indian Islands. The remittances were accompanied by letters and addresses expressing the sympathy of the contributors with the people of Ireland.—*Dublin Evening Post*.

very well satisfy its cravings; and a sense of prudence, if not of justice, of decency, if not of benevolence, should restrain its appearing as the sole obstacle to the inclusion of Catholics in the equalization of civil rights, and the consequent pacification of the empire. But the clergy have plunged headlong into this unholy strife. And never has there been less scrupulosity in the means resorted to than on this occasion. County meetings have been made the most disgraceful scenes of confusion by the introduction of organized bands of vociferators to drown all discussion. Petitions have been manufactured and multiplied by the most shameless contrivances. It is enough to say that the signatures to them have repeatedly outnumbered the population of the places from which they professed to emanate. Placards directly inciting to riot and violence, have been profusely distributed in the metropolis and in other large towns. The Press has teemed with unprecedented abuse of public men, and the Throne itself has not been respected. The progress of the Bill has been obstructed in Parliament in, to say the least, a very unusual manner. A strange and monstrous co-operation has been established between our dignified but militant Church, and the veriest dregs of Dissenting fanaticism. Unheard-of preachers and congregations, who, in other times, would only have been raked into light to shew how intolerable their crudities were, have been blazoned forth before the Legislature as the Dissenting Interest, and their ill-scribbled rolls of parchment have flaunted among the banners of the armies of Intolerance. And, to complete the disgust of the spectacle, we have had A DUEL for the honour and glory of the Protestant Religion.

It is all in vain. The Church will accomplish nothing but its own disgrace. Ministers are proceeding with a firmness which cannot fail. They *will not fail*. The liberal members of the Church of England, those who are its redemption in public opinion; the best known and most esteemed of all the Dissenting denominations; the leaders and pride of the Scottish Church; the distinguished of all political parties; these all have rallied round them, and are marching with them, like some noble and venerable procession of priests and heralds, in ancient times, advancing calmly between hostile armies; conflict ceasing at their presence; opposing warriors hearing the voice of truth and peace; and a thousand angry passions hushed into quietness, and giving way to union and affection.

The Pamphlets, the titles of which are connected with this article, are merely such a chance specimen as has been forwarded to our office, of the manner in which the Liberals have "carried on the war." They are a very creditable specimen. Of the "*Catholic State Waggon*," which is a reprint of the first article of the recently published number of the Westminster Review, an immense quantity has been circulated; and so there should be. It is an article which Bentham might have written for its logic, and Swift for its humour. The "*Appeal*" is avowedly by a recent Convert. It is calm, moderate, and persuasive. The writer takes the same ground as Mr. Peel, and he thus illustrates the necessity of concession:

"The law is become a dead letter; factious passions poison the very seats of justice, and openly resist the execution of its decrees. Society is utterly unhinged; there is neither confidence nor goodwill in any kind of human intercourse. Landed estates are unproductive—thus throwing the landlords into the scale against us; the people are destitute of employment, emigrating to England, overrunning us, and reducing to their own miserable level our peasantry, already sufficiently distressed; our two Houses of Parliament are violently disunited in themselves, and discordant also with each other. A

strong Papist influence exists in each, and is likely to include nearly every Irish member of the Commons after another general election.* No united ministry can be found to conduct our Government, without the absurd expedient of taking raw and unknown men; the attention and energy of our Government are distracted and drawn away from all other important affairs of State, by this ever-urgent and hopeless topic; the heirs-apparent of many powerful men are at open variance with those whose places they expect to fill; even the heir-apparent of the throne avowing an opinion favourable to the claims of the Papists. All things, in fact, are at variance; disunion and disruption existing and increasing in every quarter, and in every rank amongst us. Affairs in Ireland are come to such a state, that no man, of any party, even pretends to suppose that a refusal of the claims of the Papists can have any other issue than rebellion and civil war."—Pp. 15, 16.

The "Protestant" appears to be a Birmingham man, and writes primarily for his townsmen. He shews much good sense, seasoned with occasional smartness, in meeting the common objections to the safety of trusting Catholics with power. For instance :

"How trifling the obedience is which the Catholics are disposed to yield to his papal majesty, history shews, even when the pope had a great deal of the substance of that power of which he now retains nothing but the shadow. Some of the severest laws that have ever been passed against the interference of the pope in the concerns of England, were passed in the reign of Edward the First, that is to say, more than two hundred years before the Reformation was even heard of, and when the pope was acknowledged to be the head of the church. These laws, called the laws of *præmunire*, impose very severe penalties on any one who shall venture to obey the authority of the pope, when opposed to that of government. And the king, by several direct acts, shewed how little he respected the directions of the representative of St. Peter. The pope forbade Edward's invasion of Scotland—Edward laughed at the pope, and marched northwards. The pope excommunicated an Englishman who had offended him—Edward ordered the messenger who brought the writ of excommunication to be hanged. The pope granted the English clergy an exemption from a tax that had been levied on the people generally—Edward seized on the property of the clergy in spite of the exemptions."—Pp. 16, 17.

The "Rector of Alderly" endeavours, in a manner worthy of a minister of the gospel of peace, to enlighten his parishioners by an historical view of the conduct of the Catholics, intermixed with reflections of a truly Christian character.

The Letter to the Rev. W. Thorpe is a most clear and cogent piece of argument, which we should gladly have inserted entire, had our limits allowed. We can only make two short extracts.

The general principle stated :

"Whatever annexes temporal evil of any kind to the exercise or profession of religious opinions, whether by the infliction of disgrace and obloquy, of pain and fear, or of hatred and suspicion,—by injury to the peace, the property, the domestic charities, the civil rights and privileges, the influence and respectability of another,—or, by the destruction of liberty or of life, is an infringement on the rights of conscience: and, however inflicted, whether by the power of the tongue, the pen, or the sword, by the strong arm of human law and temporal dominion, or by the no less powerful *influence* of the press or the pulpit,—such infringement on the rights of conscience is a spe-

* "The recent election in the county of Clare reduces this probability almost to a *certainty*."

cies of persecution. My peace and good name are dearer to me than money; my power of usefulness than my liberty, or even my life: if you destroy the former, you persecute me more pungently, though with more refined torture, than if you employ the arm of civil authority to inflict on me fines, imprisonment, and death."—P. 2.

Apprehensions of danger unfounded:

"But suppose the Catholics unchanged, and as much disposed as ever to that intolerant spirit which the Exclusionists manifest, how little is the alarm which you have shared and propagated, supported by the FACTS *of the case!* Is there any absurdity chargeable on what they call Popery, greater than that of maintaining that at most seventy or eighty Catholic members of the Commons could overpower the remaining mass of Protestants? And, IF they did, that a *dozen* Catholic noblemen could overpower the bench of Protestant Bishops,—to leave out of reckoning the great bulk of Protestant Peers? And, IF they did, that a Protestant King would forget the rights of the majority of his subjects, and the tenure of his crown, and expose himself to that forfeiture of it which, for his now proposing to the Parliament to do justice to ALL, has been daringly held up to alarm him by some of the Journals of the day? And, IF all this did take place, that the Protestant influence of the great mass of intelligence, culture, wealth, and energy of our nation, would not outweigh the whole? I should rather say, *that influence MUST PREVENT the whole, and renders every part impossible.*"—P. 6.

The Report of the Edinburgh Meeting, which the London papers gave but a meagre account of, is exceedingly interesting. It should do something towards putting right the very incorrect notions commonly entertained about the state of opinion in Scotland. The list of distinguished men present, with the addition of Sir Walter Scott and Dr. A. Thomson, who both wrote to express their cordial concurrence in the object of the meeting which they were unable to attend, comprises the intellectual pride of that intellectual city. The meeting was intensely crowded, and the expression of its feelings was most enthusiastic. We give the 4th Resolution with the commencement and close of Dr. Chalmers' eloquent address:

"That, though we entertain no doubt that the firmness and prudence of the distinguished Statesmen who have united to support this great measure, will speedily carry it into effect, without any considerable impediment, and that the partial clamours which have been excited against it will soon subside in general and permanent satisfaction, we think it right not only to offer our humble tribute of thanks for the good we believe it will effect, but earnestly to pray for its speedy and entire consummation, and to express our conviction, that its abandonment, if such a thing were possible after the hopes that have been raised and the pledges that have been given, would be the greatest of all national calamities, and would aggravate tenfold all the evils and dangers from which it promised to deliver us."

"Dr. CHALMERS rose to second the resolution which had just been read, and was received with enthusiastic acclamations. He waved his hand repeatedly to induce silence, which having been at length obtained, he spoke *verbatim* as follows:—I understand that the present meeting would not have been called, had it not been for certain anterior efforts made in this city, and the object of which was to obtain signatures for a petition against the Catholic Emancipation. We should have remained quiet; and this, perhaps, would have been as significant an expression as we could have given of our confidence in the measures proposed by his Majesty's Government. Had there been no public exhibition on their part, I understand that there would have been no public exhibition upon ours. And I advert to this simply for the purpose of remarking, how delusive the indication often is of the state of public sentiment, in as far as it is grounded either on the majority of petitions

or on the majority of signatures. The truth is, that they are the non-contents, the alarmists, who are in motion: and the contents scarcely ever think of moving, but in the capacity of counter-alarmists. Meanwhile, if arithmetical deduction were to be made of all the petitioners on both sides of the question, it would be found that the great body of the public, the great body of the population, were in a state of rest—(*Cheers*)—and they count with us, not with our opponents. (*Loud cheers.*) We have read of expressive silence; and this is what their silence expresses. (*Cheers.*) There may have been a local effervescence here and there; but mainly and throughout the land, there is a general attitude of quiescence, perhaps the strongest demonstration that could be given of the reliance which the people of Scotland have on the wisdom and the safety of the measures now in agitation.

* * * * *

“ I am sensible of one advantage which our opponents have against us, and that is a certain command over the religious feelings of the population: and yet I am not aware of any public topic on which the popular and prevailing cry ever ran so counter as it does at present to the whole drift and spirit of Christianity. What other instruments do we read of in the New Testament for the defence and propagation of the Faith, but the Word of God, and the Spirit of God? How does the Apostle explain the principle of its triumphs in that age when truth was so mighty to the pulling down of strong holds? It was because the weapons of his warfare were not carnal. He confined himself to the use of spiritual weapons, the only ones by which to assail the strong holds either of Popery or Paganism. (*Cheers.*) The kingdom of God, which is not of this world, refuses to be indebted for its advancement to any other. Reason, and Scripture, and prayer—these compose, or ought to compose, the whole armoury of Protestantism; and it is by these alone that the battles of the Faith can be successfully fought. (*Cheers.*) It is since the admission of intolerance, that unseemly associate, within our camp, that the cause of the Reformation has come down from its vantage ground; and from the moment it wrested this engine from the hands of its adversaries, and began to wield and brandish it itself, from that moment it has been at a dead stand. (*Applause.*) We want to be disencumbered of this weight, and to be restored thereby to our own free and proper energies. We want truth and force to be dis severed from each other—(*Cheers*)—the moral and spiritual to be no longer implicated with the grossly physical; for never shall we prosper, and never shall we prevail in Ireland, till our cause be delivered from the outrage and the contamination of so unholy an alliance. (*Cheers.*)

“ It is not because I hold Popery to be innocent that I want the removal of these disabilities; but because I hold, that if these were taken out of the way, she would be ten-fold more assailable. (*Cheers.*) It is not because I am indifferent to the good of Protestantism that I want to displace these artificial crutches from under her—(*Laughter*)—but because I want that, freed from every symptom of decrepitude and decay, she should stand forth in her own native strength, and make manifest to all men how firm a support she has on the goodness of her cause, and on the basis of her orderly and well-laid arguments. (*Loud cheers.*) It is because I count so much—and will any Protestant here present say that I count too much?—on her Bible, and her Evidences, and the blessing of God upon her churches, and the force of her resistless appeals to the conscience and the understandings of men; it is because of her strength and sufficiency in these that I would disclaim the aids of the statute-book, and own no dependence or obligation whatever on a system of intolerance. (*Cheers.*) These were enough for her in the days of her suffering, and should be more than enough for her in the days of her comparative safety. (*Loud cheers.*) It is not by our fears and our false alarms that we do honour to Protestantism. A far more befitting honour to the great cause is the homage of our confidence; for what Sheridan said of the liberty of the press, admits of most emphatic application to this religion of truth and liberty. ‘Give,’ says that great orator, ‘give to Ministers a corrupt House

of Commons; give them a pliant and a servile House of Lords; give them the keys of the Treasury and the patronage of the Crown; and give me the Liberty of the Press, and with this mighty engine I will overthrow the fabric of corruption, and establish upon its ruins the rights and privileges of the people.' In like manner, give the Catholics of Ireland their emancipation; give them a seat in the Parliament of their country; give them a free and equal participation in the politics of the realm; give them a place at the right ear of Majesty, and a voice in his counsels; and give me the circulation of the Bible, and with this mighty engine I will overthrow the tyranny of Antichrist, and establish the fair and original form of Christianity on its ruins.—(The delivery of this splendid passage, which was given with prodigious force, elicited a burst of applause so deafening and enthusiastic, that the effect was altogether sublime. The shouts and huzzas were thrice renewed, and it was with difficulty the speaker could proceed.)

“The politics of the question I have left to other and abler hands. I view it only in its religious bearings, and I give it as my honest conviction, and I believe the conviction of every true-hearted Protestant who knows wherein it is that the great strength of his cause lies, that we have every thing to hope from this proposed Emancipation, and that we have nothing to fear. (The conclusion of the Rev. Doctor's speech was greeted with renewed shouts and huzzas, the whole audience standing and waving their hats in the air. This lasted several minutes, and it was not without difficulty that the tumult of admiration was allayed.)”—Pp. 17—20.

And here we trust we take our final leave, except as a matter of history, of the discussion on the question of admitting Roman Catholics to the full possession of the rights of men and citizens in the British Empire.

MISCELLANEOUS CORRESPONDENCE.

Co-operation.

LETTER III.

To the Editor.

SIR,

I COME now to shew why Unitarianism, if consistent, ought to be more favourable to Co-operation than any other religious persuasion.

In this argument, it will not be necessary to advocate the truth of Unitarianism, but only to follow the assumption to its consequences, and to state as fairly as possible the contrasts of creeds.

I assume, then, the simplicity of the creed: unqualified respect for the rights of conscience: unlimited civil liberty: individual independence of mind: universal spread of knowledge.

Those who have lived much among the orthodox, to use a distinctive name, have perhaps observed that the practical object of their creed is dogma, not happiness. It is to make all mankind think alike or profess alike, not to make them all happy alike. As they have undertaken to do this upon a vast number of

points, extremely abstruse and difficult to be understood, and some of them professedly above comprehension, i. e. above human understanding; so, to effect their purpose, they assume the necessity of a class of men devoted to the study of these difficult and metaphysical questions, who, having attained a sufficient knowledge of what it is that is above comprehension, are to make it plain to others: this plainness being still of such a nature, that the hearer is not qualified to do without the teacher, or to pass a judgment upon his doctrine, or to reason upon it, or to think upon it, as a matter of truth or error.

The peculiar doctrines of Christianity, as they are called, are few in number, and yet so lengthy and onerous in their explanation and illustration, if such it may be called, that perhaps it may be said, the preacher always ends where he begins, and that revolving years only bring with them the same perpetual motion of propositions, so varied, dissected, and recomposed, that while you recognize every feature, you can never per-

ceive the harmony and unity of the countenance. Thus all the efforts of all the learned are, as to their practical bearing upon human happiness, resolvable into a mere *strenua inertia*. The truth of these remarks is apparent in the fact, that scarcely one of the great steps towards the sublime object of the universal consummation of human happiness, has originated with the orthodox, or has been heartily promoted by them. The creed is a fundamental obstacle, and an impassable stumbling-block. The orthodox appear to have no idea of the possibility of any great increase in the virtue and happiness of mankind, and only look forward to a millenium as a miraculous event, the fruits of which are to be enjoyed by departed saints after a resurrection. Ultimately, the Almighty not being able to untie the knot, will cut it, by delivering up the greater part of the world to misery.

The Unitarian, having rejected this complicated system, which is literally above comprehension, is driven into a creed so simple, that he is immediately compelled to search for new fields of exercise and development. It is no wonder that this task, imposed upon him for the first time, should be one of great difficulty. Invention and discovery are the most arduous of human efforts. It is true that the early adventurers, occupied with soundings and fixing beacons, could not examine and record the beauties and productions of the country, towards which the navigation was so dangerous. But having accomplished this, they have no ground to stand upon but that of *Love*. They have nothing to teach and nothing to require but love. They do not teach men to believe so much as to act. When they behold a fellow-creature, they do not inquire after his creed, but they say, "Behold, our brother: he is a man, and we will love him."

The Unitarian does not waste his time upon theology as a science. The simplicity of his creed forbids it. The Bible is enough for him, which as it is the only record of the Will of God, so is the reading of it the nearest approach he can make to personal converse with its author. This is the veil, from behind which the oracle is delivered, and his own heart affords the interpretation of that oracle.

When a man has once adopted the Unitarian creed, the sooner he can get rid of controversy the better. It bars his way to virtue, knowledge, and happiness. It obstructs his usefulness to his

fellow-creatures; his devotion to the great cause for which the Saviour lived and died; the cause of universal love, virtue, and happiness. To be a man is the highest privilege God has conferred: as yet we know not how high: it is to be partaker of the divine nature. To be a man is enough, no matter how poor or mean. If my brother be poor, I will help and cherish him: if in sorrow, I will comfort him: if ignorant, I will instruct him: if vicious, I will reclaim him: if an Atheist, I will pity him, mourn for him, pray for him, and commune with him. Thus will I drive Satan from his bosom, and wait till the gentle spirit takes possession of his heart, when I will encourage him, comfort him, and compel him to love me and live with me, and bless me, and through me to know and bless his Maker. This is Unitarianism; this is human nature.

But such a heart and mind is dissatisfied with the world as it is: the pride, arrogance, and ignorance of man: the idle and voluptuous lives of some: the poverty and misery of others: the wide inequality of condition: and above all, the inexplicable problem that "one soweth and another reapeth." Having now no long line of dogmas to expound, his thoughts are intently fixed upon human improvement and happiness. To this his studies are consecrated, his private musings, his public duties. Can man be happy? Can he be virtuous? That is the question. Creature of circumstances, can circumstances be so moulded and framed, that they shall produce character and therefore happiness? Let us inquire: let all men freely inquire and bring together their stores, that we may attempt the solution of the most interesting of all problems. Here again we perceive the superiority of a simple creed. Many who join in the search and pursuit, restrict their companions to their own roads and domain. "Find it with us, or find it not." It must be sought through the medium of dogmas, which have been so long examined and sifted as to prove their utter barrenness and emptiness. The simple creed says, "Search with me, but search also in your own direction. Whoever finds, shall win the prize."

Such is the present state of the world upon this momentous subject. Knowledge has at length spread and descended to the workman. He surveys his form and strength: he moves his limbs preparatory to putting forth his strength. He sees himself a giant, hitherto unconscious of his strength. He has as yet,

only used that strength for others. "Can I feed others," he says, "and not myself? Can I build for others, and not for myself? Enough. The time is come. One shall not sow and another reap: one shall not build and another inhabit: but they that sow shall reap, and they that build shall inhabit."

The Unitarian has no dread of knowledge as the Orthodox has. He has no ambition to confine, to limit, or to direct it. He knows that knowledge cometh from the Most High, who will inspire it, direct it, and regulate it, but will never limit it. He wishes not to dictate to future generations, but hopes that they will be too wise for him to instruct. His faith is, that in the universal spread of knowledge rests the regeneration and happiness of human nature. While he administers the cup of cold water with the one hand, he pours instruction over the mind with the other, and he hopes that neither the one nor the other will lose their reward.

Finally, he acknowledges a conscience. He is well aware that the great moral truths which it is yet necessary for mankind to know and to feel, are only to be discovered, developed, and expanded, by the most tender encouragement of conscience. Instead of scrutinizing into the recesses of that holy place, that he may establish the torture in it, he regards it with religious veneration as the abode of God. Tell him in his inquiries and his edicts that he is approaching the precincts of the sacred tabernacle, and he instantly retires. He thinks no crime so great towards his brother as to break in upon his sacred hours, his private thoughts, his holy communion with his Maker. "I may indeed rap at the door, but I must not enter unless invited; and if invited, I must for ever bear inviolably in my bosom the secrets which have been revealed to me in the presence of God." Is there any sect which has this reverence for conscience, but that of the simple creed? Let the written code of every nation answer it, and every volume of orthodox sermons.

The Unitarian, then, will hail practical Co-operation as the consummation of old institutions and the commencement of new ones—as the death of the old man and the birth of the new man. "Lest I be rich and forget thee, or lest I be poor and steal," will ever be the cry and the curse of the excessive distinction of ranks: but as Co-operators can neither be rich nor poor individually, they can neither be ungrateful to God nor criminal to man.

A wide and sublime field of work is now open to those who believe that "to do good is to be a Christian." Let, then, Unitarian societies throw aside their formalities, their controversies, their offensive armour. Let them beat their swords into plough-shares and pruning-hooks. Let them leave their enemies to die a natural death. Let them serve the Lord Jehovah in serving one another. Should they adopt Co-operation, they will draw all men to them; for they will be independent, virtuous, religious, and happy. But if not, perhaps it may please God, who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will, not to give to any sect, as such, the honour of consummating his glory; but to collect out of all nations, people, and tongues, a chosen race, a peculiar people; and to bring about by his own independent providence, that it may more clearly appear to be his work, a state of society on this our earth which shall leave nothing to wish for, on the part of the sincere lover of mankind, but that he might live for ever, to see it run its glorious course.

ADELPHOS.

On the Proem of John's Gospel.

To the Editor.

SIR,

Exeter.

I BELIEVE the question at present agitated in your pages respecting the proem of John's Gospel to be one of the very first moment, whether we consider the influence which a right decision of it may have on the spiritual welfare of the individual Christian, or on the progress of Christian truth in the world at large. It is, I think, the essence of the new dispensation that it is a revelation of God in the person of his Son: hence the importance which the Scripture attaches to a just knowledge of the Son, inasmuch as it is only in a knowledge of the Son that we can have a true and saving knowledge of the Father, and receive the peculiar blessings of the New Covenant. It is this feeling which emboldens me to transmit to you a few remarks on your Reviewer's late exposition of his views on this subject (p. 120). With every feeling of respect for the candour, intelligence, and good feeling evinced by that gentleman throughout his papers on this subject, I must still take the liberty of declaring my opinion, that he has by no means done justice to his exalted theme. It seems but an inauspicious omen at the outset of his undertaking that he indulges the idea of giving a somewhat new and peculiar explanation of this celebrated

passage. But surely, Sir, it is now too late in the day for such an attempt. Riveted as the attention of the religious and learned world has been for ages on these few verses, at once so simple in language and in ideas, it cannot reasonably be expected that any materially new conception of their sense will ever be suggested, and it therefore only remains to us, out of those interpretations which have long been candidates for public approbation, to select that which our judgment deems the best.—The Reviewer appears to approve to a certain extent the ancient Photinian interpretation, espoused among modern Unitarians by Lardner and Priestley; that, namely, which considers *the Word* as an *impersonal* divine principle, existing from the beginning, and at length embodied or manifested in the person of Jesus Christ. His introductory remarks on this subject, and those which he makes on the opening verses of John's general Epistle, appear to me very just as well as perspicuous. They certainly led me to expect a more noble and elevated conception of "*the Word*" than that which, with disappointment, I found they were designed to introduce. When at length he brings us to the touchstone of his interpretation, his explication of the term Logos, what is it? *The Word or scheme of religious truth.* Your correspondent does not enlarge on this expression, but it may be presumed to be about equivalent to *the doctrine of the gospel.* According to this interpretation, therefore, the sense of the passage will be, that the doctrines of our religion were, as it were, laid up with God from the beginning, and were in due time communicated to Jesus Christ, by him to be made known to the world. Now, Sir, I ask, can any reader resist the feeling that this is a poor, frigid, and almost insignificant interpretation of one of the most grand and mysterious passages in all the Scriptures? The meaning thus assigned to the words is, no doubt, perfectly true; but it is equally certain that the truth thus conveyed is very plain and, as we say, common-place, and by no means corresponding in importance with the imposing dignity of the words with which it is delivered. But this insignificance is not the only objection to which this interpretation is liable: one of a more direct and untractable character is close at hand. Your correspondent, indeed, with a facility which I own appeared to me somewhat surprising, assumes that he may take the word Θεός, God, in the phrase, "*the Word was God,*" as an adjective; rendering it, "*and the Word was divine.*"

This assertion, like the former, is unquestionably *true*, which is also all that can be said for it: but unfortunately Θεός is not θεῖος, nor are substantives adjectives. Crellius felt this point a much greater difficulty, and took the pains to write a very thick and a very useless volume to shew that θεῖος was the right reading. But he could not make ten converts to this his whimsy, and has only afforded an illustration of the sagacious remark of Griesbach, "Conjecturæ in hac re plerumque solis auctoribus suis placuere." I cannot but regard it as a further illustration of the self-pleasing powers of conjectural criticism, when the Reviewer says of the 14th verse, that he is hardly sensible of any harshness in his interpretation there. To me, at least, the expression of a scheme of religious truth or doctrine "*becoming flesh*" is something very uncouth indeed.

But why, Sir, in order to defend Unitarianism, should we descend to this low and disadvantageous position? Why not keep on the high ground which was selected for us by the great names which I have mentioned? "By the Word," says Lardner, (Letter on the Logos,) "John does not mean a being separate from God and inferior to him, but God himself, or the wisdom and power of God, which is the same as God." Perhaps the simplest and least objectionable way of treating this subject is to determine neither to know nor think any thing further about the Word, as spoken of in this passage, than exactly so much as the writer himself declares. What, then, does this amount to? What is his own account of the Logos or Word? It is brief and simple. *It was in the beginning*, which must at least imply antecedently to the gospel dispensation: *it was with God*, hidden or involved in the Divine nature: in fact *it was God*, it was a form, principle, or agency, of the Divine nature—a manifestation of the Divine Being; it was nothing else than God himself, in a certain mode of operation or emanation. *By it all things were*: it was the immediate agent by which all things were produced: that this should be asserted concerning the word of God is by no means wonderful. *In it was life*: it was the very principle of all life to the whole creation. This agrees with the Epistle, where it is called "the word of life;" yet I think that in the Epistle the writer has his attention more exclusively directed to the Christian economy than in this passage of the Gospel. At length, in verse 14, we read, *the Word became flesh and dwelt among us*: this divine principle, yea God himself, entered into a

particular union with human nature, and in this form dwelt and conversed among us; as Jesus says, *He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.*

That there is something sublime, mysterious, and even in a measure incomprehensible, in this doctrine of the union of God with man in the person of Jesus, is so far from being an objection to it, that it enhances both its probability and its interest: its probability, because it accords with the style of the writer; its interest, from its agreement with the known principles of the human mind. An interpretation of John which divests him of all mysticism has, from that very circumstance, a presumption against it; and one which strips the highest doctrines of holy writ of all obscurity and sublimity, so far deprives religion of its interest and its power.

Your correspondent will, I trust, excuse the freedom of my remarks, believing that it arises from no feeling of disrespect, but from a sense of the importance of the subject.

T. F. B.

Experiment in Monmouthshire for bettering the Condition of the Poor.

To the Editor.

SIR, *Woodfield, March, 1829.*

IT must not be taken for granted that the whole of the village population stated in my last letter consists of the families of those who have acquired property for themselves in the way and with the encouragement before mentioned. Such a conclusion would not be warranted by facts. True it is that the experiment was entered into with no other view or expectation than that of trying whether, if the labouring poor were relieved from the extreme pressure of that poverty which of late years has reduced them to a situation little better than that of mere beasts of burden, their circumstances might not in some important respects be materially improved;—whether they themselves, or the institutions of society, were the causes of, and consequently answerable for, the deplorable state of destitution and degradation into which they had fallen;—or, whether these, together with the lamentable increase of crime resulting therefrom, were natural, necessary, and therefore unavoidable evils. Those, therefore, who were expected to afford subject-matter of practical proof under this experiment, were invited to become settlers; but when the plan began to be more generally understood, and greater numbers offered than were at first contem-

plated, their local and indispensable wants also increased; and as these could only be provided for by persons of greater pecuniary ability than themselves, shops for local supply became necessary, and leases were granted to such as were willing to erect them. In the progressive increase of the population and its improving condition, under circumstances by no means unfavourable to such a speculation, several of the first settlers borrowed money to assist them in building a second house adjoining their first; some few persons took land for the purpose of settling a newly-married son or daughter thereon; and others, again, did the same with the intention of building houses to let as a profitable investment. Without this extension of the limited views beforehand entertained, experience shewed that the experiment itself would have been exceedingly narrowed; and, as will appear in the sequel, though neither of the villages consists exclusively of habitations reared by those who occupy them, this necessary extension of the plan, in the course of its natural and successful progress, has not only benefited all parties, including inhabitant owners, but been the means of furnishing additional proof of the soundness of the general principles on which the whole was founded. To the tenure, originally a freehold lease of three lives, the privilege of adding a fourth life was gratuitously offered at a time when the attention of the labouring poor was attempted to be diverted into another channel, and their understandings beguiled by offers of non-freehold leases for sixty years of land, itself lifehold, on something smaller ground rents; and subsequently, to render all clear to the humblest capacity, the leases in Blackwood have been uniformly granted for three lives, and for such a term of years on the decease of the last of the three lives as will render it equivalent to a grant for ninety-nine years; and the earlier lessees have the option of having their leases conformed thereto, that all may be upon the same footing. The leases granted in the two more recently founded villages have all been for lives, renewable for ever on payment of five shillings on each decease. The site of the three villages combines as great a portion of the necessary and useful, as well as of the picturesque and beautiful, as is ordinarily to be met with. Each village has a railway or tram-road through its centre, communicating between certain of the great iron-works and collieries of the neighbourhood and the shipping-places at Newport and Pellgwenlly.

These roads supply coals abundantly on very easy terms, and every article intended either for conversion or comfort, however bulky or weighty, is brought along them and delivered at reasonable rates of charge. By the side of the railway in Blackwood village is also an ordinary carriage road, along which a stage-coach passes regularly twice a-day, and another road is forming over an iron bridge recently erected across the river which runs at the bottom of the original village, which not only opens a new and shorter road into the neighbouring most populous hamlet of the adjoining parish, but connects the two banks of the river so as to facilitate the extension of the village in that direction. Of the 260 houses in Blackwood, I cannot exactly state what are inhabited by their owners, but certainly a considerable portion; whilst of tradesmen not immediately connected with the neighbouring works there are masons, carpenters, tilers, market-gardeners, blacksmiths, butchers, bakers, and sawyers, besides shops of general sale. In Yuisddee and Trelyn the more recently formed villages, containing each of them from thirty to fifty houses, I am not aware that more than two persons have as yet built houses to let upon speculation; but several of the industrious cottagers, having established themselves in one house, are now about to build a second adjoining. Of the very material improvement which the outward condition of the villagers has undergone, from what has been already said, no doubt can be entertained, and that the consequences of this improvement, previously calculated on as likely to affect their characters and usefulness as members of society, were not overrated, the following facts will abundantly prove. Their spare time, when they have any, is not now devoted to the public-house, but mostly to the cultivation of their gardens, many of which exhibit a highly respectable appearance. In the year 1827, when there

was a total suspension of the works in the neighbourhood for seven weeks, in consequence of a difference between the coalmasters and their workmen on account of wages, many of the colliers in the country sought for work in the iron-works, leaving their families chargeable to the parishes; others, and in great numbers, scoured the country for twenty miles round, in parties of from five to ten each, levying contributions for their support in victuals and money; but the village proprietors, without, as I could learn, a single exception, turned into their gardens: *that was their resource*, and from the experience then acquired, they first *fully* learned the value of a cottage garden; so that, in the course of the following winter, upwards of three acres of additional garden-ground was taken and has been since brought into cultivation. On this trying occasion special constables were required to repress the outrages which were committed, and the villagers offered themselves in turn to perform this duty. As the only resident magistrate in the district, it fell to my lot to adopt measures for the protection of persons and property on this occasion, and from my own personal knowledge I can declare, that none of the very considerable number of constables then sworn in to assist me in this great object, discharged the duties of their office more zealously, patiently and effectually, though they were employed chiefly in the night time, and against many of the rioters, who were their fellow-workmen; so well had they learned, *from having property of their own*, to respect and protect that of others. But I must defer the remaining particulars which I have to impart, with a clearer exposition of the principle of the experiment which has been attended with such considerable success, for a future number of your interesting Magazine.

JOHN H. MOGGRIDGE.

OBITUARY.

CHARLES BARING, ESQ.

1829. At Exmouth, on Tuesday, Jan. 12, CHARLES BARING, Esq., in the 87th year of his age. Mr. Baring was of a family in Devonshire of great eminence in the mercantile world. He was the youngest of three brothers; John Baring, Esq., who represented the city of Exeter in three successive parliaments, and Sir Francis Baring, Bart., also many years a member of the House of Commons, and

founder of one of the first commercial houses in Europe. Mr. Baring had also a sister married to Lord Ashburton, (the celebrated Mr. Dunning,) by whom she had one son, the late Lord Ashburton, at whose death the title became extinct.

The subject of this brief memorial, Mr. Charles Baring, was a man of great worth and probity in private life, highly esteemed for his mild and amiable manners, his amenity of disposition and kind-

ness of heart. In the former period of his life, he was many years honourably engaged in active pursuits as a merchant and banker; but, on the decline of trade and manufactures in the west of England, he withdrew from the arduous and anxious concerns, the painful fluctuations, and contingencies of commercial life, and took up his abode entirely at his neighbouring residence in the country; where, in the bosom of an amiable and excellent family, he enjoyed that comfort and tranquillity which were congenial with the habits of his well-regulated mind; and where he passed his time in literary retirement, in the cultivation and pursuit of intellectual knowledge, in the virtuous discipline of the heart, and in the discreet and judicious exercise of an unostentatious benevolence. His native composure and serenity of temper were prominent and distinguishing features of his character. The influence of these qualities seldom, it might almost be said never, forsook him; while to these he added a high sense of honour, and of moral and religious principle. He was, on some occasions, placed in circumstances which called forth all the energies of his mind. Few men, perhaps, enjoyed more happiness in the conjugal and parental relations of domestic life than fell to his lot; yet, from this very cause, probably, his severest trials arose. His highly-respected and excellent wife, after a long-protracted state of delicate health, was removed to a better world, many years before him; and at different periods he subsequently experienced the loss of two very amiable daughters. These heavy trials of domestic feeling he sustained with patient equanimity and exemplary submission. He felt them as a man, and bore them as a Christian. Indeed, he had long known the full force of Christian principles, and steered his course under the direction of this best and surest guide in the voyage of human life.

At a period long prior to the painful privations which have been alluded to, he had sought a retreat from the occupations of business in objects which promised the most tranquil, useful, and rational resource. He was fortunate in having acquired the habit of reading, and in books he found the important information and genuine recreation he wished to obtain. His attention was particularly directed to the study of the Scriptures; and in the result of his inquiries into the evidences of revelation and the doctrines of Christianity, he felt the force of the objections that have been fre-

quently urged against some of the leading theological opinions which have long prevailed in the Christian world; and after much thought and reflection, he finally resolved to withdraw from the communion of the national church in which he had been educated, and connected himself with the Unitarian congregation in his neighbourhood, of which the late Rev. John Jervis was minister, at whose chapel, in the vicinity of Lymington, Mr. Baring and his family became constant and regular attendants. It is due to Mrs. Baring to state that, in this measure, and in the views of her excellent husband on this important subject, she also fully concurred.

This participation in the offices of public worship and social religion, accompanied by the continued friendly intercourse of personal kindness, proved a source of gratification and encouragement to Mr. Jervis in the exercise of his pastoral duties. Nor was the influence of so respectable an example in promoting a regard to social order, moral discipline, and religious observances, lost upon others, more particularly on that class of persons whose humble lot is cast in the lowly vale of poverty and obscurity.

The friendship of Mr. Baring was steady, uniform, and consistent, and manifested by unequivocal proofs of cordial esteem and unreserved confidence. And it is but justice to add, that these testimonies of regard were most highly appreciated by Mr. Jervis, who was fully sensible of their value, while they made an impression on his mind that no time could obliterate or impair; and it may be truly said that they greatly contributed to augment his comfort, and to soothe and alleviate the depression and discouragements of frequent indisposition. Nor did the reciprocal interchange of generous and friendly communication cease till the hand of death dissolved all earthly ties—and the social intercourses of the world were extinguished or buried in the grave.

Mr. Jervis was a man of strong intellectual powers, a sound judgment, and a well-informed and cultivated mind; of inflexible integrity and firmness of principle; of considerable literary and scientific attainments; and an ardent friend to civil and religious liberty. But he was particularly distinguished by the diffidence and genuine simplicity of his manners, his true candour and moderation of spirit. The following extracts from two letters of Mr. Baring to the present writer, on occasion of Mr. Jervis's ill-

ness and death, will best shew the high regard entertained for him by that excellent man, whose just discrimination renders his testimony valuable, and who, from long acquaintance, was fully enabled to form a correct judgment. The sentiments they express are equally just and applicable in his own case.

“Accept my thanks for the communication you have been pleased to make me on behalf of our most excellent friend. Whether it shall please God to take him to himself, or, beyond your expectation, to restore him for a short time longer to his valuable duties upon earth, must be soon decided; and in either case his lot must be what every good man will earnestly desire. It seems impossible to think of his situation without bringing home to ourselves the expression in Scripture, ‘Let me die the death of the righteous!’ You will much oblige me to acquaint me when any alteration takes place in my most excellent friend’s situation, and, if living, to assure him of my most sincere and affectionate regards.”

In a subsequent letter he writes thus :

“You have, without doubt, experienced a loss which will naturally be felt with lively emotions of grief and regret; your brother was a truly good man, and when good men die, that they have finished their course upon earth, should be considered as an event which rather asks for gratulation than for grief. Some one has said, ‘Why should we grieve when another spirit is added to the immortals?’ Who can contemplate with indifference this solemn crisis of mortality? But the man who cultivates just and rational views of Christianity may regard it, not as an enemy, but as a friend; not with gloom and consternation, but with an equal and even a cheerful mind.”—“This mode of considering our last great enemy has long been adopted by me; and I have no doubt the same has been the case with you: I must add, that it has been to me a subject of the highest satisfaction, that my friendship with your deceased brother, which had existed so many years, continued undiminished to the last moment of his life.”

After the lamented death of Mrs. Baring, and the domestic changes which naturally resulted from that melancholy event, he not only employed his time in reading, but occasionally exercised his pen upon subjects which he deemed of sufficient importance to engage his serious attention. It has been already

stated, that the bent of his mind led him to the careful perusal of the Scriptures. The sacred oracles afforded him matter of meditation, of important reflection, of deep and increasing interest in the progress of advancing life. These disclosed to him the inestimable treasures of divine knowledge; they opened to his contemplative mind the rich and copious springs of hope and consolation, in the prospect and anticipation of future and immortal happiness; hopes which this world never gave, and consolations which it could not take away.

This venerable man, feeling the internal symptoms of increasing debility and weakness, had for several months confined himself to the stillness of his own apartments, waiting the gentle summons which was to announce the close of his appointed time; thus affording an instructive example of that good hope and that resigned spirit which mark the death of the righteous; and pointing to his departure in that solemn and interesting appeal—“See in what peace a Christian can die!”

T. J.

Brompton Grove, Feb. 24, 1829.

Mr. Baring’s Publications.

In the year 1798 he published a pamphlet, containing many just and important observations applicable to the position of this country, in relation to the other countries of Europe, at that highly interesting and very critical period. This publication was entitled, “Peace in our power, upon Terms not unreasonable.” 8vo. Pp. 39. Cadell and Davies.

In 1807 he published “An Examination of the Passages contained in the Gospels and other Books of the New Testament, respecting the Person of Jesus; with Observations arising from them. By J. Smith, Gentleman.” 8vo. Johnson.

This useful work came to a second edition in 1811, “corrected and enlarged.”

In 1810 he published “Letters on the Prophecies, selected from eminent Writers. By J. Smith, Gentleman.” Johnson.

In 1823, “Thoughts on Final Universal Restoration. By C. Baring, Esq.” Baldwin and Co.

In 1815, “Simon Peter not a Calvinist. A Sermon.” Longman and Co., London; and Besley, Exeter.

In 1822, “A Selection of Prayers and Hymns for the Use of Families and Individuals. By Charles Baring, Esq.”

INTELLIGENCE.

Catholic Question.

Parliamentary Proceedings.

IN our notes of the Proceedings in Parliament on this subject, last month, the presentation of the Petition of the Dissenting Ministers of London and its neighbourhood to the House of Commons, was, by mistake, omitted. We insert it now, and continue our journal from the 20th of February, at which day our limits then compelled us to break off.

On Wednesday evening, Feb. 12th, Lord JOHN RUSSELL presented the petition to the House of Commons, when, having described the character of the body from which it came, he stated, there were to this petition the names of sixty-nine of the most eminent Dissenting Ministers in London and its vicinity. The petitioners were not, indeed, rich in revenues from the profession of their religion, but they were accustomed to the deep and earnest study of that religion, and they objected to the Church of England because it approximated to the Church of Rome. No man, therefore, could be farther than the petitioners were from inclining to the Roman Catholic faith; but considering that every man had a right to the free exercise of his conscience in matters of religion, they thought it incumbent upon them to express their conscientious opinion that religious tenets should be no bar to civil employment.

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

The Petition of the undersigned, the Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the Three Denominations residing in and about the Cities of London and Westminster,

Humbly sheweth,

That the Petitioners are thankful to the providence of the Supreme Ruler, by whom kings reign and princes decree justice, for the signal benefit conferred upon the Protestant Dissenters of Great Britain by the late repeal of so much of the Corporation and Test Acts as imposed the Sacramental Test.

That deeply impressed with a sense of the importance of this measure to the

interests of true religion, and the peace and prosperity of the kingdom, your Petitioners cannot refrain from expressing to your Honourable House their earnest desire of the repeal of all the remaining Statutes that attach civil disabilities to religious opinions.

That at the present crisis, your Petitioners feel it to be their duty to declare their loyal confidence in the conciliatory spirit of your Honourable House, and of His Majesty's Government.

And that your Petitioners entreat your Honourable House to take into your early consideration such measures as may unite all the subjects of the realm in the enjoyment of equal religious liberty.

And your Petitioners shall ever pray,
&c.

F. A. Cox, LL. D., Chairman;
THOMAS REES, LL. D., Secretary.

Robert Aspland.

John Scott Porter.

Benjamin Mardon, M. A.

Archibald Barclay, L. L. D.

William Orme.

William Broadfoot.

Dav. Davidson.

Robert Winter, D. D.

W. J. Fox.

Jno. Morrison.

J. Fletcher, A. M.

William Walford.

Thomas Cooper.

Jas. Robertson, A. M.

George Evans.

John Coates.

Thomas Jervis.

T. Belsham.

John S. Geary.

Eben. Miller, A. M.

Thomas Russell, A. M.

Jos. Turnbull, A. B.

Thomas James.

Robert Vaughan.

George Clayton.

Thomas Wood.

Charles Hyatt.

Daniel Bishop.

John Yockney.

George Moase.

Caleb Morris.

W. Wilson.

Jos. Barrett.

Robert Halby.

John Pye Smith, D. D.

John Emblem.
 A. Stewart.
 Henry Townley.
 John Richards.
 Jno. Humphreys, L. L. D.
 J. E. Richards.
 Wm. Williams.
 Ingram Cobbin, A. M.
 Wm. Stern Palmer.
 Thomas Griffin.
 Jos. P. Dobson.
 Stephen Mummery.
 Thomas Hunt.
 W. H. Murch.
 Jos. Hughes, A. M.
 Wm. Newman, D. D.
 Joseph Denton.
 Edwin Chapman.
 John Marsom.
 Henry Pawlin.
 James Dean.
 Wm. Deering.
 Jno. Knight.
 Jno. Campbell.
 John Blackburn.
 James Elvey.
 Griffith Roberts.
 James Vautin.
 George Smallfield.
 Samuel Tomkins, M. A.
 Thomas Blundell.
 Thomas Harper.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, February 23d.

The Duke of CLARENCE declared his sentiments on the Catholic Question. These are, and have ever been, favourable to the claimants; but his Royal Highness having always been impressed with the futility of attempting to settle the question without the aid of Government, abstained from expressing his opinions, being firmly determined not to embarrass the Government by a factious opposition.

This unequivocal declaration by the Heir Presumptive—as firmly delivered as it was strongly expressed—made an evident impression on the Peers, and gave great umbrage to the Duke of Cumberland.

The Duke of CUMBERLAND expressed the astonishment he felt when he heard factious motives imputed to those who were hostile to the Catholics; and his still greater astonishment at the unfair attack made upon him personally, and upon others, by the application of the term “infamous” to their opposition. His conduct had been, he thought, always fair and open, and honourable and can-

did, upon this question, both in that House and out of it.

The Duke of SUSSEX said, that the Duke of Clarence had applied the terms of reprehension to the Opposition in general—not to any one opponent in particular. If the Duke of Cumberland applied the words of condemnation to his own conduct, that was his own taste. When, however, a Message came from the Crown, recommending to Parliament the consideration of the question of Catholic disabilities in a constitutional way, and in such a manner as may be found consonant with the safety and security of the Protestant Church and the rights and liberties of the people, it certainly was not extraordinary that his brother should express his surprise at the course pursued in opposition to his Majesty's declared wishes and intentions, and that he should characterize that conduct as base and infamous.

The Duke of CLARENCE denied that he either did or could apply the expression which had been alluded to in reference to his illustrious relative; but the fact was, his illustrious relative had spent so much of his life abroad, that he had quite forgotten what was due to the freedom of debate in this country. (*Hear, hear.*)

Tuesday, Feb. 24th.

Dangerous Associations' Bill.

On the motion of the Duke of WELLINGTON, the order of the day was read for the third reading of the bill.

The Marquis of ANGLESEY, after disclaiming any wish to throw impediments in the way of his Majesty's Ministers, spoke as follows:—My Lords, this bill is an ungracious act; it appears to be nothing less than a gratuitous insult. My Lords, it is useless and nugatory: it is a work of pure supererogation: it is an enactment against a thing which has no existence. The Catholic Association is defunct. It dissolved itself upon the prospect of brighter days. What, my Lords, gave birth to the Catholic Association? Harsh, unjust, oppressive, and offensive laws. Remove a cause, and the effect necessarily ceases: repeal the grievous penal enactments, and the Association is annihilated: it cannot revive; it would have no soil on which to vegetate. As far, then, as the Association is concerned, the law will be utterly useless. Let us now consider it as it will affect other societies. What generated the Brunswick Clubs? There is not a noble Brunswicker present who will not at once say, the Catholic Association. They

professed to form themselves in opposition to the Catholic Association, and for the purpose of supporting the Government. My Lords, I give full credit to the Brunswickers for the loyalty of their intentions; but I, for one, having been at the head of the Irish government when they were formed, beg leave to say, that I could not give them my thanks for their efforts; for I felt that I had ample power, and had no occasion whatever for their assistance. On the contrary, I only felt that I had an additional nuisance to controul. But, my Lords, as these Clubs grew out of the Association, so they will perish at its dissolution. Therefore this bill is useless.

After some further discussion, the bill was read a third time, and passed.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, March 3d.

Mr. BROWNLOW presented (what was known throughout Ireland as) the Irish Protestant petition, which was subscribed by 2 Dukes, 17 Marquisses, 20 Earls, 11 Viscounts, 2 Counts, 22 Barons, 35 Baronets, 52 Members of the House of Commons, and upwards of 2000 persons of other rank.—After a few remarks from Mr. HUSKISSON, Mr. BROUGHAM, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. TRANT, the petition was ordered to be printed.

Thursday, March 5th.

Mr. PEEL (having been returned to the House of Commons as member for Westbury, a small borough in Wiltshire), after the Call of the House, said, he rose, as a Minister of the King, and by the just authority which belonged to that situation, to vindicate the advice which had been given to his Majesty by an united Cabinet (*hear, hear*), to insert in his most gracious speech that recommendation with respect to the condition of Ireland, and the civil disabilities affecting his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, which had just been read; and to submit to the consideration of the House those measures by which his Majesty's Government proposed to carry that recommendation into effect. He rose in the spirit of peace, to propose the adjustment of the Catholic Question, (*hear, hear,*) of that question, which had occupied the attention of Parliament, and which had distracted the Councils of the King, for now nearly thirty years. He rose to discuss the question in the spirit recommended in one of those beautiful prayers by which, on the present, as on every other occasion, the proceedings of this House are auspicated, and in which

we were enjoined to lay aside all private interests, prejudices, and private affections:—"May God grant that, in the simple and appropriate language of that prayer, the result of our councils on this day may lead to the maintenance of the true religion and of justice; to the safety, honour, and happiness of the kingdom; to the public welfare, peace, and tranquillity of the realm, and to the uniting and knitting together all classes of persons and all estates in true Christian charity." After an able speech which occupied upwards of four hours, he moved for a Committee of the whole House, "with a view to consider the laws imposing civil disabilities on his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects;" and the motion was, after two nights' debate, triumphantly carried, by a majority of 188 members—348 to 160.

The fundamental principle of the measure developed in Mr. Peel's speech is, "the abolition of civil disabilities, and the equalization of political rights," in England, Ireland, and Scotland. In particular, Roman Catholics are to be admitted into both Houses of Parliament without restriction of numbers or modification of privilege. They may hold all offices in the State, except those of Lord Chancellor and Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. The existing penal laws affecting Roman Catholics are to be repealed. Roman Catholics are to be put with respect to property on a footing with Dissenters. The declaration against Transubstantiation is to be abolished. The oath of Supremacy is to be retained for Protestants; but for Roman Catholics the following oath is to be substituted:

"I, A. B., do declare that I profess the Roman Catholic religion. I, A. B., do solemnly promise and swear, that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to his Majesty King George the Fourth, and will defend him to the utmost of my power against all conspiracies and attempts whatever which shall be made against his person, crown, or dignity, and I will do my utmost endeavour to disclose and make known to his Majesty, his heirs and successors, all treasons and traitorous conspiracies which may be formed against him or them. And I do faithfully promise to maintain, support, and defend, to the utmost of my power, the succession to the crown, hereby utterly renouncing and abjuring any obedience or allegiance unto any other person claiming or pretending a right to the crown of these realms. And I do further declare, that it is not an article of my faith, and that I do renounce, reject, and

abjure the opinion, that princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, or any authority of the See of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or by any person whatsoever. And I do declare, that I do not believe that the Pope of Rome or any other foreign prince, prelate, person, state, or potentate, hath, or ought to have, any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm. I do swear, that I will defend to the utmost of my power the settlement of the property within this realm as established by the laws: and I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present Church Establishment, as settled by the law within this realm: and I do solemnly swear that I will never exercise any privilege to which I am or may become entitled, to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion or Protestant government in this kingdom: and I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of this oath, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever."

With regard to ecclesiastical securities, the Roman Catholics to be put on the footing of all other Dissenters. No veto; no pensioning of the Catholic priests; no interference with the intercourse in spiritual matters between the Roman Catholic Church and the See of Rome. The Catholics not to hold places belonging to the Established Church, the Ecclesiastical Courts, or Ecclesiastical Foundations; nor any office in the Universities, the Colleges of Eton, Winchester, and Westminster; nor any school of ecclesiastical foundation. The laws relative to Roman Catholic rights to presentations to be retained. In cases where any Roman Catholic shall hold an office with which Church patronage is connected, the Crown to have the power of transferring the patronage. No Roman Catholic to advise the Crown in the appointment of offices connected with the Established Church. The episcopal titles now in use in the Church of England and Ireland not to be assumed by the members of the Roman Catholic Church. When Roman Catholics are admitted to corporate and other offices, the insignia of such offices in no case to be taken to any other place of worship than a place of worship of the Established Church. No robes of office to be worn in any other than the Established Church. The communities bound by religious or monastic vows not to be

extended, and provision to be made against the future entrance into this country of members of the order of Jesuits: those already here to be registered.

Such is the substance of the Emancipation Bill. A second Bill limits and regulates the elective franchise in Ireland with a view to diminish fictitious votes, and raise a more independent yeomanry. The freehold qualification to be raised from forty shillings to ten pounds: freeholds to be registered, and the registry to be taken before the Assistant Barrister of the Irish counties, with the power of an appeal in certain cases to a higher tribunal.

Mr. Peel founded his case for the Government on this intelligible proposition—that the time had come when it was more dangerous to leave the Catholic question unsettled, than to settle it by granting the claims.

For himself, he acted on his honest conviction, and gave his conscientious and best advice according to his oath of office. This conviction had been growing upon him for several years; and he had proved his sincerity by offering to retire in 1825, an intention which he relinquished only out of personal regard to Lord Liverpool. It was not for him to maintain the struggle with inadequate materials and insufficient instruments. He was unsupported in the House even by the speeches of those who were now so clamorous; and in the country the state of opinion was shewn, through its legitimate organ the representation, to be favourable to the cause which he had so unavailingly opposed. To prove this, he analyzed the Parliamentary divisions, and the votes of members for fifteen of the most populous counties and twenty of the largest towns in England. In Ireland the case was even stronger. How would all the evils of our situation—with a divided Cabinet, a divided Legislature, and a divided Country—be aggravated in the event of a war!

The statement of Mr. Peel was received with the warmest cheering perhaps ever heard in the House of Commons. It was fiercely assailed by a few leaders of the minority; but their speeches present hardly any materials either for analysis or extract.

Mr. BANKES took the lead. Mr. O'NEILL followed, and with great perseverance quoted Mr. Peel's own speeches against him. Sir ROBERT INGLIS appealed to the Constitution of 1688.

Sir GEORGE MURRAY spoke with much animation in reply to Sir Robert.

It was objected that the "securities"

were worth nothing. Mr. CHAS. GRANT shewed that the best securities were to be found in the healing nature of the measure; in the spirit of the English people, clergy, and nobles; and in the interests of the Irish.

Mr. BROUGHAM's speech related chiefly to the second measure—the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders.—He had opposed the measure for the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders in 1825; and he would not disguise it, that, for his own part, to that measure he had all but an invincible repugnance. Even had he been one of those who supported that measure, he might with perfect consistency oppose this, which was one of a much more extensive character. But he looked not to these measures separately—he considered them as a whole. “If the question is put to me, Do you mean to vote for the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders?—if this question be put to me separately, singly, and apart from all other considerations, as an abstract proposition to be weighed and determined on its own grounds, and on its own grounds answered, my answer is at once and simply, No! But that is not the question to be answered, for it rests on other grounds, and is a much more difficult and complex question; and if I be practically called on to say whether or not I shall take upon myself the responsibility, shall I dare to take to myself even the smallest share of the awful and tremendous responsibility of saying to Ireland, ‘Your last chance of tranquillity, good order, and safety, is gone, from the adoption of these two measures, which are inseparably connected’?—from that responsibility—even from my small share of that responsibility—I honestly confess I do shrink: and I am not ashamed to confess that I do, for it is a responsibility that not only will appal the stoutest heart, but shake the soundest judgment. I therefore agree to the disfranchisement as the price—as the high price—as the all but extravagant price, of this inestimable good.”

Tuesday, March 10th.

Mr. PEEL introduced his Bill for the relief of the Roman Catholics, and that for the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders. In answer to the objections which had been made to the latter measure, Mr. Peel gave an arithmetical analysis of the fitness of these freeholders to exercise the elective franchise.

In one county, he found that since the year 1823, 23,700 freeholders had been registered, and that of this number

19,205 were marksmen, who could not write their own names. For voters of such a character, he proposed by this bill to substitute a class of really respectable and independent electors. In another county, where from 10,000 to 15,000 voters had been registered within the same time, he had ascertained that not more than one hundred had applied to be registered at their own instance, and that the registration of the rest had been made at the instance and expense of liberal clubs, or of gentlemen who expected the votes of the freeholders so created to be given as they directed.

It was charged against Ministers, that they are carrying forward their measure with “indecent haste.” Among other pithy answers, it was retorted, that the objectors saw nothing “indecent” in the haste with which the Bill for suppressing the Catholic Association was hurried through, or in any other penal enactment. Further delay was deprecated and refused.

Friday, March 13th.

The general petitions of the Catholics of Ireland were laid before Parliament by the Marquis of LANSDOWNE and Sir F. BURDETT. The statement of the noble Marquis shewed the peculiar fitness of the time chosen by his Majesty to accord to the Catholics the boon of equal rights: since this question began to be agitated, they have increased largely in numbers, intelligence, and wealth. Thirty years ago, only ten Catholics held stock to the amount of 2000*l.*—now there are upwards of eighty: education has advanced in a more rapid degree among the Catholic population; and there is less crime in Ireland than in England,—the criminal indictments being less than 1 to every 1500 of the population, while in England they are as 1 to every 750 persons.

Thursday, March 19th.

The Roman Catholic Relief Bill, read a second time, after two nights' debate. On Tuesday the debate lasted little more than four hours,—the previous part of the evening having been occupied in receiving petitions; and when the adjournment was moved, an altercation followed between Sir ROBERT INGLIS and some of the friends of the measure, as to how much of Wednesday night should be consumed in the same manner. The debate was, however, resumed at six, and continued until three o'clock, when the division was called for. The numbers were—for the second reading, 353; against it, 173; Ministerial majority,

180. The second reading was moved by Mr. PEEL. The speakers in support of the motion were—Mr. BENSON, Mr. GOULBURN, Lord CASTLEREAGH, Mr. WILMOT HORTON, Sir HENRY PARNELL, Mr. ROBERT GRANT, Mr. HORACE TWISS, Lord MOUNTCHARLES, Lord PALMERSTON, Lord MILTON. Against the second reading—Sir EDWARD KNATCHBULL, Mr. G. BANKES, Mr. SADLER, Mr. BANKES, Lord TULLAMORE, Mr. TRANT, Sir C. WETHERELL, the Attorney-General. Mr. PEEL replied.

Of the speeches, two on each side were more remarkable than the rest: on Tuesday, Mr. SADLER'S—a maiden oration, that was highly praised; on Wednesday, Lord PALMERSTON'S, Sir CHARLES WETHERELL'S, and Mr. PEEL'S.

We insert the peroration of Mr. PEEL'S:

“ One parting word, and I have done. I have received in the speech of my noble friend the member for Donegal, testimonies of approbation which are grateful to my soul; and they have been liberally awarded to me by gentlemen on the other side of the House in a manner which does honour to the forbearance of party among us. They have, however, one and all, awarded to me a credit which I do not deserve for settling this question. The credit, if it be a credit, belongs to others, and not to me. It belongs to Fox—to Grattan—to Plunkett—to the gentlemen opposite—and to an illustrious friend of mine, who is now no more. (*Cheers.*) By their efforts, in spite of my opposition, it has proved triumphant. I will not conceal from the House that in the course of this debate, allusions have been made to the memory of my right honourable friend, now no more, which have been most painful to my feelings. An honourable baronet (Sir E. Knatchbull) has spoken of the cruel manner in which my right honourable friend was hunted down. Whether the honourable baronet was one of those who hunted him down, I know not; but this I do know, that whoever joined in the inhuman cry which was raised against him, I was not one. (*Cheers.*) I was on terms of the most friendly intimacy with that illustrious statesman down even to the day of his death, and I say with as much sincerity of heart as man can speak, that I wish he was now alive among us to reap the harvest which he sowed, and to enjoy the triumph which his exertions gained. I am well aware that the fate of this measure cannot now be altered: if it succeed, the credit will redound to o-

thers; if it fail, the responsibility will devolve upon me, and upon those with whom I have acted. These chances, with the loss of private friendship and the alienation of public confidence, I must have foreseen and calculated before I ventured to recommend these measures. (*Cheers.*) I assure the House, that in conducting them, I have met with the severest blow which it has ever been my lot to experience in my life; but I am convinced that the time will come, though I may not perhaps live to see it, when full justice will be done by men of all parties to the motives on which I have acted,—when this question will be fully settled, and when others will see that I had no other alternative than to act as I have acted. (*Cheers.*) They will then admit that the course which I have followed, and which I am still prepared to follow, whatever imputation it may expose me to, is the only course, which is necessary for the diminution of the undue, illegitimate, and dangerous power of the Roman Catholics, and for the maintenance and security of the Protestant religion.”

Thursday, March 19, the second reading of the Bill for Disfranchising the Irish Forty-shilling Freeholders, was carried, on a division, by a majority of 223 to 17.

The principle of the measure had not a single supporter, except Mr. A. ELLIS, who, as a Parliamentary reformer, upheld the Bill, because it was the object of reform to render the elective franchise free from corruption. Mr. BROWNLOW frankly confessed, that he was not ashamed to do evil in the present case, for the sake of the good which would follow. Mr. LITTLETON, Mr. VILLIERS STUART, Lord BECTIVE, Mr. STUART WORTLEY, Mr. ABERCROMBY, and Mr. C. WYNNE, were actuated by similar motives; holding that the evil of the measure, though great in magnitude, was compensated by the greater boon which could not be obtained without it. Mr. BANKES repudiated this doctrine. Mr. GRATTAN stated that the Bill will at once disfranchise one hundred and seventy-eight thousand voters; and these, Lord DUNCANNON averred, were neither so much the slaves of the priest or the vassals of the landlord, nor so ignorant or uneducated, as they were supposed to be, except perhaps in some mountainous districts. Mr. HUSKISSON thought it unfair in the Ministers to take advantage of a nation's enthusiasm to destroy its franchises: they might at least have attempted to correct the admitted evils

of the system before they destroyed the right. Abuses of the franchise were as common in England as in Ireland, yet it was never proposed to disfranchise four-fifths of the people. The measure was denounced by Lord PALMERSTON as unjust, unnecessary, and in politic: the persons whom it affected are mostly Catholics; and it would have the effect of leaving a Catholic question behind. Mr. DOHERTY shewed that the franchise had been frequently altered. Mr. PEEL took his stand upon the evidence laid before the Committee in 1825; which shewed that frauds and perjuries existed among these freeholders: the alteration of the franchise would create a respectable and substantial yeomanry. Mr. HUSKISSON and Mr. BANKES proposed that the measure should be made prospective; but no notice was taken of the suggestion.

The House went into Committee on the Disfranchisement Bill on Friday. Sir JAMES MACKINTOSH observed that it was a "tough morsel;" but as it was necessary to the attainment of emancipation, he had made up his mind to swallow it. The same inducement weighed with other members; but not with Mr. LENNARD and Lord GEORGE BENTINCK, who determined to oppose the Bill at whatever risk. Lord DUNCANON moved a resolution to the effect of purifying the exercise of the existing franchise, but not to abolish it. The amendment was negatived by 220 to 20.

NOTICES.

*Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian
Missionary Society.*

THE Annual Meeting of this Society will be held on Good Friday next, the

17th April, on which occasion the Rev. J. Hincks, of Liverpool, will preach in the Unitarian Chapel, Mosley Street, Manchester, and a collection be made in aid of the funds of the Institution. In order to accommodate friends from the country, a dinner will be provided (price one shilling) in the school-room of the Mosley-Street Chapel; after which the business of the Society will be transacted, and the report read of its proceedings during the last year.

JOHN R. BEARD, Secretary.

Somerset and Dorset Unitarian Association.

A MEETING of this Association will be held at Crewkerne on Good Friday, April 17th. The morning service will commence at Eleven o'clock, and it is expected that there will also be an evening service.

E. W.

Manchester College, York.

THE adjourned Annual Meeting of Trustees will be held in Cross-Street Chapel Rooms, Manchester, on Thursday, the 9th April next, at Eleven o'clock in the forenoon precisely.

The friends of the College will dine together at Four o'clock in the afternoon of the same day, at the Mosley Arms, Market Street, to commemorate the Forty-third Anniversary of its Foundation; George Wm. Wood, Esq., in the Chair.

S. D. DARBISHIRE, } Secretaries.
J. J. TAYLER }

Manchester, March 26, 1829.

CORRESPONDENCE.

The conclusion of Mr. S. Wood's Journal next month; when we hope also to redeem some other pledges of the same kind.

The Editor very much regrets that the Rev. J. Brown, considering himself an aggrieved man, should have sent such a reply to Mr. T. Cooke, Jun., as he cannot consider admissible into the Repository. Much of it is irrelevant, much personal towards an individual, distinctly pointed out though not named, and not hitherto involved in the discussion; and it contains various appeals and challenges which, if inserted, would lay us under the necessity of opening our pages to an interminable series of personal recriminations. If Mr. B. will amend his reply so as to free it from these objections, we shall certainly hold him entitled to its insertion. Or if he will repeat to the Wareham Unitarians, and they accept, his challenge to a personal discussion, we shall be very ready to record the result, whether it be the proof or disproof of Mr. Cooke's statement.
