

THE
Monthly Repository.

No. CLXIV.]

AUGUST, 1819.

[Vol. XIV.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

The Nonconformist. No. XIII.

On the Controverted Clause in the Twentieth Article of the Church of England.

IN the common editions of the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, subscribed by the Clergy of the Church of England, the Twentieth Article reads thus: "The Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in matters of faith: and yet, it is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of holy writ, yet as it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so besides the same, ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation." The genuineness is disputed of the first clause of this Article: "The Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith, and yet"—and of the corresponding words in the Latin editions: "Habet Ecclesia ritus statuendi jus, et in fidei controversiis auctoritatem, quamvis"—The following facts are stated, not as sufficient to decide the controversy, but to direct the attention of the members of this society to the subject, which is not altogether destitute of importance or interest, and to call forth the information which they may possess for its elucidation.

Few things are more directly influenced by our characters, prejudices and habitual modes of thinking, than the estimates which we form of internal evidence. It is with some the most convincing, and with others the least satisfactory, kind of proof which can be employed. Some cannot perceive a particle of it, where others find it in abundance, even so as to amount to moral demonstration. The contents of the New Testament have

been deemed so extraordinary as to require a greater body of external evidence than any other book in the world; and it has also been contended, that they "afford good reason to believe the persons and transactions to have been real, the letters genuine, and the narration in the main to be true," even on the supposition of its being now first discovered in some antiquarian library, and coming to our hands "destitute of any extrinsic or collateral evidence whatever." Thus Bengelius found the internal evidence in favour of the text relative to the three heavenly witnesses resistless, notwithstanding the total absence of external authority; and the Editors of the Improved Version find it equally resistless against the initial chapters of Matthew and Luke, which exist in every known manuscript and version whatever. Alleged facts must be met by facts; but to a display of internal proof, however clear to the writer, the simple words "I don't see it," are an incontrovertible reply by his reader. That the clause in question looks like a forgery; that it is clumsily dovetailed into the remaining part of the Article; that the whole is rendered by it inconsistent and contradictory, &c., are, therefore, considerations which it is not worth while to dwell upon. A perception of them depends so much upon the constitution and training of the minds of individuals, that it can rarely be communicated. And even if they be well-founded, the inconsistency of creedmakers is not altogether an impossible supposition; though it must be allowed that they have rarely manifested it, when aiming at tyranny over conscience.

Without venturing to advance a decided opinion, I shall mention a few facts bearing upon the genuineness of the controverted clause, and affording materials for the discussion,

though not, perhaps, for the decision of the question.

This assertion of the Church's authority is no part of the Forty-two Articles of Edward VI. which were chiefly the work of Cranmer, who, whatever his errors, had such views of carrying further the Reformation, as would have induced him to make provision for simplifying the service of the Church, as it then existed, rather than for increasing its rites and ceremonies. These Articles were in force (except during the reign of Mary) up to the meeting of Convocation in 1562, when they underwent some alteration, and being reduced to thirty-nine, became the permanent creed of the Church. They were subjected to a second revision in 1571, but the changes then made were very trifling indeed. In the interval between these two periods the clause in question seems to have made its first appearance.

The transactions of the Convocation in 1562, might be ascertained by four kinds of evidence, three of which are in existence. 1. The testimony of those who took part in its proceedings, or of contemporaries. This is wanting: and that it is, operates perhaps rather against the clause, for it seems likely that the Puritans would not have silently allowed so portentous an addition to an authority which, in their opinion, savoured much too strongly of Popery before. Its surreptitious introduction they could neither provide nor protest against. 2. The manuscript then subscribed. 3. The records of Convocation. 4. The copies thereafter printed and published.

The *manuscript then subscribed* remained in the possession of Archbishop Parker, and was by him, after the lapse of some years, deposited in Bennet College, Cambridge, where, I believe, it is still to be seen. It is in Latin, signed by both Houses of Convocation, by the Upper on 29th January, and the Lower on 5th February, and consists of the Forty-two Articles of Edward VI. with the erasures, alterations and additions then agreed upon, and many of which are in Parker's own hand. The clause is *not* in this manuscript. There are in it many additions which are struck through with the red pencil, which

Parker was in the habit of using, and which probably were submitted to the meeting, discussed and rejected; but the clause does not appear even in that shape. This evidence is therefore strong against it.—I should think it fatal; but for the next kind of proof appealed to, viz.

The Records of Convocation. These are not now extant. They perished in the fire of London. But they were preserved in the registry at Lambeth previously, from the year 1562, and even appealed to by Laud, in his famous speech in the Star-chamber, to repel the charge of having himself forged this very clause of which he had repeatedly been accused. The extract produced by Laud, on this occasion, certified by a public notary, was in the possession, many years after, of the descendents of Chief Justice Hale, who was executor to the celebrated Selden, by whom it was, probably, obtained from Prynne, who seized the papers of Laud, by virtue of an order of Parliament. In this minute of the proceedings, the Twentieth Article *has* the controverted clause. That the extract was faithfully made there are two reasons for believing. 1. The document was a public one, the office public, access to it not difficult at any time, and the whole soon after in the uncontrolled possession of Laud's bitterest enemies, and yet the correctness of the transcript was never impeached. 2. These very records were again appealed to during the Protectorate. Fuller says, in his Church History, "The clause in question lieth at a dubious posture, at, in, and out, sometimes inserted, sometimes omitted, both in our written and printed copies. *Inserted in,* The Original of the Articles, 1562-3, as appeareth under the hand of a public notary, whose inspection and attestation is only decisive in this case. *Omitted in,* The English and Latin Articles set forth 1571. In a word concerning this clause, whether the bishops were faulty in their addition, or their opposites in their subtraction, I leave to more cunning state-arithmeticians to decide." To which Dr. Heylin replied, that he had himself inspected the records of Convocation, and seen it there, and adds—"Which makes me wonder at our Author, that having access to those

records, and making frequent use of them in this present History, he should declare himself unable to decide the doubt, whether the addition of this clause was made by the bishops, or the subtraction of it by the opposite party. But 'none so blind as he that will not see,' says the good old proverb." Of this, Fuller in his reply, took no notice, nor did Heylin advert to it in his rejoinder.

It should be observed, that the record gives the Articles, not only as resolved upon, but *as subscribed* on the 29th January, 1562, so that it is in the most complete opposition to the MS. copy referred to. Were this the whole of the conflicting evidence, the conclusion must be, that the record had been interpolated—not by Laud perhaps, for under all the circumstances detection could scarcely have been avoided, but previously—the next head of evidence is

Printed Copies. The Articles having been framed, corrected and passed, in *Latin*, the *first Latin edition*, after the rising of Convocation in 1562, seems entitled to great weight in the argument. It is to be presumed that it was intended for the use of the clergy, and so many of them were present, (one hundred and seventeen,) that any important variation was not likely to pass undetected. This edition was printed by *Wolfe* in 1563, and *has the clause!* There are *two old English editions*, without date, which are supposed to have been printed before the revisal in 1571, for this reason: the title of the twenty-first Homily of the second tome, which was occasioned by the Northern Rebellion in 1569, is not added to the thirty-fifth Article, as it is in the subsequent editions; they were printed by Richard Jugge, a name not unknown to the black-letter student as connected with the publications of that period. *They have not the controverted clause.* By what authority, or by whom, this English translation was made, does not appear. Besides that omission, it has another remarkable agreement with the subscribed manuscript, and difference from *Wolfe's* edition, which seems to prove that it was not translated from that edition. In the thirty-seventh Article, Of the Civil Magistrate, it says, "The Queen's Majesty hath the

chief power in this realm," &c.—faithfully rendering, *Regia Majestas, &c., summam habet potestatem*—whereas *Wolfe* has (and no other known edition) *jure summam habet potestatem*: transforming it from an assertion of *fact*, to one of *right*.

It is certain that after they passed the Convocation the Articles were submitted to the Queen, and ratified by her; and it is, perhaps, worth considering, whether this addition and that of the controverted clause were not made on that occasion by Elizabeth herself.

The Convocation met again in 1566, but no business was done, except granting a subsidy to the Queen; however in that year, a bill was brought into Parliament for obliging the clergy to subscribe the Articles, which passed the Commons, but was stopped in the Lords, by the Queen's interference. This was ascribed to evil counsellors, but it was quaintly replied, that on this occasion, as on many others, "all Elizabeth's council rode upon one horse." The Bill was the same as passed in 1571. It is mentioned here, because the title of the Articles being recited in *English*, gives a greater authority to the translation than it would otherwise have had, and consequently makes against the clause.

We come now to the Convocation of 1571. At the commencement of this sitting, the Lower House, in consequence of the command of Archbishop Parker, subscribed in a body the Articles as passed in 1562. For this purpose they made use of the Latin printed edition, which has the controverted clause; but the very copy, with their names affixed, was preserved in the Bodleian Library, and that clause is struck through with a pen. The Articles now were discussed in English, using as a basis the translation which had been published in the interval, of which the manuscript copy, with the alterations made by the bishops, and subscribed by them, is in Bennet College Library, presented also by Parker, and having no trace of the controverted clause. The Lower House again subscribed, after the alterations were made, but whether to the same copy as in 1562, or to another, is not known, and their signatures are not extant.

The records of this Convocation are completely lost. Its proceedings terminated with a resolution to print the Articles, both in Latin and English, which was done immediately, or at least in the course of the year. The Latin edition, (there seems to have been but one,) printed by Day, is without the clause.

There are *four* English editions of the Articles, printed in this year, by Jugge and Cawood, without the clause.

There are also *four* editions, by the same printers, of the same date, with the clause.

An edition, without date, but supposed to be only a year or two less ancient, printed by Jugge only, is without the clause.

In one, and only one, of the English editions of 1571, there is a marginal reference to a passage in the works of St. Augustin, in proof of the doctrine, for which his authority is cited in Article twenty-nine. This reference is in the Bennet College manuscript, subscribed by the bishops in that year, *in the hand-writing of Parker*. There was also preserved, amongst Mr. Petyt's papers in the Inner Temple Library, the rough draft of a letter in Parker's hand, without address, and supposed to be intended for Lord Burleigh, concerning the propriety of this appeal to the authority of St. Augustin, from which it appears that the applicability of the place cited, had been disputed. At this time the Articles were passing through the press; the citation from Augustin was withdrawn; but as the only edition, most probably therefore the *first*, which has the citation, also has the controverted clause, these facts demonstrate that, whether it was there rightfully or wrongfully, Parker was privy to its insertion.

The Puritans were very powerful in the House of Commons at this time; and Laud has directly and forcibly charged them with causing the fraudulent omission of the clause. To this accusation two replies may be made. *First*, The bishops, and they alone, seem to have had the controul of the publication of the Articles, which were actually printed before they came under the consideration of Parliament, and the printed book referred to in the Act. *And, Secondly*,

It could scarcely be to them a matter of sufficient moment to undertake such a measure, as this is one of the articles, the subscription of which it seems that Legislature did not expect would be enforced, and which in fact they did not ratify at all. The statute of 13 Eliz. c. 12, enjoins subscription to all the Articles of religion which *only concern the confession of the true Christian faith, and the doctrine of the Sacraments*. The articles of discipline, to which, I presume, this must belong, were purposely omitted, as appears by the following well-known anecdote: "When some members of the House of Commons, and among the rest *Sir Peter Wentworth*, were sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury (Parker) for the Articles which then passed the House; the Archbishop took that occasion to expostulate with them, Why they did put out of the book the Articles for the Homilies, consecrating of Bishops, and such like? (Meaning, by the *limiting clause*, confining subscription to articles only of a certain tenor.) 'Surely, Sir,' said *Wentworth*, 'because we were so occupied in other matters, that we had no time to examine them, how they agreed with the word of God.' 'What!' said the Archbishop, 'surely you mistook the matter; you will refer yourselves wholly to us therein.' Sir Peter replied, 'No, by the faith I bear to God, we will pass nothing before we understand what it is; for that were but to make you popes; make you popes who list, for *we will make you none*.'" The bishops, however, soon managed to make the clergy subscribe the whole. But the circumstance serves to render it improbable that the fraud rested there, and also to account for the various readings not exciting more contemporary discussion.

In 1604, the whole Convocation again solemnly subscribed the Articles. They used an English printed copy, by Christopher Barker, 1593, with the controverted clause.

In 1633 the authenticity of this clause was publicly debated in the divinity schools at Oxford, upon occasion of Heylin's disputing for his Doctor's degree. Prideaux, the professor, read the Latin article out of the *Corpus Confessionum*, published at Geneva, 1612, without the clause.

Heylin, objecting to this authority, (which was indeed only a translation from the English editions,) sent a friend to a neighbouring bookseller's, who furnished him with an English copy of the Articles with the clause, and this he has recorded as a triumphant silencing of his opponent. The very next year, Heylin tells us, Latin copies of the Articles were printed at Oxford without the clause, but Laud, then Chancellor of the University, interposed, and "the printers were constrained to reprint the book, or that part of it at the least according to the genuine and ancient copies." Still the printers persisted, and Latin copies from the University press are extant so late as 1636, without the clause.

Hales did not know of the clause, or rejected it as spurious, at least so it has been inferred from the following passage in his letter to Laud, 1636: "I count in point of decision of church questions, if I say of the authority of the church that it was none, I know no adversary I have, the Church of Rome only excepted. For this cannot be true, except we make the church judge of controversies; the contrary to which we generally maintain against that church." Language so directly opposed to the commencement of the Twentieth Article, would scarcely have been employed, had its authority been recognized.

The accusation against Laud and the bishops of Charles I. of being the original forgers of this clause is manifestly unjust. Of its omission, if genuine, no rational account can be given; the evidence seems considerable against its ever having received regularly the sanction of the Convocation till 1604, and its surreptitious introduction appears to me to lie at the door of Parker, or of Elizabeth herself. But it is probable that there are many facts tending to illustrate the subject, besides those which have been now adduced. Either fraud or forgery certainly has been committed, and either is a serious imputation upon the sovereign or primate or clergy, who acted as the founders of "the best-constituted church in the world."

F.

SIR,

July 7, 1819.

I AM rather inclined to apprehend that your estimable Correspondent V. F. and some others, [pp. 5—8; 137—142; 281—286,] in their biographical notices of the late Mr. Meadley, have not a little overdrawn his claims to literary eminence. Although I am perfectly willing to admit that the discussion which has occurred at the Sunderland Library, as far as it respected his religious views, was a very forced and needless intrusion of topics, utterly unconnected with the circumstances which called for the monumental memorial of his services to that institution; yet, on the other hand, it seems to me that his friends are claiming for him an elevation of character which his talents had in fact never reached.

Much of this, indeed, may be in a chief measure owing to an assumption of his intimacy with the late Archdeacon Paley, which in reality never existed, at least at all beyond the common civilities of occasional intercourse, this eminent man was accustomed to shew his parishioners in *general* during the periods of his residence at Bishopwearmouth.

Nor were these intercourses of a nature by any means sufficient to qualify Mr. M. as an adequately competent historian of that great man's life, his sentiments or his views—or will the execution of the task, as it *has been* accomplished by him, ever, I conceive, compensate the irreparable loss the Archdeacon's friends have sustained in the ampler Memoirs of his Life, with which, *but for* M.'s undertaking them, they *might* have once been gratified.*

V. M. H.

SIR,

July 6, 1819.

I HAVE observed something very like a charge of *Unitarianism* preferred against *Thomas May*, the Continuator and Translator of *Lucan* and

* To this circumstance I have already alluded in a preceding Volume of the Monthly Repository.

[Although we possess a copious general Index in MS. of all the Volumes of our Work, we are unable to discover the communication to which our Correspondent refers. Ed.]

the Historian of the Long Parliament. It appears from the following passage in a Biographer, too often calumnious. Speaking of May's having been "graciously countenanced by King Charles I. and his royal consort," Wood remarks—

"He, finding not that preferment from either, which he expected, grew discontented, sided with the Presbyterians upon the turn of the times, became a debauchee, *ad omnia*, entertained ill principles as to religion, spoke often very slightly of the *Holy Trinity*, kept beastly and atheistical company, of which *Tho. Chaloner*, the regicide, was one; and endeavoured to his power to asperse and invalidate the King and his cause." (*Ath. Oxon.* 1691, col. 295.)

The conclusion of this passage will easily account for those unsupported charges of irreligion and immorality, among which is placed disaffection to the doctrine of a *Trinity*. Lord Clarendon, in his own *Life*, written at *Montpelier*, 1668, could find nothing worse to say of his early associate than that "he fell from his duty and all his former friends; and prostituted himself to the vile office of celebrating the infamous acts of those who were in rebellion against the king." He adds, indeed, "Which he did so meanly, that he seemed to all men to have lost his wits, when he left his honesty; and so shortly after died miserable and neglected, and deserves to be forgotten." (P. 35.)

Lord Clarendon may be suspected to have suffered a temporary *loss of his wits*, while thus depreciating May's History (which has found an enlightened modern Editor) and, venting a royalist's spleen against the Author. So far from having *died miserable and neglected*, unless the expression refer to the circumstance of his having been found dead in his bed, *May* was buried, probably with a public funeral, in Westminster Abbey, where, according to *Wood*, there was erected to his memory "a large monument of white marble," by order of the Parliament, in honour of their Historian, as appears in the following conclusion of his epitaph, by Marchmont Needham: *Hoc in honorem servi tam bene meriti, Parliament. Reipub. Ang. P. P. May* died in 1650, and

shared with *Blake* and *Cromwell* in the disturbance of their ashes by the royal profligate *Charles*, and in his puny attempt to disparage their memories. The minute biographer *Wood* has, however, recorded that the place where *May's* tomb occupied "the west wall," was in 1670, devoted to Dr. Triplet. It was near the tombs of *Camden* and *Casaubon*.

LIGNARIUS.

SIR,
AMONG the subjects relative to public worship that of late years have come under discussion, there is one which, I think, deserves more consideration than has usually been allotted to it. No sincere Christian can doubt the importance of whatever has a tendency to kindle a spirit of fervour, and to rouse that feeling of inward devotion, without which the mere outward forms of worship become not only mechanical, but no longer acceptable to our heavenly Father, who must be worshiped in "spirit and in truth." It becomes, therefore, a question for our consideration, what are the means best adapted for cherishing the pure flame of rational devotion and thanksgiving. In this connexion it is that I regard the importance of that delightful branch of our religious services, which receives the soul-inspiring aid of *poetry*. It is this which has added sublimity wherever she has been associated, and in proportion as her influence has been felt, she has united refinement to the exalted pleasures of religious adoration. With this conviction, we surely cannot too highly prize the admirable effusions of those excellent men who have thereby so nobly served the cause of piety and virtue. Who then can reflect on many of the beautiful productions of *Doddridge*, or read the simple measures of *Watts*, without regretting that we are not permitted to enjoy them till they have passed the ordeal of the modern refinery? I do not mean to deny the necessity of omitting certain portions of the writings of many of our sacred poets, in order to render them consistent with modern ideas of scriptural truth: in the most important of these our Unitarian Editors coincide, nor would there otherwise

often remain any alternative, but the total rejection of what, in most respects, is unexceptionable; but in how many instances have we seen liberties taken with this kind of writings, where little better reason could be offered than the caprice or speculative notions of a compiler, who in his turn is supplanted by other innovators of still more varied fancy, till, at length, we are almost at a loss to recognize the original author through the disguise imposed upon him.

It has become of late years a prevailing fashion for congregations to become editors of their own hymn-books, and these have of course varied in merit, according to the taste or talent of those employed in their compilation. I am free to admit that the system, of which for some reasons I complain, has been of considerable service to the cause of religious poetry, by calling forth the talents of contemporary authors, who have contributed to enlarge the number of unexceptionable compositions. But if good have incidentally followed, I cannot but lament the perversion of talent, which, in a large proportion of these publications, has led to the mutilation of even the best compositions, and the bad taste engendered by an affectation of refinement. A kind of puny criticism is made subservient to the detection of that, for which the poet alone is accountable, or is employed in raising matter for petty philosophical or theological cavils. And why is religious poetry alone to be at the mercy of every compiler, no matter how little he may possess of that sacred fire which originally gave birth to the object of his unsparing attacks? Who can view without regret the tasteless mutilations of living and dead authors, which are not unfrequently brought together from various quarters in the most unseemly manner? With as little scrupulosity, we may often observe the name of an author retained, although he would scarcely recognize his own productions, still less would he have sanctioned so unfair a proceeding. In questioning the justice and propriety of subjecting the works of others to the arbitrary alterations of individual editors, I am well aware of the motives by which many estimable per-

sons have been actuated in these well-meant labours: at the same time I must be allowed to inquire, whether any of their praiseworthy objects is not counterbalanced by other more important considerations, not to mention the inconvenience to which strangers are subjected in our places of worship. I may also be permitted to doubt whether we do not depart, in a great degree, from the original intent of *poetry* in public worship, when we make it merely a vehicle for moral sentiment and Scripture paraphrases, often possessed of no other of its pretensions than that of mere *rhyme*. Surely this kind of versification adds little, either of dignity to public devotion, or of weight to the precepts of religion. As regards the moral and religious improvement of *children*, I cordially admit that much may be done by putting into their hands practical hymns adapted to their capacity, which can hardly be expected to appreciate the higher order of compositions; and I think it desirable to admit into our selections for public use, such a variety of subject as shall be suitable to different classes and circumstances. This, I conceive, is perfectly compatible with the rules of propriety and good taste, which, as I have endeavoured to prove, are violated by too many of our modern compilers.

In making the foregoing remarks, I must observe that nothing invidious is intended. Every publication is open to fair criticism, and while, in many instances, I disagree in the views of the editors of our modern Unitarian hymn-books, in others I think a great deal of judicious taste has been shewn, without encroaching unnecessarily upon the undoubted prerogative of the poet.

B.

SIR,

July 8, 1819.

IN addition to what R. H. [p. 299] has replied to E. S. [p. 164], your readers may be referred to the following writers.

Mr. Hallett, in his *third volume*, (1736,) says (p. 52), that "Austin undoubtedly joined the *first* and *second* commandment into one, and divided the *tenth* into two." He then proceeds (pp. 52—55) to point out the variations in the editions of the com-

mandments sanctioned by the *Romish Church*.

The late Mr. Granville Sharp has gone farther into the subject, in his "Remarks on the Catechism recommended by the four R. C. Archbishops of Ireland," 1810. At p. 30 he says, inaccurately, according to Mr. Hallett's and R. H.'s accounts of Austin, that "the first attempts to suppress the second commandment—must have been made in very dark times of Popery." In the subsequent pages he has collected much curious information, and, notwithstanding his horror of Popery, has not failed to do justice to several *Catholic* editions of the commandments, in which they are arranged like those published by the Protestants.

C. D.

SIR,

THERE is not any thing, in reading controversy, more disgusting than the conviction, or even the suspicion, that the writer *misrepresents* his opponent; and gives such statements of his sentiments and of his reasonings in support of them, as are calculated to make them appear ridiculous, and thereby endeavouring to create a *prejudice* in the minds of his readers *against* him and the *doctrines* he advocates, and in favour of his own dogmas. Every man, as he has an undoubted right to think for himself on all theological subjects, has also an equal right to defend what he sincerely believes to be the truth; but if in doing this he treats with contempt those who have defended opposite sentiments, as hardly possessed of common sense, and as incapable of sound reasoning and argument, although men of equal learning and piety with himself, and so stating their arguments as to give them the air of being trifling, impertinent and absurd, he who does this exposes himself to severe and merited censure, and betrays the weakness of the cause he attempts to defend.

I have been led to these remarks by the manner in which Dr. Priestley is treated by Dr. Magee, in various instances, in his "Discourses and Dissertations on the Scriptural Doctrines of Atonement and Sacrifice."

I shall select and make some observations on one instance, as a specimen

of Dr. Magee's manner of treating Dr. Priestley, and of the way in which he combats his arguments.

In No. XXXV. * (which he entitles) "On the Arguments by which it is attempted to prove the Passover not to be a Sacrifice," he says, "It is a *curious fact*, that the declaration of St. Paul, (1 Cor. v. 7,) that Christ our passover is *sacrificed* for us, is adduced by Dr. Priestley, (Theol. Repos. I. 215,) as a convincing proof that Christ was not *sacrificed* at all." I am inclined to think that this is a gross misrepresentation, or else that, if the Doctor has said any thing like it, what he has said is so stated and perverted as not to convey the meaning he intended to convey. I have not the work referred to by me, or I would have examined into the truth of this "*curious fact*." Some of your Correspondents, who are in possession of the Theological Repository, will, perhaps, explain this matter.

Dr. Magee goes on to *quote* the Doctor as saying, "It follows from the allusion to the Paschal lamb," contained in this passage and others of the New Testament, "that the death of Christ is called a sacrifice, only *by way of figure*; because these two" (namely, sacrifice and the paschal lamb) "are quite different and inconsistent ideas: and the argument by which he endeavours to establish this, is not less extraordinary than the position itself, as it brings forward an instance, in which one of these *totally different and inconsistent* ideas is expressly called in the Old Testament by the name of the other; the passover being in the passage which he quotes from Exod. xii. 27, directly termed *the sacrifice of the Lord's passover*." "This," says Magee, "seems an *odd species of logic*." Had we the Doctor's piece before us, or had Dr. Magee given us a fair, ungarbled quotation of what he has said upon the subject, we should, I have no doubt, be convinced that this contemptuous sneer at the Doctor's logic is impertinent, ungenerous, and without any foundation. Is it conceivable that Dr. Priestley would assert that "the passover was not a *sacrifice*, and that *sacrifice* and the *paschal lamb* are two

* Page 297, 4th edition.

quite different and inconsistent ideas," and then bring forward (as he is here represented as doing) a passage of Scripture, without explanation or comment, where the passover is "directly termed" a sacrifice? Is the Doctor to be considered as an idiot? Yes, most certainly, if we form our judgment from the representation given of him by Dr. Magee.

Notwithstanding all that Dr. Magee has said to the contrary, Dr. Priestley was certainly correct in saying that "the passover was not a sacrifice, and that these two (namely, sacrifice and the paschal lamb) are quite different and inconsistent ideas." In the institution* of the passover, (and every circumstance belonging to that institution is minutely detailed by Moses,) there is not any thing of the nature of sacrifice connected with it. It was not a *sacrifice* but a *feast*, as it is expressly and repeatedly called, and as such it was observed in all their generations. The command to all the congregation of Israel was, that they should take a lamb every man according to the house of their fathers; a lamb for a house; that they should *kill* it in the evening, and that they should *eat* the flesh in that night, roast with fire and unleavened bread. And Moses concludes with saying, † "This day shall be unto you for a memorial; and ye shall keep it a *feast* to the Lord throughout your generations; ye shall keep it a *feast* by an ordinance for ever."

A learned writer ‡ gives the following account of the nature of sacrifices: "Whatever is offered in a solemn manner immediately to God, so that a part of it, or the whole of it, is consumed, is what is meant by the word sacrifice, whether it be upon an altar, or what is used instead of an altar; whether it be by fire, or in any other manner, is not material; but there must be a *gift* or *oblation* of it; whatever the subject or matter of it may be, it must be *offered to God*, and there must be a consumption of it." But in the celebration of the passover, as instituted by Moses, none of these circumstances occur; there was no oblation. The lamb was not

offered to God, but eaten by the children of Israel. It was not consumed. No priest was employed to kill the lamb and present it to God. There was no altar upon which it was laid; no confession of sin over it, or crime alleged for which it was to make an atonement. How then could it possibly be a sacrifice?

Dr. Magee may swell his pages with numerous quotations from Jewish and Christian writers to prove that they considered the passover as a *sacrifice*, and speak of it as such; but we have evidence that will outweigh them all, (the evidence of the most enlightened Jews, that of our Lord and his disciples, and of the Jews in their time,) to prove that they neither considered the passover to be a sacrifice, nor did they observe it as such. The historian tells us, that when the day of unleavened bread came that the passover must be *killed*, the disciples of Jesus asked him where they should prepare to *eat* it. What was the answer? Was it, provide a lamb, carry it to the Temple that the priest may present it to the Lord, slay the victim and offer it on the altar, a burnt-offering to the Lord? Such it must have been had the passover been a sacrifice; but instead of this he directs them to go into the city, and to follow a man bearing a pitcher of water, and to say to the master of the house into which he entered, "the Master saith, Where is the guest-chamber, where I may (not *sacrifice* but where I may,) *eat* the passover with my disciples?" They did so, and the man shewed them a large upper room, where they made ready the passover, and Jesus and his disciples sat down and ate it together. "With desire have I desired (said he to his disciples) to *eat* this passover with you before I suffer."

Had the passover been a solemn sacrifice to God, this conduct of our Lord and his disciples would have been a profanation of that sacred ordinance, and a gross violation of the law of Moses, by converting a solemn sacrifice into a feast, and thus robbing God of his offerings. Had the Jews in their days considered it as a sacrifice to God, in vain would Jesus have made the appeal to them, "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" This

* Exod. xii. † Verse 14.

‡ Sykes on Sacrifices, p. 4.

very circumstance would have convicted him of transgression.

But to what authorities does Dr. Magee appeal? To Jewish rabbies; men who made void the commandments of God by their traditions; to Christian writers, who, in general not satisfied with the simplicity of the gospel of Christ, have defended every corruption, both of Judaism and of Christianity. And is this *evidence* to be set up in opposition to the *testimony* of Jesus Christ?

But that the passover was not a sacrifice we have even greater evidence than that of Jesus, the testimony of God himself. The passover was instituted and observed by the Israelites *on the day in which the Lord their God brought them out of the land of Egypt*: but God addressing the people of Israel by the prophet Jeremiah, says, * “Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, put your burnt-offerings unto your sacrifices, and eat flesh; for *I spake not* unto your fathers, nor *commanded them, in the day that I brought them out of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices*; but this thing *commanded* I them, saying, obey my voice.” But, if we believe Moses, God did *at that time speak* to them by him concerning the passover, and did expressly *command* them to observe it as an ordinance for ever. If, then, the passover was a sacrifice, this declaration is not *true*, or else it was not of divine origin, God did not *command* it. Dr. Magee says that it was a *sacrifice*, and that God did *command* it; but “let God be true and” (Dr. Magee, and all the Jewish rabbies and Christian writers, who dare to contradict him) “every man a liar.”

Let us see now how Dr. Magee proceeds in his refutation of Dr. Priestley. “Dr. Priestley, however,” he says, † “hopes to *mend* the argument by asserting, that this (Exod. xii. 27), is the *only* place in the Old Testament in which the paschal lamb is termed a sacrifice,” and that here, “it could be so called, only in some secondary and partial, and not in the proper and primary sense of the word:” and for these reasons—namely,

that “there was no priest employed upon the occasion, no altar made use of, no burning, nor any part offered to the Lord: all which circumstances (he adds) were essential to every proper sacrifice.” What is the reply of Dr. Magee to all this? “Why,” he says, “now, in answer to these several assertions, I am obliged to state the direct contradiction of each: for, first, the passage in Exodus xii. 27, is *not* the only one, in which the paschal lamb is termed קרבן, a *sacrifice*: it being expressly so called in no less than four passages in Deuteronomy, (xvi. 2, 4, 5, 6,) and also in Exodus xxxiv. 25, and in its parallel passage, xxiii. 18.” Let us examine this reply: and, first, we affirm that neither in Exodus xii. 27, nor in any of the other passages referred to, is the passover termed a *sacrifice*. The Hebrew word קרבן does not necessarily mean a *sacrifice*, but simply to *kill*, and when used in relation to the passover cannot possibly have that meaning; for the best of all reasons, namely, because, as we have seen, the passover was no sacrifice at all. The passage in Exodus should have been rendered, “It is the *slaying* of the Lord’s passover;” but the *killing* of an animal, intended to be offered in *sacrifice*, no more constitutes it a *sacrifice* than the *slaying* of it for food does.

Parkhurst, in his Hebrew Lexicon, gives the following explanation of the word: “קרבן to *slay* in general, 2 Kings xxiii. 20; Ezek. xxxix. 17, 19. Sometimes for food, as in 1 Sam. xxviii. 24; 1 Kings xix. 21; but most frequently for sacrifice. Gen. xxxi. 54, xlvi. 1, and al. freq., and so it *may be* rendered to sacrifice.” In the former of the passages in Genesis, “And Jacob *offered sacrifice* upon the mount,” our translators have put in the margin of our Bible, “*killed beasts*,” “Jacob *killed beasts* upon the mount, and called his brethren to eat bread: and they *did* eat bread, and continued all night in the mount.”

The same remarks will equally apply to the Greek word made use of by the apostle, 1 Cor. v. 7: “Christ our passover is *slain* for us.” The apostle there refers to the passover, not as a sacrifice, but as a *feast*; for he immediately adds, “Let us therefore keep the *feast*, not with the leaven

* Chap. vii. 21—23. † P. 298.

of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." The Greek word εἰσθῆ, there used from θῶ, says Parkhurst,* means "to slay for food, occ. Matt. xxii. 4; Luke xv. 23, 27; Acts x. 13; xi. 7; Compare John x. 10." "In the LXX." he adds, "it is used for זבח."

Upon what untenable premises, then, does Dr. Magee assert, in contradiction to Dr. Priestley, that the passover is expressly called a sacrifice in the passages above referred to!

But in further contradiction to the Doctor, Magee asserts: "2. A priest was employed. 3. An altar was made use of. 4. There was a burning, and a part offered to the Lord: the inwards being burnt upon the altar, and the blood poured out at the foot thereof." It is much easier to assert and to contradict than it is to answer and refute. What is there in the institution of the passover to justify these assertions of Dr. Magee? And yet the institution must necessarily contain every thing in it essential to the due observance of the ordinance; and that it did so we may be assured from the particularity with which Moses describes the manner in which they were to observe it, and he charges them, when the Lord shall have brought them into the land which he swore unto their fathers to give them, to keep this service.

"A priest was employed." What does the Doctor allege in justification of this assertion? Why he says, † "1. It was a *corban*, or offering, brought to the *tabernacle or temple*, as we find it expressly enjoined in Deut. xvi. 2, 5, 6." "Thou shalt therefore זבח, *kill* the passover unto the Lord thy God, of the flock and the herd, in the place which the Lord shall choose to put his name there. Thou mayest not *kill* the passover within any of thy gates, which the Lord thy God giveth thee; but at the place which the Lord thy God shall choose to place his name in, there thou shalt *kill* the passover at even, at the going down of the sun, at the season that thou camest forth out of Egypt." This is all of it exactly agreeable to the institution by Moses; but here is nothing said about

"a priest, a tabernacle, a temple, an altar, a sacrifice, a corban or offering," or any one thing the passage is brought to prove. They were, it is true, to kill it in the place which the Lord should choose to put his name there: this, says he, must mean the *tabernacle or temple*. If it were so, that would not make it a sacrifice.

Dr. Magee not only says that it was expressly enjoined in the passage just quoted, but that it was "exemplified at the solemn passover in the reign of Josiah, 2 Chron. xxxv. 5, 6, 10, 11." It is there stated that Josiah kept a passover unto the Lord in Jerusalem; and they *killed* the passover on the fourteenth day of the first month, and he set the priests in their charges, and encouraged them to the service of the house of the Lord, and he commanded the Levites to put the ark into the house which Solomon had built, and to prepare themselves by the houses of their fathers after their courses, according to the *writing of David, King of Israel*, and according to the *writing of Solomon* his son; and in the 10th and 11th verses it is said, "So the service was prepared, and the priests stood in their place, and the Levites in their courses, according to the king's commandment." This ordering the charges of the priests, and the courses of the Levites, had no connexion with the institution of the passover, but was the appointment of David and Solomon for the general and regular service of the sanctuary. They were, therefore, in their places according to the *king's* (Josiah's) *commandment*, on this solemn occasion. It follows, "And they *killed* the passover, and the priests sprinkled the blood from their hands, and the Levites flayed them." This is all that is said concerning the passover in the above passage referred to by Dr. Magee, to prove that the passover "was a *corban*, an offering brought to the *tabernacle or temple*, as expressly enjoined in Deuteronomy, and exemplified in this passage." But there is not any thing in the passage to shew that it was a *sacrifice*, or that it was an *offering* brought to the temple and offered to God. There is no mention of any altar, or that the blood was the blood of a sacrifice, that it was sprinkled on the altar, that it was shed for sin, or designed to make an atonement. The

* Gr. Lex. under θῶ, iv. † P. 299.

priests, indeed, seem to have been employed in the business: they *killed* the passover, and sprinkled the blood *from their hands*, a singular mode of expression, if there was any mystery in it, or any importance attached to it, and this they did not by the authority of Moses or the command of God; but, as it should seem, by the authority of the king; for we are told they were there according to his commandment. Now we well know that kings and priests have always been fond of assumed, unauthorized power. Kings sometimes dispense with the law of God. Thus Hezekiah commanded the passover to be kept on the fourteenth day of the *second* month, contrary to the command of God by Moses, that it should be kept on the fourteenth day of the *first* month. "And a multitude of the people had not cleansed themselves, yet did they eat the passover, *otherwise than it was written*; but Hezekiah prayed for them, saying, The good Lord pardon every one."*

As to the sprinkling of the blood of the passover *from the hands* of the *priests*, it could have no relation to the sprinkling of the blood of their sacrifices by the *high-priest* within the veil, but was properly a memorial of the sprinkling of the blood of the passover, on the lintel and door-posts of the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt; that the destroying Angel, seeing the blood, might pass over their houses, and not slay their first-born. Besides, in the account of Josiah's passover, there is not any mention of the *high-priest*, (who alone could carry the blood of their sacrifices into the holy of holies and sprinkle it there,) as having any thing to do with it.

But to proceed. Dr. Magee goes on to assert, that, "2. The blood of the paschal lamb was *poured out, sprinkled, and offered at the altar by the priests*, in like manner as the blood of the victims usually slain in sacrifice, as appears from Exod. xxiii. 18, and xxxiv. 25; 2 Chron. xxx. 15, 16, and xxxv. 11."

In the former of these passages, we read, "Thou shalt not offer the blood of my *sacrifice* with leavened bread,

neither shall the *fat* of my *sacrifice* remain until the morning." In the margin, in which the translators profess to give a more exact meaning of the original, instead of the word *sacrifice* they have inserted the word *feast*, the *fat* of my *feast*. Nor is there any word in the original that answers to the word *offer* in the translation. The literal rendering of the passage, I conceive, is, Thou shalt not זבח *kill* with leaven the blood of my זבח *slain beast*, neither shall the *fat* of my *feast* remain until the morning.

The *killing of the blood*, in this passage, evidently means the *shedding of it*, as appears from the parallel passage also referred to, Chap. xxxiv. 25, "Thou shalt not שחט *shed* (not thou shalt not offer, but thou shalt not shed) with leaven the blood of my *slain beast*, neither shall the slaying of the *feast* חג, or the *festival victim** of the passover be left until the morning."

"The *fat of my feast* shall not remain until the morning," is exactly in agreement with the words of the institution.† The lamb was to be *killed* in the evening, and the flesh was to be *eaten* that *night* roast with fire; the head and the legs and the purtenance thereof were to be *eaten*, and *nothing of it* was to remain until the morning. The command, therefore, was to eat the *whole* that night, and not to leave any of it, even the *fat*, till the following day.

Dr. Magee next refers us to 2 Chron. xxx. 15, 16: "Then they killed the passover on the fourteenth day of the second month." This is all that is said about the passover in the passage. The remaining part of the 15th and 16th verses relates entirely to the *burnt-offerings* that were *offered* for the cleansing of the *priests* and *Levites*; for it follows, "And the *priests* and the *Levites* were ashamed, and sanctified themselves, and brought in the *burnt-offerings* into the house of the Lord, and they stood in their places after their manner, according to the law of Moses, the man of God: the *priests* sprinkled the blood, (namely, the blood of the burnt-offerings,) which they received of the hands of the *Le-*

* 2 Chron. xxx. 15, 18.

* See Parkhurst on the word.

† Exod. xii. 6—10.

vites." This passage wants no comment; it is upon the face of it a complete refutation of every thing it was intended to prove. With equal propriety might the Doctor have referred to every one of the Levitical sacrifices as he has done to that of the burnt-offerings, and with equal truth he might have affirmed of each of them that what is said concerning them is applicable also to the feast of the passover.

The last passage Dr. Magee refers to, (2 Chron. xxxv. 11,) we have already considered.

Upon these passages I shall make only one further observation, namely, that the Doctor refers to them without quoting the words: such a quotation would have been fatal to the whole of his argument. It was to be presumed that his readers would suppose that the word of a dignitary of the Church was to be depended on as to the contents of the passages, without the trouble of an examination; in that case the Doctor would have been safe; an examination would have led to detection, and the pious fraud would have been discovered.

The Doctor proceeds, with a kind of triumph, to give a summary of the whole of his arguments in the following words: * "Thus, then, all the distinguishing characters of a sacrifice, we find to belong to the offering of the paschal lamb. It was brought to the temple, as a *corban*, or sacred offering to the Lord. It was slain in the courts of the temple; and the blood was received by the priests, and handed to the high-priest; who poured it forth, and sprinkled it before the altar, offered it together with the fat and entrails which were burnt upon the altar." All these characters of a sacrifice the Doctor affirms (without the slightest degree of evidence, and contrary to the plain truth of the fact) to belong to the paschal lamb. It is no where called the offering of the paschal lamb. It is no where called a *corban*, or sacred offering to the Lord. We no where read that it was slain in the courts of the temple; or that the blood was received by the priests, and handed to the high-priest. We are no where told that the high-

priest poured forth the blood of the passover, and sprinkled it before the altar; or that he offered it together with the fat and entrails upon the altar, or that they were burnt upon the altar. On the contrary, the terms *corban*, *high-priest*, *altar*, *entrails*, *pouring forth*, *sprinkling before the altar*, *offering*, or *burning upon the altar*, never any one of them in any instance occur in the accounts we have, either of the institution, or of the celebration of the passover. The term *fat* is once mentioned, not as to be offered, or burnt upon the altar, but as to be eaten in the night in which the passover was slain, and not to be suffered to remain until the morning; for so it must have been eaten, if, according to the command of Moses, the whole of the lamb was to be eaten that night, and nothing of it to be left till the morning. How then could Dr. Magee venture to make assertions so palpably false, and their falsehood of so easy detection!!! We appeal to all the passages to which he has referred, and affirm that they do not contain any thing in them to prove the passover to be a sacrifice, or that any one of the distinguishing characters of a sacrifice, as stated by him, belong to that ordinance.

From these observations we see what little reason the Doctor had to treat Dr. Priestley and his arguments upon this subject in the supercilious manner in which he has treated them. If, Sir, you think these remarks worthy of a place in your valuable periodical publication, they are at your service.

JOHN MARSOM.

Birmingham,
August 6, 1819.

SIR,
PERMIT me to express, however inadequately, the affectionate respect with which I cherish the memory of the late Rev. Joseph Bretland.* Soon after my entrance into public life, I was honoured with his friendship: to his uniform kindness and candour I am considerably indebted; and many are the agreeable and instructive hours which I have passed in his society. An individual more distinguished by purity of manners and a strict adherence to the suggestions of duty I have never known. He was a fine example in particular

* P. 301.

* Mon. Repos. XIV. p. 445.

of filial piety, which he had an opportunity of exercising long after he had reached the stage of manhood. Like many other men of superior talents, attainments and virtues, he courted the shade of retirement: nor can they who were best acquainted with him cease to regret that his habits were so sequestered.

Mr. Bretland was a student in the Dissenting Academy at Exeter; his tutors, if I mistake not, being the Rev. Samuel Merivale,* the Rev. Micajah Towgood,† and the Rev. John Turner.‡ In mathematical learning he was no common proficient; and he had a taste especially for the reasonings and investigations of geometry, the influence of which on the general cast of his mind and of his compositions it was not difficult to perceive. His knowledge was various and accurate; but theology, in all its branches, seems to have been his favourite pursuit.

It is a memorable circumstance that, half a century ago, Mr. Bretland avowed, from his pulpit in the Mint Meeting-house at Exeter, those religious principles which are professed, diffused and vindicated by most of the book societies styled *Unitarian*, and the progress of which has of late years been comparatively wide and rapid. He then stood alone as the preacher of them in the West of England, and was exposed, in consequence, to peculiar obloquy. In the avowal, too, of these principles—the absolute unity of God, and the unequivocal humanity of Christ—he continued steadfast to the last. His pastoral relation to the congregation in the Mint, was of many years' duration; and for a short time he was the colleague of the Rev. James Manning, and of the late Rev. Timothy Kenrick, in the charge of the united societies assembling respectively at the Bow and at George's Meeting-house. The elocution of Mr. Bretland was extremely correct and pleasing: his discourses were usually practical, though argumentative; and some of

them contained very beautiful and pathetic passages.*

Tuition, either private or public, was, for some years, one of his employments: in 1799, he became the colleague of Mr. Kenrick, whose character and labours he most deeply venerated, in a seminary for the education of Protestant Dissenting ministers.

By an affecting coincidence, the day of Mr. Bretland's funeral was the day of the anniversary of the Western Unitarian Society, holden this year at Bath:† on which occasion one of his former pupils in the academy‡ publicly rendered a very interesting tribute of respect and gratitude to the memory of both his excellent instructors. On the same day too, the society of which I am speaking expressly and formally recognized the principles on which it had been established in 1792, and which, under the blessing of heaven, it has been enabled to assert and illustrate with growing success. That by such a recognition of them it has fulfilled the hopes and wishes of some of its oldest members, who were then present, is true: nor can I doubt that the issue of the discussion approves itself to the feelings and the judgment of nearly all the subscribers, of every class and standing.

I should be happy, Sir, were it in my power to annex a correct list of Mr. Bretland's productions from the press, which however were very few, and, I fear, are, with scarcely an exception, out of print. The attempt shall be made; but I must intreat some of your Correspondents to supply my omissions and rectify my inaccuracies.

JOHN KENTISH.

A Sermon on Acts xx. 26, 27, preached before an Assembly of Protestant Dissenting Ministers in Exeter, May 10, 1786. 8vo. Pp. 36.

The subject is "the duty of ministers declaring *the whole counsel of God.*" It was followed, if I recollect rightly, by a *postscript*, and involved the preacher in a temporary and local controversy.

* Belsham's Memoirs of Lindsey, p. 219, Note.

† See the Sketch of his Life, &c. by Manning, p. 64.

‡ The early friend of the amiable John Scott, of Amwell.

* Mon. Repos. IX. pp. 703, 704.

† Ibid. XIV. p. 453.

‡ The Rev. J. H. Bransby.

A paper in the *Theological Repository*, Vol. VI. 322—331, entitled, "Objections to Ordination among Dissenters," and signed A LOVER OF ORDER.

A paper in the same work, VI. 382—408, "On the Scripture Doctrine of the Love of Christ," with the signature ADJUTOR.*

A Sermon on the Death of Mrs. Elizabeth Rowe, at Crediton, Devon, October 21, 1798. 8vo.

Papers, on different subjects, in the *Monthly Repository*, some with his own signature; and a sett, in Vols. V. and VI. "On the Temptation of Christ," signed GARON: these consist of five letters.

Query: Whether an edition of Dr. Priestley's English Grammar was not published by Mr. Bretland?

J. K.

SIR, July 9, 1819.
HOMO'S remarks on suicide, (p. 227,) have reminded me of two passages, which form a striking contrast, and which I quote from the original accounts. The first is in "Observations on Wadsworth," printed about 1692, by Mr. Layton, author of "The Search after Souls," mentioned in *Mon. Repos.* VI. 10, 213. That author says, at p. 124,

"The present time affords a rare example of a young, rich and otherwise happy Lord, who, by a pistol bullet, took away his own life at the Bath, meerly to rid and free himself from such sharp pains of the gout and stone, as then oppressed him."

The other passage is in a "Dedication to the Public," prefixed to his "Dissertation on the unnatural Crime of Self-Murder," by Dr. Fleming, in 1773. He says,

"Near forty years ago, I had the uncommon pleasure of reconciling a gentleman, racked with the stone, to a patient endurance of his painful condition; though he had set his house in order, had formed his resolution, and fixed on the time of dispatching himself. Which persuasion, the said gentleman acknowledged, in

* I now suspect, but do not know, that the paper, in the same volume, signed *Subsidianus*, came from the pen of Mr. Bretland.

a letter to a worthy friend of mine, (Dr. Benjamin Avery,) was wrought in him, by a remonstrance I had drawn up against suicium, which was inserted in the *Old Whig*, a weekly paper."

In an appendix to this *Dissertation*, Dr. Fleming "points out the inequality of some of our penal laws which take away the life of man;" and has anticipated the juster views of criminal jurisprudence which are now, I hope, gaining some of the public attention. On "simple theft" he would not inflict the penalty of death, and remarks that "a neighbouring state has wisely appointed a rasp-house and other severe labours, as a far more equitable and efficacious punishment." On *forgery* he observes, "If I am rightly informed, the *Dutch* have a far better way of punishing the criminal; for they cut off the first joint of his thumb, and thus render him for ever unable to commit another forgery. At the same time, this very maiming fixes on him a perpetual mark of disgrace; and yet leaves him opportunity of reforming himself, and of being further serviceable to society. Thus the sagacious provident Republic are not so lavish of men's lives as we are."

J. O. U.

P. S. Dr. F., in his "Ingratitude of Infidelity," 1775, p. 40, refers to "an anonymous pamphlet, entitled, *The Apostles' Creed better than the Assemblies' Catechism*, printed 1720, said to be by Mr. Joseph Hallet, Junior." Does any one of your readers possess this pamphlet, which might deserve a new edition?

Brief Notes on the Bible.
No. VI.

"MY God, my God! why hast Thou forsaken me?" (Matt. xxvii. 46,) is the opening of the 22d Psalm.

Was it, inquired one of my children, quite consistent in the mouth of Jesus? He possessed a knowledge of his impending fate, and even declared, that to the fulfilment of his mission such a consummation was indispensable; which, therefore, could be no indication that his God and Father had forsaken him.

Whatever inconsistency, however, may be imputed to this invocation, it

is a slight, and, if the expression be allowable, a venial one, upon the hypothesis of the *simple humanity* of the sufferer.

That he was not unappalled by the sufferings he contemplated, is evident from his prayer, that, if possible, the cup might pass from him. Though prepared to suffer and to die, it is no violent presumption that his actual sufferings might be more acute than he had anticipated,—and, in a paroxysm of agony, this, perhaps convulsive, expostulation might break from him without any definite meaning. It was followed by a second cry of lamentation; and both were uttered just before his dying and more collected declaration, (John xix. 30,) “It is finished.”

He had *submitted* to all that it behoved him to endure, but did not sustain the extremity of suffering without the expression of such a *sense* of it, as was natural to a simply human being; and in words neither weighed, nor resembling any language that he had ever used, or was capable of using, in a state of mental composure.

There is nothing, therefore, staggering in the inconsistency which has been suggested.

But another far more important consideration is behind.

What will the orthodox say to it?

Will they contend it to be possible that “God made man,” or that a man, in any profoundly mystical identity with God, could have ejaculated such a sentence? That Jesus in his blended character could thus have expostulated with himself? That such a preposterous interrogation could have passed the lips of a being conscious of the divinity within him, and that God had neither forsaken, nor *could* forsake him?

Really, Sir, what I have thus committed to paper stares upon me in such a guise of absurdity, that I shrink from it with a sensation not to be defined; but, as our Lord and Master reasoned with the Jews upon their own principles, so are we constrained to parley with the modern Pharisees on theirs.

Upon the Unitarian hypothesis the passage is of easy explication; but, on the orthodox scheme, it involves (especially in conjunction with the

prayer in the garden) such a real and revolting inconsistency, as furnishes a problem for them, which I suspect to be of somewhat more difficult solution.

BREVIS.

Liverpool,

July 24, 1819.

SIR,

IT is not my intention to take out of the hands of Dr. Carpenter, who is so much more able than I to do justice to the subject, the elucidation of the doctrine of the Divine Influences, to which he is invited by your Correspondent L. J. J. in the last Number of the Repository, [p. 419]. But as L. J. J. intimates [pp. 367, 368] that he does not understand how Unitarians can consistently make use of expressions, implying a belief in that doctrine, some of which he quotes from two hymn books, which have been recently compiled for the use of the Unitarian congregations in this town, such as,

“With truth and virtue feed our souls,”
&c. &c.

I wish to explain what I conceive to have been the views of the compilers, in admitting into their collections such expressions as are here alluded to. And, first, I think it may be distinctly stated that they did not mean to convey the idea, that supernatural communications from the Deity are to be expected as the result of our petitions for divine illumination, any more than when using the words of the Lord's Prayer—“Give us this day our daily bread,” they would expect to receive a miraculous supply of food.

Petitions for divine aid to the mind appear to stand upon the same footing as those for every other blessing, or rather on a better. For, if we are to pray for any thing, what objects are so proper as wisdom and virtue? Other things may be good or bad according to the use we make of them, but these are always good.

In fact, your Correspondent's difficulties seem to relate to prayer in general; against which philosophical objections may, no doubt, be urged; though, perhaps, even on the principles of natural religion, they are not insuperable. But whatever force there may be in these objections, it is suffi-

cient for a Christian that the duty of prayer is distinctly taught, indeed positively enjoined, in the New Testament, both by our Lord and his apostles, as well as recommended by their example. On this ground then, I apprehend, the compilers of the works in question are justified in admitting such expressions as imply a wish for divine aid to guide us to truth and virtue, and in believing that these pious aspirations are neither improper nor unavailing, though they may not be able to explain exactly in what manner, or to what degree, they are efficacious. And most certainly, if the compilers had struck out all such expressions, their works would not have been accommodated to the people for whose use they were designed: for these compilations were not made for schools of speculative philosophy; but for congregations of Christians, who are contented to take their religion from the Scriptures, and feel no desire to be "wise above what is written."

T. F.

Nottingham,
July 13, 1819.

SIR,
YOUR Correspondent L. J. J. [pp. 367, 368,] has called the attention of your readers to a subject of great importance, and certainly of some difficulty: and though I have no doubt that his communication will meet with the attention it merits, from the individuals to whom he particularly addresses his remarks, I am inclined to offer a few thoughts which have occurred to myself, as calculated to satisfy the doubts which arise in the reflecting mind on this question. Some years ago I read a discourse of Dr. Priestley's, on the subject of the Divine Influence upon the Mind, with which I was far from being satisfied. It appeared to me, that with such views it would be impossible to vindicate the use of prayer, or to lay any solid foundation for the practical part of religion. I could not help thinking that in combating one error, he had fallen into another, and I was unwilling to believe, that sound principles of reasoning could lead to a result evidently unfavourable to the use and efficacy of religion. Indeed, I think it must strike your Correspondent himself, as affording a presump-

tive argument against the solidity of his views, when expressions, apparently so congenial to the devout mind as many of those he has selected, appear objectionable. Allowing for the vividness of expression natural to poetical compositions there seem to be but few of the lines selected, of which it would not be easy to give a rational and satisfactory explanation. It appears to be understood by your Correspondent, that, in these passages, the Almighty is represented as acting by a supernatural and immediate impulse: but, surely, this is not a necessary deduction. We may suppose the Divine Being to exercise a providence over the spiritual part of his creation, quite as ordinary, and regulated by laws quite as general, as that which we admit he exercises over the material world; and still it may be very proper, in the one case as in the other, to pass by the operation of second causes, and turn our regards solely upon the great First Cause, expressing in simple but striking language, the simple but important and undoubted truth, that God is the only Fountain of all our blessings. To make use of a common illustration—when we pray for daily bread we do not fancy that it will be supernaturally provided, without the use of labour and industry. When we speak of God as giving fruitful seasons, we include in our consideration all that series of natural causes which he has at command. So when we pray for guidance in our spiritual course, we mean, if we mean any thing, and do not content ourselves with a mere sound of words, that God would exercise his providence, in placing in our way the means of improvement, and adapting our principles to our trials. Surely this cannot be thought irrational. For if we believe that God has actually revealed his will to us in a supernatural manner, (and all Christians do believe this,) fervently to pray that he would so order his providence, as that this holy will should be understood by us, and applied to the sanctification of our lives, cannot be shewn to be irrational or unbecoming.

It is not necessary for the vindication of such a petition, that the person

preferring it should have a distinct conception of the means which the Almighty may adopt to fulfil it.

The prayer of Cornelius was heard, and his desire of further light on the subject of religion was satisfied, though he could have no distinct conception of the means which God would employ for that purpose. Suppose any devout Heathen of the present day to fall down and pray to the unknown God, and with a strong sense of his own ignorance to implore him to enlighten his mind with truth, could there be one found so insensible as to bring against him a charge of absurdity on that account? And if God, in the exercise of his providence, should lead him to the knowledge of the gospel of Jesus Christ, which is able to make men wise unto salvation, this, surely, would be no less an instance of divine grace, than if he had taught him by the ministry of heavenly angels, or by his own immediate operation had inspired him with the knowledge of his truth. So, may it not be a rational prayer of every partaker in Christian privileges, that he who knows our thoughts, and is conscious of every thing that passes in our minds, would promote the influence and superintend the efficacy of those means which he has planned for our instruction in righteousness, and our final admission to glory?

Views of this kind, it has been said, open the door to every sort of delusion. And it cannot be denied that men have often entertained extravagant and unscriptural notions respecting the Divine Influence upon the mind. But we are liable to err on either hand, by taking a confined view of this subject. On the one hand, those who maintain the doctrine of Divine Influence, generally conceive of the Almighty as acting upon the mind in an arbitrary and supernatural manner, as if he had no fixed rule of proceeding in such a case, and was in want of proper instruments to effect his purposes; and, on the other hand, those who controvert the notion of sensible impulses, sometimes go so far as to give us the impression that, in their opinion, the Almighty exercises no controul over the spiritual part of his creation, (that is, has nothing to do with the noblest part of

his works,) and that in none of the acts of his providence does he concern himself to promote the spiritual well-being of his creatures. This is to go from one dangerous extreme to another; for what can have a greater tendency to deprive religion of its influence, than such a view of things as this, which represents us as struggling with difficulties and exposed to dangers, in relation to our most important interests, without being able to look up to that great Being, on whom all our hopes depend for help and protection? His spirit, which pervades every thing and discerns every thing, is debarred, it seems, from interposing its energies in behalf of creatures, whose infirmities expose them to constant peril, though they have before them the prospect of immortal life and happiness.

On this supposition, too, what account can be given of the duty of prayer? For why should we be called upon to commune with that Intelligence who surrounds us, unless it comes within the scope of his providential government to bear a personal relation towards us, as the hearer and answerer of prayer? But a theory, which excludes the Divine Being from so large and important a part of his creation, will be found to have its origin in narrow and erroneous views of his nature and perfections. There is every reason to suppose that he has the dominion equally of the spiritual and material kingdoms. We, indeed, have no knowledge of mind except from its operations; we know little or nothing of the nature or quality of spiritual existence; and, therefore, the operations of mind do not seem to us capable of being brought under the same strict cognizance of Divine Providence as takes place in the material world: but we may be sure that, with respect to God, both departments of creation are equally and entirely known; and, if known, then guided equally to a good end, by the exercise of divine power, wisdom and goodness, in the formation and maintenance of equitable and beneficial laws. Under this idea of the extension of Divine Providence to every part of the creation, we ought to regard every influence which tends to the moral improvement of mankind,

as the gift of the grace and favour of God, for which we ought humbly and heartily to give him thanks, and for the continuance and extension of which we ought to pray, whatever be the instrumentality by which this good influence may have been exerted.

I am aware that this whole view of the subject is exposed to objections, arising from the difficulty of reconciling the exercise of Divine Providence with the accountableness of man; but this is a difficulty which, like the origin and existence of evil, must press equally upon every theory connected with theological speculation.

H. T.

Warwick,

July 13, 1819.

SIR,

IN the List of Congregational Subscriptions to the Unitarian Association, (see p. 6 of the Report of the Committee,) I observe our congregation is justly mentioned; but the name of our highly-respected minister, Rev. William Field, is by some means omitted. I should not have troubled you, Sir, with a correction of this, but from the circumstance, that at this season of the year, a number of strangers from all parts of the United Kingdom, visit the neighbouring Spa of Leamington; of course, among them there are many Antitrinitarians, and this being the nearest Unitarian place of worship, (a delightful walk of two miles,) such as are desirous of paying their adorations to the one only living and true God, will most likely be at a loss unless they inquire for Mr. Field's chapel. Divine service commences at eleven in the morning, and six in the evening.

J. ARMSTRONG.

P. S. I mention the time from the following suggestion of your Correspondent W. Whitfield, [XIII. 305,] "You will, no doubt, be perfectly aware of the usefulness of a complete list of the Unitarian places of worship in the United Kingdom; the names of the towns in which they are to be found, alphabetically arranged; the name of the chapel, if any; the situation in each town; the name of the preacher, and the time at which the different services commence," &c.

I beg to say that, with the assist-

ance of a friend, and by the constant perusal of your valuable Miscellanies, I have made out a list of about one hundred and fifty Unitarian, Arian, Presbyterian and General Baptist congregations, with the names of their respective ministers: this I shall be happy to transfer to any tract society or individuals, who may have means to acquire such further information as will enable them to furnish the Unitarian public with a correct list of their several places of worship.

SIR,

July 10, 1819.

I DO not find in the writings of those who have entered into the controversy concerning the authenticity of St. Paul's Epistles, that they have paid any attention to the only argument, in my opinion, which ought to have decided the question long since: I presume, therefore, to state what the inspired apostle has said, to lead us to the proper proof; and we, as Christians, are bound to take his sacred word. In his second Epistle to the Thessalonians, chap. iii. ver. 17, he says, *The salutation by the hand of me, Paul, which is my token (seal or mark) in EVERY Epistle.* **THUS I WRITE.** In examining the other Epistles, I can find this mark or token only in the following—1 Cor. xvi. 21: *The salutation of me, Paul, with my own hand.* Col. iv. 18: *The salutation by the hand of me, Paul.* Gal. vi. 11: *Ye see how large an Epistle I have written to you with my own hand.* Philemon, ver. 19: *I Paul have written it with my own hand.* In this last quotation the apostle introduces his name as much as a pledge for the payment of a sum of money, as a proof of the authenticity of his epistle.

In no other letters bearing his name, do I perceive this essential mark or token, which the apostle makes use of to distinguish his own authentic writings from those which were written in his name, but without his authority: not having his hand and seal solemnly pledged for their authenticity. It was not necessary, perhaps, for the apostle to make the same solemn asseveration in his private correspondence with an intimate friend and companion, such as Timothy was; but in writing to a public body of Christians, there was great

propriety in so doing. It is singular enough that *Tertius*, who wrote the Epistle to the Romans, see chap. xvi. 22, should make use nearly of the same phrase; *I Tertius, who wrote this Epistle, salute you in the Lord*: though he writes in the name of Paul in the beginning of the Epistle, he ends it in his own name; and in no part of it says he had written by the direction or advice of the apostle. From the above circumstances, all those Epistles which have not the mark or token of this attestation of Paul, ought to be considered as of less authority in points of doctrine than those which have it; as we are assured by the apostle himself that *they* proceeded from his own pen. Indeed, this is St. Paul's argument why we should not receive any epistle as written by him which wants this essential characteristic, but should only be considered by us as the apocrypha of the new covenant.

I should be happy to gain attention to this simple statement by any of your learned Correspondents in your valuable Miscellany, where every subject meets with a candid reception, and is so treated; and the more so, it must be acknowledged, as being of so much importance to the Christian world, and is by no means exhausted by any thing heretofore written on the subject.

Permit me to remark, that I do not recollect any one of the writers in the Monthly Repository, on the final salvation of all men, to have quoted from a work on this subject, published and printed for Dilly, in the Poultry, in 1784. It is handled very masterly by the Author, who is nameless. Its running title is, "Proofs of Universal Salvation, with Objections answered." The Author is, or was an Arian, but this opinion is unconnected with his argument. It would be doing an acceptable service to the religious world if a few of his Scripture proofs could appear in your Miscellany occasionally, especially the Author's proof from 1 Cor. xv. 24—29, p. 197, which appears to me, as well as to the Author, to be *decisive* of itself, were there no other text in all the Bible of the like import.

PHILALETIUS.

On the Rev. Samuel Newton's Objections to the Improved Version.

LETTER II.

THE worthy author of the "Trinitarian's Appeal Defended," having proved to his own satisfaction, and that of his admirers, that no person is qualified to be a translator of the New Testament who is prepossessed in favour of any system, unless that system be the true orthodox faith, proceeds

2. To exercise, I will not say his critical knife, but his critical hatchet, in hewing down the Editors of the Improved Version without ceremony and without mercy; and, I must add, with an assurance scarcely to be paralleled. "What I judge of the Version," says this prince of critics, p. 33, "you have partly seen and shall see further. What are we to judge concerning those critics who make an archiepiscopal translation of the Scriptures the basis of their Version, and who in the third page begin to print two pages in italics," &c.;—"concerning critics who tell us that part of the first, and the whole of the second chapter of Matthew are of doubtful authority," &c.;—"critics who receive the genealogy, and reject the miraculous conception," &c.;—"critics who found their objections upon the death of Herod," &c.;—"critics who tell us that *γίνομαι* is used seven hundred times in the New Testament, but never in the sense of create?" &c. &c. And so the gentleman goes on in the same self-complacent style of interrogatory through four pages, sometimes stating, and sometimes misstating, what the Editors of the Improved Version have asserted or assumed, never condescending to examine either their arguments or their authorities, and in the end coming to this most satisfactory conclusion: "So—their general character as critics is FAIRLY impugned, and we cannot expect from them a Version, with the excellencies which they are pleased to ascribe to that which they have published."

In any writer but the author of the Trinitarian's Appeal, &c., the above mode of treating the defendants in the case would be thought a matchless specimen of vanity and insolence.

But considering that those poor *witlings*, as this writer is pleased to describe the Editors of the Improved Version, had no better authority to plead than that of Locke, who knew not how to construe a common Greek sentence, or Dr. Clarke, who was little better, or of Lindsey and Priestley, who were flimsy lucubrators, or of Sykes, whose authority is not worth notice, or of Wakefield, who is a lame biblical critic, or of Evanson, to whom it is folly and ignorance to appeal, or of Simpson, who is an obscure *referee*, or of Newcome, or of Law, or of Williams, or of Pierce, or of Hallet, or of Cappe, and many others, who, in the estimation of this great and self-constituted umpire of critical controversy, are like the notorious Hugh Farmer, mere ephemeral insects delighting in their own buzz; taking, I say, all these premises into consideration, one cannot but approve of the short work which this supreme judge in the high court of criticism, this Bentley of theological erudition, has made with the Editors of the Improved Version, in striking them off at once by summary process, together with all their authorities aforesaid, by his own *sic volo, sic jubeo*, from the rolls of criticism, and consigning them to their proper place and station among Grub-street vagabonds.

3. In the next Letter, p. 38, the reverend gentleman suspecting, perhaps, that, whatever he and his admirers might believe, there might be some old-fashioned readers who would not be quite so easily satisfied with his brief and *fair* way of disposing of the Editors of the Improved Version, vouchsafes to descend from his lofty station into the arena of debate, and condescends to offer his arguments, such as they are, to confute the positions and reasonings of the Version. It is quite needless to enter into the general question concerning the miraculous conception of Jesus, which has been so ably discussed, and I may say settled by Dr. Priestley, Dr. Williams, Mr. Pope and Dr. John Jones. I shall, therefore, only touch upon one or two points which are particularly insisted upon by the author of the Trinitarian's Appeal, &c.

The Editors have stated, upon the authority of Epiphanius, that Cerinthus and Carpocrates received the

genealogy of Matthew, though the Ebionites rejected it. The author of the Appeal, &c., disputes the fact, which in truth is not of the least consequence whatever. There the genealogy stands, at the beginning of Matthew's history; and there is no sufficient reason for rejecting it. But what the Editors maintain, and what cannot be disproved, is this: that the writer of the genealogy could not be the historian of the miraculous conception, for their intentions were directly opposite—the design of one being to prove that our Lord descended from Abraham and David, because he was the son of Joseph; and the design of the other being to prove that Jesus was not the real but only the reputed son of Joseph. So that if the history of the miraculous conception be true, it would appear to the Jews that Jesus of Nazareth was deficient in an essential qualification of the promised Messiah, viz. the descent from David.

Now how does our learned divine get over this difficulty? In the easiest and *handsomest* way that can be imagined, viz. p. 41, "These men," i. e. the Editors of the Improved Version, "suppose what they please, and then infer the iron obligation of necessity. There appears indeed to be a necessity—a fatal one—in their logic, their faith and their impudence. The matter is settled, but where? Only in the minds of *some prejudiced witlings*. The generality of commentators believe, and with reason, that Matthew had no such design in his genealogy as they ascribe to him—he expresses himself thus: 'And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ:' a most extraordinary way of shewing his design to prove that Joseph was the father of Christ."

Now, Sir, I am of opinion that there are some persons in the world, and perhaps those *impudent witlings*—the Editors of the Improved Version among the rest, who may be simple enough to believe that one of the strongest presumptions that a man is the father of a child is, that he is the husband of the mother. This, however, according to the reverend gentleman, is a *most extraordinary* mode of proof. Perhaps he may understand these things better, and may take

exceptions to the proof. I for one, however, firmly believe that Mary the mother of Jesus was a woman of a strictly virtuous and most excellent character; nor can I ever be induced to admit, without evidence much superior to any which has hitherto been produced, that she was with child when she was married to Joseph, and that she made her good-natured husband believe that the father of the child was the Holy Spirit, or as we are taught by a learned divine of the Established Church, the angel Gabriel.* Neither could the evangelist Matthew believe any such thing, when he states as his reason for introducing the genealogy, that Jesus Christ was the son of David, the son of Abraham: which he must have known that he certainly was not, if Joseph was not his father.

“But,” says the reverend gentleman, “the generality of commentators believe, and with reason, that Matthew had no such design in his genealogy as they,” the Editors, “ascribe to him.” I have, I think, sufficiently shewn that they do not believe with reason: and as to the rest, if they like to believe, let them believe on.

4. Dr. Lardner has proved to the satisfaction of the learned, that the death of Herod happened seventeen or eighteen years before that of Augustus; and Luke relates that Jesus was thirty years of age in the fifteenth year of Tiberius. It is evident, therefore, that the birth of Christ happened two or three years after the death of Herod. Dates are stubborn things, and will not yield to passion and prejudice: and these dates completely upset the whole fable of the miraculous conception. The Editors of

* The angel Gabriel is the Holy Ghost. See this doctrine most learnedly and elaborately argued by the Rev. Reginald Heber, in the fourth of his Bampton Lectures. Such is modern Oxonian divinity. What would Dr. Wallis and his contemporaries have thought of this doctrine? What does Bishop Burgess even now think of it? Will he allow that the angel Gabriel is a person but not a being? And that this nonentity was the father of Jesus Christ? What is Dr. Moysey's opinion? Does he believe that the angel Gabriel includes the whole idea of God and something more?

the Improved Version have referred to Lardner's account of the death of Herod; and their opponents falsely charge them with appealing to Lardner as agreeing with them in the rejection of the miraculous conception. This writer, as usual, joins in the cry of the pack, and with great simplicity he produces Lardner's words as a confutation of the assertion of the Editors, p. 44: “When St. Luke says, ‘Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius,’ &c., he *may intend* some computation of the reign of Tiberius different from that of his sole empire after the death of Augustus.” He *may intend*. What! is a direct assertion of the sacred historian to be set aside by a conjecture even of Dr. Lardner? Who ever dreamed of a double computation of Tiberius's reign, except for the sole purpose of cobbling up this great chronological difficulty? This distinction was indeed very common in the Lower Empire, but was not known in the reign of Augustus, and could never be applied to Tiberius, who, it is plain from Tacitus, was far from being confident of an undisputed succession. Let this reverend gentleman now surmount this “mighty chronological argument,” and “wing his little way over this lofty mountain” as best he may.

5. This author, though no great friend to argument, bows with the most profound veneration to popular authority.

It is stated by the Editors of the Improved Version, that “if the account of the miraculous conception of Jesus be true, he could not be the offspring of David and Abraham.” How does the author of the Trinitarian's Appeal, &c., reply to this plain fact? “To me,” says he, p. 49, “it appears sufficient to reply, the Christian world in general believed and do believe, that Jesus was miraculously conceived, and that he was the offspring of David and Abraham.” This is an easy way of getting over a difficulty. The evangelists give the pedigree of Joseph to prove that our Lord was descended from Abraham and David; but the Christian world it seems supersede the authority of the evangelists: they believe the contrary; they deny that Jesus was the son of Joseph; they maintain that Christ

descended from Abraham in a way different from that which is stated by Matthew and Luke; and this satisfies our critical author.

He bows to similar authority in a case of still greater importance. In 1 Cor. xv. 13, the Apostle Paul avers, that if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen; and if the dead rise not, then they also who are fallen asleep in Christ are perished: an assertion which is utterly inconsistent with the doctrine of an intermediate state of percipient existence between death and the resurrection. To such an expectation, therefore, it is impossible that he should refer in the Epistle to the Philippians, (i. 23,) where he expresses a desire to depart and to be with Christ. How does the reverend gentleman, who maintains the doctrine of an intermediate state, solve the difficulty? By his usual summary process. Believers, who think as he does, cannot be mistaken. "Plain people," says he, p. 81, "understand, and cannot but understand, the meaning of the apostle; and they are not such conjectures of impossibility as these which will prove effectual to subvert their faith." That is, plain people first believe that virtuous souls exist in a state of happiness separate from the body between death and the resurrection; and the same plain people also believe that, if there be no resurrection, all that have fallen asleep in Christ are perished. These "plain believers," says the author, "understand, and cannot but understand, the meaning of the apostle;" but I am sure it is not for such wittings as the Editors of the Improved Version to understand these plain believers. But at any rate it is very clear, that they who believe what these plain people are reported to believe, need not stick at any thing. Contradictions are a trifle. Transubstantiation would be nothing. Alps are no Alps to them. Difficulties are no obstacles to them. In short, there is no knowing to what sublimity of absurdity the author and his plain friends "may wing their little way," after the notable specimen which they have thus exhibited of the transcendent vigour of their faith.

B.

SIR, Clapton, June 4, 1819.

I WISH your Correspondent [p. 103] had copied a few more lines from *Voltaire*. Those which he quoted are in *La Henriade*, (Cant. vii.) where Saint Louis, in a vision, conducts his descendant among the shades. That exclamation of *Henry* on beholding the sufferings of the wicked, is immediately followed by this reply from his conductor:

"Ne crois point, dit *Louis*, que ce tristes
victimes
Souffrent des châtimens, qui surpassent
leurs crimes;
Ni que ce juste Dieu, créateur des hu-
mains,
Se plaise à déchires l'ouvrage de ses
mains.
Non, s'il est infini, c'est dans ses recom-
penses;
Prodigue de ses dons, il borne ses ven-
geances.
Sur la terre on le peint le premier des
tirans;
Mais icy c'est un père; il punit ses en-
fans."

Of these lines any of your readers, to whom the original is not familiar, may, if they please, accept the following translation; in which I have endeavoured to convey the poet's sense:

Think not, said *Louis*, in this dreary
clime,
The allotted pains exceed the sufferer's
crime;
Or that the forming Pow'r, by justice
sway'd,
Delights to ruin what his hand has made.
No, boundless is the recompence he pays,
Lavish of good, his wrath alone he stays.
On earth portray'd, a Tyrant, vengeful,
wild;
Here, as a Father, he corrects his child.

I question whether *White*, *Stonehouse*, *Winchester* or *Vidler*, have surpassed this *unchristian* poet, as I fear we must describe *Voltaire*, in a just representation of the Divine character, as it is loved and venerated by those who receive and understand the Christian doctrine of *Universal Restoration*.

The note quoted from *Voltaire*, at the close of the lines, (p. 103,) reminds me of an *unmerciful Doctor* of the seventeenth century. This was *Lewis Du Moulin*, who died in London 1680, having published, that year, "Moral Reflections upon the number of the Elect; proving plainly from Scripture Evidence, &c., that not one

in a hundred thousand, (nay, probably not one in a million,) from Adam down to our times, shall be saved." (*Wood*, A. O. 1692, II. 754.) This *Du Moulin* was a brother of *Milton's* antagonist, the author of *Regii Sanguinis Clamor ad Cælum*. The *Moral Reflections* produced the same year "Mercy Triumphant: the Kingdom of Christ enlarged beyond the narrow bounds which have been put to it, by *Dr. Lewis Du Moulin*, in his most Antichristian Book. By *Edward Lane*, M. A., Cambridge." (*Ibid.* I. 898.) Of this writer I know nothing but what *Wood* further relates, that he "was educated in *Paul's School*, and afterwards in *St. John's College*, Cambridge," that he "became Vicar of *North-Strobury*, [perhaps *Shoebury*,] in *Essex*, by the favour of the Lord-Keeper *Coventry*, 1630, and was thence removed by the same hand to the Vicarage of *Spersholt*, near *Rumsey*, *Hants*." His answer to *Du Moulin* was reprinted in 1681, "together with several arguments about Transubstantiation, not in any author yet;" and an Answer to *Hickeringill's* "Second Part of *Naked Truth*."

J. T. RUTT.

SIR,

Clapham.

AS one of your Correspondents (p. 295) has been pleased to notice some remarks of mine, which you lately inserted on the subject of Final Restitution, (p. 87,) perhaps you will allow me to add a few words further in support of what I then advanced. As to the general observations made in the paper alluded to, they are just, I think, and liberal, and I heartily approve of them. I love free inquiry as well as any one, though I believe there is not much room for it on the present subject. What I maintained was this: that the arguments by which the doctrine of Final Restitution is supported, are feeble and unsound in their nature, and can form no just ground for allowing this doctrine to pass for a part of religious truth. Now I argued that in attempting to deduce this doctrine from the attributes of the Deity, we enter on a field where we have not sufficient experience to guide us. In answer, your "Occasional Reader" observes, that we may indeed be thus in the dark as

to particular events, which are necessarily involved in complicated circumstances, but that in a question which, like this, regards the final result of the Divine government, certain necessary consequences from the Divine attributes may be manifest enough. Now this, as a general remark, appears very just, but I wish to shew that it is not applicable to the present question; that is, that we are as unable to deduce the doctrine of the final happiness of all men from what we know of God, as we are to prophesy distant events from what we know of the course of things in this world.

Let us consider the sort of argument by which this doctrine is maintained. "God," it is said, "is almighty, and just and good: it is highly improbable that such a being should create such a race as mankind, and afterward suffer any of that race to perish;" that is, as the matter stands, that he should suffer any man to fail of final happiness through obstinate impenitence. Here the question arises, Why is it improbable? How is it at variance with any known attribute of God? Is it unjust? It is inconceivable on what ground any one can complain of injustice, if by wilful, persevering misconduct, he forfeit a gift to which, were he innocent, he could have no claim, and which, were he penitent, he could not receive but through an act of pardoning mercy. Some, indeed, have most fool-hardily denied that God can justly punish transgression at all, inasmuch as a creature can be neither better nor worse than his Creator has made him. The premises here are not unjust: God asserts for himself that he creates evil as well as good: he has not so constituted the world as to prevent sin and evil from entering; that is a fact, and we do not now attempt to explain it by the hypothesis of two creators; but would it mend the case to suppose that God allows this evil to proceed without check or punishment? No: sin and punishment must come together. That sin should exist may be a mystery, but it is a fact; but then that punishment should follow sin, is no mystery, but perfectly natural: God would be unjust if it did not. He would be destitute of every moral attribute.

But perhaps I have dwelt too long on

this blind sophistry, which best refutes itself. Let me proceed to ask, Is the final impenitence and consequent destruction of some part of the human race incongruous with the *goodness* of the Deity? "Yes, it is," some will answer, "the God of love can never suffer any of his reasonable creatures thus to ruin themselves, and to forfeit that immortality for which they were fitted." There is some plausibility, I allow, in such a sentiment, but if I mistake not, no shadow of sound reason. The argument is this; such a catastrophe is disagreeable to the will of a benevolent being, and therefore to the will of God; and since he is almighty as well as benevolent, we may conclude he will not suffer it. Now, to be convinced of the fallacy of this way of reasoning, we may apply it to the question about the origin of evil in general; on which it bears exactly in the same way that it does on the present question. Were we now in Eden, as man was before sin and evil entered together, we might plausibly enough by this argument persuade ourselves that evil was a thing impossible. Indeed, something very like this was actually suggested in that happy place: but we know by whom, and we know the consequences. The source of difficulty, I conceive, is this: we first form abstract ideas of infinite power and goodness; we attach these to the Deity, and then proceed to expect that his conduct will realize them. Whereas we ought to conceive of the Deity by what we actually know of him, as manifested in the world around us, and in the facts and predictions of Scripture. Now if we do this, we shall never dream of any such love or power as will produce pure, unmixed good; and seeing how much evil and how much punishment actually exists in the present world, we shall feel utterly incompetent to judge to what extent they may go in another. I do not mean that we must be tossed about in a boundless sea of gloomy apprehensions. Not only what we see before us tends, on the whole, to inspire us with cheerful hopes, but God has himself, in his word, given us certain well-defined assurances, on which we may rely, and which limit the regions of doubt and fear. He has assured us that every man shall find himself

treated with *justice, mercy and love*. Whatever, therefore, is fairly and distinctly implied in this assurance, we may firmly believe. But, if I have argued justly, it appears that no man will have reason to think himself either unjustly or unkindly treated, if, after an adequate season of trial, persevering disobedience hardens itself into final impenitence, and the boon of immortality is forfeited. In saying this, I seem to rest on natural feeling and common sense. And let it be remembered, that unless the contrary can be established by clear and sound argument, that is, that a man so perishing in impenitence will be unjustly or unkindly treated, the whole doctrine of final restitution falls unsupported to the ground. In the meantime, against this doctrine there stands not only an awful and absolute silence in the word of God, but many express denunciations, which, in my own judgment indeed, are decidedly opposed to it, but which, I suppose, all will allow to be calculated to leave a very contrary expectation on the mind.

I have said enough: your Correspondent writes with friendly candour, and I trust that he will believe that I also am no enemy to the freest discussion of religious questions; no, not even of that before us, as far as we have any light to guide us. But as the matter stands, I must regard it as foolish and vain and unhallowed, to attempt to bring to light the destiny of those around whom the Scripture has thrown the blackness of darkness for ever.

EUELPIS.

SIR, August 5, 1819.

THE following free remarks on a subject which has been lately under discussion in your valuable pages, are with frankness, but I trust becoming deference, submitted for consideration.

In inquiries concerning the treatment of offenders under the Christian dispensation, it appears to be of the greatest importance to keep steadfastly in view *the grand object and design of that dispensation*. The Apostle Paul, in brief but comprehensive terms, describes Jesus as having "*abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light by the gospel*."

Thus his revelation is opposed to every thing connected with *death*: it does not, like the dreams of the Heathens, rest our hopes and our fears in the imaginary realms of the dead, the regions of *Elysium* and *Tartarus*; nor does it suffer the former to wither in despondency, by the dreary prospects of endless insensibility; but it dissipates all the shadowy and threatening clouds presented by the grave, and imparts to mankind the assurance, not merely of renewed life, but of a life of immortality. As this is the purport of the *Christian revelation*, so it is the design of the kingdom or government of Christ, or as it is often termed the *Christian dispensation*, to realize and establish such an event. Nothing was so opposed to the objects of our Lord's mission, character and office, as human misery and death; there was no object which he so incessantly laboured to accomplish as the mitigation and ultimate removal of these evils, and the promotion of the blessings of a renovated and immortal existence.

The present life, mingled as it is with evil and suffering, and transitory in its duration, has evidently for its primary object, use and enjoyment, not abuse and consequent dissolution. It is the result of a most curious organization, made not to produce pain, but to yield pleasure, to acquire knowledge, to effect objects of utility. Sickness, disease and death are the derangement and disorganization of the structure, and consequently in their own nature opposed to the purposes for which it was fashioned. When life is removed, it can only be restored by a renewed act of that creative power by which it was originally produced; and in proportion as its new powers are of a superior and more durable kind to those we now possess, they must be the result of a higher act of omnipotence, and all those evils which bring death in their train, must be proportionately further removed from their very nature. To suppose destruction or suffering to be the very objects for which superior vital powers are imparted, appears scarcely any thing short of absolute contradiction. When an assurance is given that the dead will be reanimated, and even exalted to the condition of *quickenings spirits*, accord-

ing to a glorious pattern which is exhibited, can it be imagined that it has for its proper object, in the cases of numerous individuals, perpetual suffering? Can this newly-constructed and most exquisite frame be fit only to be torn and deranged? Or is it reasonable to suppose that the Creator will re-edify the frames, and reproduce the vital powers of some persons so indifferently, or so well-fitted to live in misery or die in wretchedness, that perpetual suffering or dreadful destruction will be all they have to anticipate, either through all eternity, or for a period of time so lasting that it may be compared to it? Admitting this last supposition to be the truth, and that it is intended to terminate in the immortal felicity of the sufferers, would not the expectation of such a result, from such a process, be like expecting to put a machine, constructed anew, but retaining some of its former defects, into the best possible order, by exposing it to the most violent treatment? Is it not infinitely more reasonable than either of these suppositions, to conclude that the great object and proper effect of this *resurrection* from death, must be to destroy, and not in any cases to impart new energies to this principle of destruction? To suppose that while new vital powers are imparted to one grand division of mankind for use and felicity, the like new vital powers are imparted to another whole division of our race, to be sources of suffering, is such an opposition of ideas, as I feel assured can never have had its origin from the fountain of revealed truth.

The many healing and life-restoring miracles which God wrought by Jesus, among a nation generally in fixed enmity to his gracious designs, were evident blessings to all on whom they were effected. But if the restoration of this life, or its re-establishment in health and vigour, be a great blessing, its reproduction with powers of far superior vigour and durability, must in its very nature be a blessing of proportionately greater magnitude to *all* its partakers. And in this light it is clearly represented in the New Testament. The gospel is an annunciation of the universal resurrection of the dead, as I think may be clearly learned from the tenor

and concluding events of the gospel-histories, from the Acts of the Apostles, who "preached through Jesus the resurrection of the dead," from the first and all the following verses of 1 Cor. xv., the declaration of Paul, above quoted, and many other passages of the New Testament. If then the *gospel*, or glad tidings, intelligence from heaven of a joyful and animating nature, and the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, be convertible terms, it follows that the event is *in its own nature* a great blessing. The universal subjection of the human race to death is described as a state of *condemnation*, and their universal resurrection as a *justification of life*; a phrase which seems to indicate something more than mere deliverance from that condemnation. As that sentence was consequent to the sin of our primitive parents, and passed upon all men on account of their common sins and imperfections, so the promise of universal resurrection was consequent to the exemplary righteousness of Christ, who was raised as *the first-fruits* from the dead. "As in Adam all die, so in Christ all will be made alive; Christ the first-fruits, afterwards they who are his at his appearance; then (or next after) will be the end, when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power—the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death," 1 Cor. xv. 20, &c. What is this language but an assurance that as all men now are mortal like Adam their parent, so all men, in a great degree according to the order of moral worth, shall at length be raised like Christ their great exemplar; that as they all died from their resemblance to Adam in moral imperfection, so they will all be raised on account of their resemblance to Christ in moral capability; that in the end they shall all be brought to that resemblance, by the subjugation of all other ruling principles to his authority, when all the moral causes of death being removed, this only remaining enemy will be destroyed—that is, life and immortality will be universally established?

That there will be great distinctions in the resurrection state, which will be regulated entirely according to the scale of genuine Christian excellence, may be sufficiently inferred from the

above passage, in which it appears that the faithful followers of Jesus have the priority in order, and that all moral evil must be subdued before immortality can be universally realized. It seems to have been generally concluded, that bad men will be raised with precisely the same evil propensities with which they were characterized in this life; the proud man still swelling with pride; the avaricious and selfish still hankering after wealth and devoid of social feeling; the sensual still doating on the objects of his low gratifications. This conclusion appears at variance with the moral ends justly to be anticipated from events of such magnitude, so alternately awful and glorious as those of death and the resurrection. Are such operations of infinite power for no purposes of corresponding magnitude? Assuredly their objects coincide with their nature and power. Death is the mortifier of sin—resurrection the animating principle of righteousness. The proud man in death quits all the sources of his haughtiness, all the means of his superciliousness and contempt of others, and resigns all the energies by which his short-lived greatness was sustained. In the resurrection he will be so far from finding those sources, means and energies restored, that every thing around and within him will inculcate the absolute necessity of reversing his conduct and pursuits. He will be placed under the proper and absolute dominion of Christ; to whose will all other authorities will now be subdued, and have become extinct. His renovated powers being for no other purposes than obedience, will find no objects, no gratification in any other pursuits. In proportion as he wishes to attain any distinction in this new kingdom and world, he must reverse his former steps—must humble all remaining pride and presumption, and cherish humility, brotherly-kindness and charity. He will see the faithful followers of Jesus rising far above him in the scale of wisdom and true greatness; but so far from envying those whom he had contemned, he must learn to rejoice in their ascendancy, and meekly, probably at a humble distance, to imitate their virtues. Were this view of retribution, which, from the nature of

Christ's kingdom and power, appears to me to be founded in truth, to be impressed upon the convictions of the proud, it must operate with much greater force in commanding their reason and subduing their passions, than any general denunciations of eternal misery or eternal death to an indiscriminate body of men, denominated *the wicked*.

As I am convinced that many passages in the New Testament, which have been applied to sinners subsequent to their resurrection, in reality relate to events under the Christian dispensation prior to that epoch, I propose in another letter, with your indulgence, to give my sentiments on such passages.

E. S.

Homerton,

August 13, 1819.

SIR,

IT will not be deemed improper in me to request permission to offer a remark or two on the letter of your Correspondent *Dominicus*, in the last Number, pp. 424, 425.

The design of one of the passages on which he has animadverted, was to express an opinion which to me seems well-founded; that, in comparing the Institutes of Calvin with those of Dr. Priestley, there appears, in the former work, a richness and unction of spirituality and practical piety; and, in the latter, an opposite character of jejuneness in that respect. Whether this opinion be just or not, every one of course must think for himself: but I do not perceive that it is greatly affected by the fact that, on one great branch of obedience, the French Reformer entertained a sentiment lower than that which most Christians in our country approve. Had I thought so, I should certainly have had no objection to have made the qualification. I was not ignorant that Calvin's sentiment on the sanctity of the Lord's-day was different from that which appears to me supported by sufficient evidence. [Let the reader peruse, if he please, Owen on the Sabbath, or President Edwards's Sermons on the Perpetuity and Change of the Sabbath.] There can be no reasonable doubt that he considered the religious observance of the first day of the week as a duty, upon the grounds of expedience and

utility *principally*, but I hesitate whether we can say *wholly*. In his Dissertation on the Fourth Commandment, to which *Dominicus* refers, he uses expressions which seem to me incompatible with that opinion. After he has laid down three reasons for the precept, and has observed that the first of them, the prefiguring of a spiritual rest, was fulfilled and abolished by the gospel, he goes on to say: "But, since the two latter reasons ought not to be reckoned among the typical representations of the old dispensation, and are equally suitable to all ages; though the Sabbath be now abrogated, the practice is still kept up among us of assembling together on the appointed days," [the whole connexion shews that he means the Lord's-day,] "for hearing the word, the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and public prayer; and also a cessation from labour is given to our servants and workmen. If the same necessity lie upon us, for the relief of which God enjoined the Sabbath on the Jews, let no one pretend that it has no reference to us. Our most wise and condescending Father has been pleased to provide for our necessity no less than for that of the Jews. But, it may be said, Why do we not assemble together every day, so as completely to take away any distinction of days? Truly I wish that were possible; and it would certainly be a commendable act of religious wisdom, to appropriate to that purpose a small portion of every day. But if, from the infirmity of the generality of men, daily religious assemblies cannot be carried into effect,—why should we not comply with the arrangement which we see is *enjoined upon us* [nobis impositam] by the will of God?"

In his Commentary on the Pentateuch, Calvin expresses himself in a manner which justice requires us to regard his conveying his more matured opinion. "Assuredly God set apart the seventh day to himself and consecrated it, on the completion of the creation of the world, to afford his devout worshipers a release from all other cares, for meditation on the beauty, excellence and splendour of his works. It is proper, indeed, that we should at no time be inattentive to the consideration of the wisdom

and power, the goodness and righteousness, of God, in the admirable formation and government of the world. But, because our minds are feeble and liable to forgetfulness and distraction, God, in kind condescension to our infirmity, sets apart one day from the rest, and commands it to be free from all earthly business and cares, that nothing may obstruct the holy attention of the mind. With this view he ordained, not merely that individuals should observe in private this rest from their labours, but that they should assemble in the sanctuary, there to offer prayers and sacrifices, and improve in the knowledge of religion from the interpretation of the law. So far, the need of a Sabbath is common to us and to the ancient Israelites, that we may for one day be free [from worldly concerns,] and may thus be better prepared for improvement in religious knowledge, and for the serious profession of our faith." *In Exod. xx. 8.*

It was from no unhandsome design to steal an advantage that, in the passage on which *Dominicus* does me the honour to remark, I did not class Calvin among "Sabbath-breakers." For, though his views of the sanctification of the Lord's-day were, so far as appears to me, defective and introductory to very melancholy consequences, he did certainly hold that the whole obligation of the fourth commandment was not superseded by Christianity, and that it binds us to special religious observances on that day, and to such means as promote a corresponding state of mind: and I can find no intimation whatever in his writings, that he approved of festivities and recreations on the Lord's-day.

I am obliged to *Dominicus* for referring to the passage in Mather's *Life of Elliott*, with which I was not before acquainted: nor can I ascertain to what foreign Protestant writers Dr. Owen alludes, who called the puritanical doctrine of the Lord's-day, an *English fancy*. But I could adduce some of the most estimable Dutch divines, whose sentiments are in accordance with that which *Dominicus* disapproves. Van Mastricht, in enumerating the duties included in the sanctification of the Lord's-day, puts in the first class, "a cessation

from all our own works, which are such as have for their object worldly gain, the ordinary labours of our calling, unnecessary travelling, feasting and carnal recreations." *Theol. Moral. Lib. ii. Cap. xv. Sect. 3, 5.* Hoornbeck, a contemporary of Dr. Owen, at the close of a Disquisition on the Sabbath, has this paragraph: "We are aware that the authority of Calvin has been brought against this doctrine; to which Walæus (*Diss. de Sabb. Cap. v.*) answers; 'The passages which are by some invidiously produced - were written by Calvin, neither against himself nor against his colleagues and fellow-labourers in the Reformation, with whom he never had any controversy on this subject; but against certain Papists and scholastic writers.' Theophilus Philo-Kyriaces (who in 1639 published a work on the Lord's Day*), goes farther, and thinks it right to dissent from Calvin's opinion on that subject. 'No man,' says he, 'will be surprised if he should find that to have befallen Calvin, which often happens to the diligent husbandman: in attempting the extirpation of weeds, he tears up some of the corn with them.'" — *Exercit. Theol. II. 117.*

Putting all these things together, I venture to think that the author of "The Scripture Testimony to the Messiah," is not chargeable with that want of candour which *Dominicus* seems to impute to him.

Another of your Correspondents, *Brevis*, [p. 414,] does not appear to have considered that there is reason to believe that a word has been lost out of the Hebrew text of 1 Sam. xx. 12. That "Jehovah, God of Israel," is not the language of invocation, but is the nominative to a verb which is wanting, is manifest from the subsequent וי. In Kennicott's No. 560, a manuscript which he assigns to the xiiith. cent. יהוה is found in the text before יהוה, and the same word is added in the margin of his No. 224, an earlier manuscript, which Lilienthal considers as a transcript from one of extraordinary antiquity and value, and free from the masoretic

* An English translation of the book, with a recommendatory Preface by Mr. Baxter, was published in 1672. It gives no information of the author's real name.

conformation. Thus the words will be, in the form of a solemn oath: "As the Lord, the God of Israel, liveth, I will try my father." This method of remedying the passage is rendered probable, from the similarity of contiguous letters, a very frequent source of omissions in manuscripts; if we suppose the error to have crept in after the introduction of the Chaldaic forms of letters. The Septuagint supplies the chasm thus; "The Lord, the God of Israel, *knoweth* that," &c. The Syriac, and the Arabic in Walton's Polyglott; "The Lord, the God of Israel, *is witness* that I will try my father."

J. P. S.

Dover,

August 10, 1819.

SIR,
I BEG leave to acknowledge the kindness of your Correspondent *Verbum Sat*, who, in your last Number [p. 413] very properly corrected an error into which, as he truly observed, I was unintentionally led, and also to add, that although the distinction did not occur to me while I was writing that letter, yet the sentiments therein expressed equally apply to all those Unitarian friends who have so generously contributed to our design.

B. MARTEN.

SIR, York, July 31, 1819.

WHEN my late most excellent friend Mr. Lindsey was hesitating about the duty of resigning his station in the Established Church, I remember his frequently mentioning, with great interest, the Memoirs of Mr. Thomas Emlyn—the narrative of his violent cruel persecution—the controversy in which he was compelled to engage with many leading characters in the Establishment, as well as with the furious bigoted Presbyterian ministers of Duplin. I was not at that time fully aware how painfully my friend's own mind was occupied in considering the sacrifice he might himself be compelled to make, should the clerical petition, intended to be presented to Parliament, be finally rejected; but I was deeply affected by the high admiration he often expressed, and to which he afterwards bore public testimony in "The Apology," of the patience, the

fortitude, and the pious resignation with which that eminent confessor endured the loss of fortune, of friends, of reputation and of liberty, rather than consent to make any concession contrary to his own firm conviction of the strict unity, the infinite goodness, and the peerless majesty of the great Father and Lord of all.

A letter which I received lately from a very eloquent, popular preacher at Boston, in America, and as I hear from many friends in that country, a very pious, excellent man, brought powerfully to my mind all the former interesting associations of 1771, with the character of Mr. Emlyn, many of which, if not wholly obliterated in the long period of almost half a century, were at length become less influential and vivid. Speaking of Mr. Cappe's Sermons on Devotional Subjects, which were last year reprinted at Boston, and of which my friend sent me a very able Review by a Mr. Ware, of that town, taken from a periodical work which has lately commenced there, says, "I have long seen and felt that Unitarianism will gain infinitely more by being exhibited as a living spring of devotion and high virtue, than by the ablest defences."

He afterwards adds—"This leads me to remark that the modern Unitarians have been wanting in justice and gratitude, (as far as I can judge,) to that venerable confessor, Emlyn. I read not long ago his Life, and a part of his writings. The latter are able defences of the truth, not often surpassed by his successors, and his Life filled me with admiration." "The Unitarian calendar is not so rich in saints (nor that of any other church) as to spare a confessor of such primitive zeal as Emlyn." I design, however, to refer my correspondent to Mr. Lindsey's Apology, and his other works, which he may probably have never seen, in order to shew that he is in part mistaken. I imagine it is but lately that Unitarianism has made much progress among our transatlantic brethren; but it seems now to be spreading very rapidly in Massachusetts, and most ardently do I wish that it may farther recommend itself to them, not merely by the enlightened views, but by the holy exemplary lives of their English pre-

cursors; and I cannot help agreeing with our American friend that it might be useful to some who live in happier times, if the conflicts and sufferings of those were occasionally brought back to their remembrance, who, in periods of great difficulty and danger, have "fought the good fight, and have kept the faith," and for whom "there is laid up a crown of righteousness."

This gentleman, in common with many other excellent persons, is an active member of the Massachusetts' Peace Society, founded on principles which surely no reflecting Christian can fail to approve and endeavour to support. They do not decide upon the controverted question, whether "war is in all cases prohibited by the gospel," but circulate tracts to turn "the attention of the community to its nature, spirit, causes and effects." What pleasure, Sir, would it give me to see the plan of a similar institution proposed and advocated among Unitarians in general, in your excellent publication. Could a small portion of the Fellowship Funds be more usefully or honourably applied?

CATH. CAPPE.

South Petherton,

August 9, 1819.

SIR,

YOUR Correspondent, Mr. Seward, [p. 422,] is mistaken in attributing to Dr. Geddes the poetical epistle addressed to the Rev. Dr. Priestley, which appeared in the last Monthly Repository. I am enabled to state, on the unquestionable authority of a lady, who is a near relation of mine, that it was written, in her presence, by the late Rev. Samuel Badcock, immediately after receiving an insult from a clergyman, who was at that time vicar of the parish of Barnstaple, in Devonshire. The circumstance which produced it cannot be detailed more clearly than in the lady's own words.

"Mr. Badcock had been requested by a member of his congregation to attend the funeral of a deceased friend, and, as is usual on such occasions, he walked by the side of the clergyman in front of the procession. The latter fancying himself degraded by appearing in public with one whom he thought infinitely beneath him, said to Mr. Badcock, 'Sir, it is not pro-

per that a clergyman of the Church of England should appear thus publicly with a Dissenting minister.' Mr. Badcock bowed, and preceded him.

"On his return from the funeral he called on me, and related the contemptuous behaviour of the clergyman, who had afterwards great reason to regret his insolence, as it was highly resented, not only by the Dissenters, but also by the most respectable members of his parish church.

"Mr. Badcock instantly addressed to Dr. Priestley the poetical epistle in question, and at the same time informed him of the above circumstance."

I will only add, that Dr. Priestley's answer passed through the hands of the lady to whom your readers are indebted for the above account.

J. NICHOLETTS.

SIR,

THERE is an aphorism, which the politician and the moralist would do well to remember: Expediency is for the day—Truth lasts for ever. Its application to a subject which is now engaging a considerable share of attention, will readily appear, when a passage is quoted from a fast sermon published in the year 1793. The author assumes the appellation of Volunteer; but a discerning public attributed the production to the pen of the truly elegant and justly-admired author, Mrs. Barbauld. The title of the sermon is, "Sins of Government, Sins of the Nation." It abounds in striking observations, and suggests matter for reflection, not only for 1819, but for periods still more remote. One part which occurs p. 16, as peculiarly applicable to the exertions now making for abolishing, or greatly diminishing our custom-house, &c. oaths, I beg leave to present to your readers.

"Is not the name of God and the awfulness of religious sanctions profaned among us by frequent unnecessary and ensnaring oaths, which lie like stumbling-blocks in every path of business and preferment, tending to corrupt the singleness of truth, and wear away the delicacy of conscience, entangling even the innocence and inexperience of children? Have we calculated the false oaths which, in the space of one sun, the accusing

angel has to carry up from our custom-houses, our various courts, our hustings, our offices of taxation, and—from our altars? Are they such as a tear will blot out? Have we calculated the mischief which is done to the ingenuous mind, when the virgin dignity of his soul is first violated by a falsehood? Have we calculated the wound which is given to the peace of a good man, the thorns that are strewed on his pillow, when, through hard necessity, he complies with what his soul abhors? Have we calculated the harm done to the morals of a nation by the established necessity of perjury?"

When this striking appeal was first made, the danger of innovation was sounding in every ear; war was engrossing the mind, and the spirit of party was sowing the seeds of discord, which, during subsequent years, acquired deep root; many of the fatal effects of which still remain. They are, however, diminishing, and the united efforts of friends to the amendment of our criminal code of laws, must have given the celebrated author already quoted, the hope that Britons are beginning to regard righteousness as the true exaltation of their nation. Times of peace are peculiarly suited to produce these desirable results. Till lately, the practice of the Society of Friends was the only standing protest against the abundance of oaths, which clog our trade, and disgrace our courts of justice. The subject is now receiving a more extensive investigation. It has begun where it was most to be wished, and carried on with a prudence that precludes the fear of ultimate disappointment. All party views have been shunned. The general principle alone has been discussed. Avoid all unnecessary appeals to the Deity, has been the Christian's motive for exertion. The lawyer has shewn the difficulty of enforcing the penalty now resulting from perjury, whilst the merchant has proved that a pecuniary penalty is the only valid security against any attempt to defraud the revenue. There are, therefore, sufficient inducements for persons of all descriptions to lend their aid to a cause which requires only to obtain publicity to secure approbation. A brief account of what has been done shall be given; and if the subject should to you, Mr.

Editor, appear of the same importance as it does to myself, you may, through the widely-diffused circulation of your publication, be exciting a bond of union, where it has not already been called forth; and thus hastening the period when one of the sins of the nation will be lessened, if not totally blotted out. It is deserving of notice, that government has thrown no impediment in the way, but on the contrary, has facilitated every inquiry, and different persons in office, as well as members of parliament of every political description, have expressed their cordial co-operation in the measures pursued for abolishing custom-house, &c. oaths. In London the plan begun. Some gentlemen concerned in shipping and in different branches of merchandize, presented a memorial to government, stating the evils attendant on the administering of oaths, now required at the custom-house. This was duly received, but as the matter did not seem to interest the nation in general, it was not surprising that no active means were employed to give it effect.

When this was known at Liverpool, the merchants of that port united in a judicious and temperate address, similar in spirit to what was presented from London. A wise scheme was also proposed to correspond with other sea-ports, and to solicit their co-operation. This met with ready concurrence in Bristol. A memorial was framed by the merchant adventurers of that city, which proves that respectable body well understood the cause they undertook to advocate. Other places are following the example; and it cannot be doubted, from the mass of information communicated to the public by the Committee appointed by the House of Commons, for investigating the present state of our criminal law, that if the nation proves sufficiently solicitous to remove a crying sin, the legislature will manifest a proportionate eagerness to correct the evil. As the subject is new, would it not be a suitable employment of a few of your pages to insert some of the more striking memorials that may be drawn up? These would furnish materials and encouragement for general co-operation. If the idea should meet with your approbation, the memorials sent from

Liverpool and Bristol shall be ready for your insertion in your next Number.* AN OATH-OPPOSER.

SIR,
YOUR Obituary, by announcing [p. 445] the decease of Mr. William Saint of Norwich, reminds me of the great obligation under which the kind and friendly attention of that worthy gentleman formerly laid me and my family. In the depth of my distress, arising from a cause which for peace' sake I shall not specify, he made me frequent visits, accompanied me in numerous walks, lent me several of his books, made my daughter some very welcome presents, and appeared anxious in the greatest degree to soften our sorrows and to lighten the load under which we most unjustly laboured. Since we left the place we have been favoured with some of the most tender and consolatory letters that a feeling heart and an enlightened mind could dictate. Having his time very much occupied with his pupils, he was not able to write so often as he wished, but when he did possess a little interval of leisure, he employed it in writing us letters so long, so replete with all kinds of information that he thought likely to be interesting to us, and interspersed with such a number of judicious, sensible and pleasing observations, that they might be called pamphlets more properly than letters. One of these which is now before me, dated April 16, 1813, consists of not less than forty-four pages octavo. Blessed, for ever blessed be the memory of this generous, kind-hearted, excellent person! I feel not merely the highest esteem and veneration, but the warmest gratitude and affection towards him, and the humble hope of being one day permitted to renew my intercourse with him, under all the favourable circumstances of an improved and ameliorated condition, inspires me with the most exquisite pleasure. For some time past our correspondence has been intermitted, and I rather wished it should be so, knowing how great a sufferer he was by ill health, and fearful of his exerting himself too much in answer-

ing my letters. All the consolation that it was in my power to give him I had already given him, both in conversation and by letter. Counsel and exhortations to patience, submission and fortitude, I was not sparing of. The hopes which Christianity inspires, and the prospects it opens to our view, I repeatedly proposed to him, and in short omitted no argument that my reading and reflection suggested to fortify his mind, and enable him to endure his afflictions like a true follower of a meek and suffering Saviour. Having done thus much I felt my inability to do more for him, and, therefore, though I frequently thought and spoke of him with feelings of deep concern and anxious interest, yet I judged it best, all things considered, to content myself with hearing of him rather than from him, or exposing him to the effort of answering my letters, when I was well convinced he could not do it without injury to himself.

Never, whilst memory holds its seat in my breast, shall I forget the many interesting, agreeable and improving conversations that I have had with him. His mind was well furnished with knowledge of various kinds, and no man could shew greater readiness to communicate it. His mode of reasoning was clear, distinct, and well calculated to convince, without any thing positive or dogmatical, and free from any affectation of extraordinary sagacity or superior attainments. He appeared alway disposed to argue for the truth, and not for victory, wishing rather to have his own opinions rectified, if they were wrong, than to bring over others to think with himself. Upon religious topics there was certainly some degree of reserve, and as I believed I knew the cause of it, I was averse to press him, lest he might think I took undue liberties with him, and feel himself hurt and mortified. Upon political, philological, philosophical and metaphysical subjects, we generally had but one opinion, and from what occasionally fell from his lips, I did not hesitate to draw the conclusion that there was but a trifling degree of discrepancy between us in regard to religion. My opinion of the indispensable duty which all men are under to render their conduct in every in-

* We shall be obliged to our Correspondent by his transmitting these valuable documents. ED.

stance consistent with their convictions, I fully and freely declared; he might think my decision would fairly admit of restrictions and qualifications according to circumstances, but upon that point, for reasons best known to himself, he did not think proper to be explicit. Whatever there might be less excellent in this part of his character than was to be wished, I would gladly draw a veil over it, entertaining towards him the highest regard, esteem and respect in all other cases. In a small and unhealthy body there was a soul of very fine and eminent powers, acute, sagacious, penetrating, judicious and discriminating. Mathematical demonstrations of a very abstruse kind he went over with all the ease and spirit of a consummate master, seeing his way before him with a perspicuity truly admirable, and coming to his conclusion with the most complete accuracy and correctness. His memory was so retentive as to prevent his forgetting what he had once acquired, and his discernment such as to enable him in the shortest time to discover in which way new problems might be at once satisfactorily and expeditiously solved. In his heart dwelt all those gentle, mild and amiable virtues, which render their possessor, independently of other qualifications, truly estimable; but when united with the properties of a sound and vigorous intellect, exalt him to the level of the first and most admirable characters that distinguish and reflect honour upon human nature.

I esteem my acquaintance with this gentleman one of the most felicitous circumstances of my life, and I feel grateful beyond the powers of words to express, that I have lived long enough to be able to bear my testimony without impeachment of adulation or interest, to the genuine excellence of one who, in my judgment, merits the joint appellation of a truly great and good man.

THEOS. BROWNE.

SIR, Exeter, Aug. 18, 1819.

I WISH to announce my intention of submitting to the readers of your Repository, in an early Number or two, a Literary Memoir of a very old acquaintance of mine, the Rev. J. Bretland, lately deceased, formerly the

colleague of Mr. Timothy Kenrick, in the Exeter Academy. As a tribute of affection and gratitude to his memory, and as a means of kindling in the minds of literary Unitarians the glow of Christian enthusiasm, I shall willingly devote a part of my short visit to my friends in Devonshire, to a collection of the necessary materials.

BENJAMIN MARDON.

P. S. Allow me to take this opportunity of informing parents, that I still continue to receive students of the Glasgow University into my house, No. 100 George-street, for the purpose of superintending their general conduct and pursuits. Glasgow possesses considerable advantages for the study of moral philosophy and political economy, and for laying the foundation in anatomy and chemistry, of a medical education. The session of College begins with the first week in November.

SIR, August 15, 1819.

GIVE me leave to suggest that your Correspondent's purpose, expressed p. 408, would be most effectually attained if the worthy relict and biographer of Mr. Cappe would republish, in the form of the Unitarian Tracts, her Memoirs of that enlightened and exemplary Christian.

Such a Tract would come into the catalogues of all our Book Societies, which are at present but scantily supplied with biographical articles. Though Unitarians have hitherto appeared so small a minority, among professing Christians in this country, yet they will be found, I am persuaded, to have furnished their full proportion of those who proved, by more than professions, that it was their first desire to *love God and to obey the gospel of his Son.*

It is obvious how such biographies would assist to form the Christian characters of our youth, and would enable us all, in the most satisfactory manner, to convince gainsayers, according to the following sound doctrine:

Ye different sects, who all declare
That *Christ* is here, or *Christ* is there;
Your stronger proof divinely give,
And shew me where the Christians *live.*

I quote this verse from memory, but I believe we owe it to one of the Wesleys.

E. F.

REVIEW.

“ Still pleased to praise, yet not afraid to blame.”—POPE.

ART. I.—*The Bampton Lecturer Re-proved; being a Reply to the calumnious Charges of the Rev. C. A. Moysey, D.D. etc., in his late Bampton Lectures against the Unitarians, and especially the Editors of the Improved Version; in Letters to a Friend. To which is annexed, A Letter, in Reply to the Charges of the Very Reverend Dean Magee, in Volume II. Part II. of his Dissertations on Atonement and Sacrifice.* By Thomas Belsham, Minister of Essex Street Chapel. 8vo. pp. 198. Hunter and Eaton. 1819.

A CONTROVERSIAL work which is not answered is usually represented by party zeal as unanswerable; we are pleased, therefore, that Mr. Belsham has condescended to take up his pen against the present assailant of the Unitarians, who is no otherwise considerable than as he has connected himself, in the quality of Bampton Lecturer, with the great theological question of our times.

Trinitarian writers are fond of depreciating both the numbers and the talents of the Unitarians; but their own practice shews that they do not consider these opponents as few or weak. Not a sermon is preached upon any public occasion, not a charge is delivered, as Mr. Belsham says, p. 118, but a thrust is made at the Unitarians. From the highest dignitary to the lowest aspirant, all are loud in their invectives against the Unitarians. Mr. Belsham adds,

“ It has even been said that attempts have been made to poison the ear, and to excite the prejudices of the august representative of royalty; who cannot indeed be expected to enter deeply into theological speculation, and who will probably be content to believe as the church believes; but who, I trust, will never depart from those principles of toleration which have hitherto distinguished his illustrious House, which so fondly endeared the Hanover Family and the Hanover Succession to the oppressed nonconformists of a former age; and the reverse of which first devoted to public execration, and afterwards banished from the throne, the detested family of Stuart. As to the reported conduct of the

most reverend assailant upon the occasion to which I allude, if the rumour is correct, to say the least, it was not very manly to attack where a defence was impossible.” —Pp. 118, 119.

These incessant attacks upon the Unitarians may be owing, in many cases, to the sincere horror which the reputed orthodox feel in contemplating a system of faith which they apprehend endangers men's salvation, and in some instances they may have been provoked by the supposed aggression of Unitarian sermons or publications; but they cannot be wholly accounted for, except on the admission of a certain unsoundness of which the Trinitarians are conscious in their own arguments, and of a consequent growing defection from their own communion. The danger from Unitarianism is not at any rate magnified in the eye of the thorough believer, by any affectation of mystery in the proceedings of the Unitarians themselves. Mr. Belsham says, with as much truth as good-humour,

“ All that Unitarians do to promote their cause is done openly, without any reserve or affectation of concealment. Their books are published, their lectures are advertised; the proceedings of their societies are made known; hardly half a dozen can meet together for friendly conversation, but the secretary sends up the account, signed with his initials, for the next Repository; and hardly any pious and charitable female is gathered to her fathers, but her works and virtues are immediately chronicled for the benefit of posterity. Our adversaries may smile at the consequence we assume; but, at any rate, a community, which affects so much publicity, can never be suspected of treasonable designs; and whatever passes among ourselves, nothing hostile or unfriendly to our fellow-christians, however different in opinion, ever escapes upon such occasions.”—Pp. 119, 120.

Far be it from us, however, to repine at the frequency or vehemence of the contests to which Unitarians are challenged. Experience has proved that controversy, even when carried on most unpleasantly by their opponents, is favourable to their cause.

They have never wanted, and, under Providence, will never want writers to maintain their principles and vindicate their characters. May their advocates always obtain as honourable a triumph as must be decreed to Mr. Belsham for his victory over the Bampton Lecturer!

Dr. Moysey displays so much petty intolerance, and falls into such gross blunders, that his answerer could not possibly have preserved an uniform tone of gravity. Mr. Belsham's motto is, that "it is better to laugh than to be angry." If his antagonist (for the Bampton Lecturer attacks him personally) feel the edge of his irony, he must reflect that his own temerity has given it all its sharpness.

The Oxford divine seems to cast a look of regret upon the departed statutes which carried pains and penalties against the Unitarians, and attributes the present activity of these misbelievers to "the impunity which the Legislature has formally granted to them;" upon which Mr. Belsham says, with becoming spirit,

"The Unitarians rejoiced in the success of Mr. Smith's Bill, because it placed them upon a level with their fellow-subjects. They now enjoy their religious liberty upon the ground of legal right, not as a matter of courtesy and forbearance. But in point of *security*, they feel no difference between the protection of the spirit of the times and that of the laws. In this enlightened and tolerant age, what miserable narrow-minded bigot would have dared to rouse the spirit of the persecuting laws against the Unitarians? Or who can believe, if such a savage were to be found, that the mild spirit of the House of Brunswick would not immediately have issued out a *noli prosequi*, as upon all former occasions, to have stopped such infamous proceedings? The Unitarians felt no fears. And the learned Lecturer knows but little of mankind, or of the history of religion, if he is not aware that persecution has never damped the zeal or stopped the progress of a rising and ardent sect. The truth is, that Unitarianism has preserved its steady march: it has neither been accelerated or retarded by the repeal of the penal laws. All its engines were at work before. Plain speaking, sound argument, sober criticism, Scripture proofs, theological learning, ecclesiastical history, public preaching, fair and learned controversy, Unitarian societies for the distribution of books, Unitarian funds, Unitarian missionaries, Unitarian academies, and the

Improved Version,—all these machines were in motion long before the Trinity Doctrine Bill was thought of, and their success would have been the same if that bill had never existed. And if the success has been great,—and it has indeed exceeded all expectation,—it has been owing to no other advantage than that which truth, familiarly explained, and calmly, fearlessly and judiciously defended, must always possess over error rashly persisted in and intemperately maintained, even though power and interest, and fashion and popularity, are ranged under its banners. The repeal of the last odious relics of the persecuting code is an honour to the age in which it was accomplished, to the government by which it was countenanced, to the patriot by whom it was introduced, and to the parliament by which it was enacted; it restores to the Unitarians their natural rights as freeborn subjects of the United Empire, who have done nothing to forfeit their birth-right; and it is hailed by them with joy and gratitude to the government by which these rights have been acknowledged and restored, and with thankfulness to Divine Providence for having cast their lot in an æra so auspicious: but it has not, to my knowledge at least, been the means of inducing a single effort for the promotion and vindication of Evangelical truth, which the Unitarians would not have thought it their duty to have exerted, had the persecuting code still continued to disgrace the Statute Book."—Pp. 7—9.

Dr. Moysey, following herein the usage of *soi-disant* orthodox doctors, charges Unitarians with rejecting doctrines, however clearly revealed, merely because they cannot comprehend them; to which his Reprover replies,

"A charge so unjust and illiberal as this is only to be met by a direct negative. And I do aver in my own name and in that of my Unitarian brethren, that no one individual among us rejects the doctrine of the Trinity, or any other doctrine, solely because it is incomprehensible: but we refuse our assent to the doctrine of the Trinity because, according to some expositions of it, it is a gross and palpable contradiction; and because in every form it is unfounded in reason and unsupported by the Scriptures."—Pp. 11, 12.

Mr. Belsham is eminently successful in this, as in all his preceding works, in the statement of the philosophical argument for the pure Unitarian doctrine, and in the exposure of the weakness or inconsistency of all the received explications of the

Trinity. Dr. Moysey takes up the scheme of Bishop Gastrell, which is expounded in the words of the bishop, and then animadverted on, in the following passage :

“ These three names, of God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, must denote a threefold difference or distinction belonging to God, but such as is consistent with the unity and simplicity of the divine nature; for each of these includes the *whole* idea of God and *something more*. So far as they express the nature of God, they all adequately and exactly signify the same. It is the additional signification which makes all the distinction between them.”

“ So, then, according to this newly-discovered or more properly revived hypothesis of the Trinity, the Father includes the whole idea of God and something more: the Son includes the whole idea of God and something more: and the Holy Ghost includes the whole idea of God and something more: while altogether, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost make but one entire God and no more.

“ This is indeed the mystery of mysteries: *Cedite Romani scriptores, cedite Graeci*. It transcends transubstantiation itself. It is a mystery at which *reason stands aghast*; and *faith herself* must be more than ‘*half confounded*.’ Well might the learned Lecturer so earnestly and repeatedly call for and enjoin the lowest prostration of the understanding before he divulged so awful a secret. Well might he cry avant! to the busy and meddling Unitarians, who are so notorious for their profane habit of prying into holy mysteries, and their troublesome opposition to implicit faith.

“ But for my own part, I must profess, that however I may be branded by the learned Lecturer as a Deist, an infidel, a heretic, a blasphemer, or with any other term of reproach which may be drawn from his copious vocabulary; if the penal code itself were to be restored, so that I might no longer speak truth with *impunity*; nay, even if the wholesome statute *de haeretico comburendo* were again to be called into action, and I were absolutely bound to the stake; yet with all these powerful aids to unlock the understanding and to support the faith, I could never be brought to believe the doctrine of the learned Bamptonian Lecturer to be true, viz. that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, each of them include the ‘*whole idea of God and something more*,’ and yet when taken together that they make up one entire God and nothing more.”—Pp. 32, 33.

The zealous Lecturer's biblical

learning strikes his opponent with as little awe as his theological metaphysics. In reading the extract which we are now about to give, the least impartial reader will be ready to cry out for mercy on the Bampton divine :

“ There is, however, one text which appears to have fallen under the learned Lecturer's high displeasure, and which he marks repeatedly with tokens of disapprobation. Nor, to say the truth, do I greatly wonder at it, for it is full in the teeth of his favourite doctrines. The author of the ‘*Letters to the Bishop of London*’ has stated, that the Unitarians ‘*believe Jesus Christ to be a proper human being, in all respects like unto his brethren*.’ This the learned Lecturer cites as a very obnoxious doctrine, in direct opposition to the doctrine of the church: and (p. 64) he marks the words ‘*in all respects*’ by italics, as being particularly offensive. These words, he tells us, (p. 65,) assert that ‘*our Saviour was a mere human being—and they lose none of their impiety by the subsequent admission of Christ's divine mission*.’ To this unfortunate text the learned Lecturer recurs again and again, and always with some note of disapprobation, particularly p. 92: ‘*They seek to degrade our Lord to a mere man in all respects, like unto his fellows. But the falsehood of that blasphemy has been shewn*.’ This is strong language: but to do justice to the learned Lecturer, I do not believe that he knew that it was a passage of Scripture against which he was fulminating the charges of falsehood, impiety and blasphemy. But if he will take the trouble to open his New Testament at the second chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, he will find, at the 17th verse, that the writer affirms that ‘*in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren*.’ I quite agree with the learned Lecturer, that this doctrine is utterly irreconcilable to that of the Church of England: but for this discrepancy the members of that communion, and not the Unitarians, are responsible.”—Pp. 41, 42.

In a different style, different because equally suited to the subject, Mr. Belsham expresses his thoughts upon the Scripture doctrine of the judgment of the world by Jesus Christ :

“ Upon the whole, it cannot be disputed that the Scriptures represent our Lord as the MAN by whom the world is to be judged—they speak of his proper humanity, as that which peculiarly qualifies him for this high office: ‘*God has given him authority to execute judgment because he is the*

Son of man.' (John v. 27.) The apostles are also described as his coadjutors upon this solemn occasion (Matt. xix. 28): 'When the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.' And the apostle Paul appeals to the Corinthians, (1 Cor. vi. 2,) 'Know ye not that the saints shall judge the world?' The import of this prophetic language it is perhaps impossible for us fully to comprehend, and is such as nothing but the awful reality can explain. It is evident, however, that whatever is signified by 'judging the world,' it means nothing more than what a man may by divine appointment and energy be qualified to perform; and that the apostles and even Christians in general are to be associated with Jesus upon the grand occasion. And this consideration allows room for the conjecture, that possibly no personal interposition even of Jesus himself may be intended. But as prophets are said to perform what they only predict, (see Jer. i. 10,) so Jesus may be said to judge the world, because he has solemnly and authoritatively announced that God will judge it: and apostles and saints may be said to be associated with him in this high office, because the apostles, by authority from Christ himself, and believers in all ages by their doctrine and example, bear their solemn and united testimony to this grand consummation of the divine government. But it becomes us not to be dogmatical on so mysterious a subject, but rather to be mindful of our own important duty, to give all diligence to be found of our Judge in peace."—Pp. 54, 55.

Dr. Moysey gives himself up, bound hand and foot, to his ever-watchful opponent, when he asserts (singular assertion!) that the Unitarians "array a few selected and mutilated passages against the general and harmonious evidence of the whole gospel:"

"Yes, Dr. Moysey, they do *select*, and they do *array*, the whole Gospel of Matthew, and the whole Gospel of Mark, and the whole Gospel of Luke, and the whole history of the Acts, and the whole of the two Epistles to the Corinthians, and the whole Epistle to the Galatians, and the whole Epistle to the Ephesians, and the two Epistles to the Thessalonians, and the two Epistles to Timothy, (notwithstanding the spurious reading of 'God manifest in the flesh,') and the whole Epistle to Titus and to Philemon, and the whole Epistle of James, and the two Epistles of Peter, and the whole of the three Epistles of John, (notwithstanding the notorious and abominable interpolation of the heavenly witnesses,) and finally, the whole Epistle of

Jude;—these *insulated* and *detached* books the Unitarians do *select* and do *array*: and they challenge their Trinitarian brethren to produce a single passage, from beginning to end, in any one of them, which contains any thing like the doctrine of a Trinity of persons in a unity of essence. And against what do they *select* and *array* these sacred writings?—Against the rest of the books of the New Testament? No, no! very, very far from it. They *select* and *array* them against the misconception and misinterpretation of a few passages in the Gospel of John, who is a very mystical and figurative writer; against a difficult passage or two in the Epistle to the Romans; against the obscurity of some rhetorical passages in the Epistles to the Philippians and Colossians; against the fanciful and misunderstood analogies of the unknown writer to the Hebrews; and against the difficulties occurring in the prophetic language of the Apocalypse. But of each of these books by far the greater portion speaks the purest Unitarianism. The doctrine of the Trinity derives no countenance from a single sentence through the whole New Testament; and that of the deity of Christ derives its support from a small number of mistaken and misinterpreted texts; while that of the proper unity of God, in person as well as in essence, and that of the simple humanity of Jesus Christ, shine forth with a resplendence that he who runs may read."—Pp. 60, 61.

There is no little meaning in the following reply to the wanton, virulent charge of audacity and fraud, preferred against the Editors of the Improved Version:

"And what motive can reasonably be assigned to these abused and calumniated Editors, which could induce them to act so base and foolish a part? Men do not usually act without a sufficient reason; and where the crime is great the temptation is proportionable. If indeed mitres and crosiers had danced before the eyes of these reprobated Editors; if deaneries and bishoprics had awaited them as the prize of their laborious and iniquitous exertions to support a tottering and unrighteous cause, frail human nature might possibly have given way. They might have been induced to falsify and prevaricate, and against their better knowledge they might have been led to pervert and to corrupt the word of God:—they might have been tempted to tamper with the sacred text; and, in defiance of all evidence, to retain notorious interpolations as genuine readings, in order to impose upon the ignorant, and to support popular and established errors:—they might eagerly have contended for gross mistranslations which they

knew to be erroneous, but which, in sound at least, were favourable to the popular system:—they might have tortured and wrested the genuine and figurative language of Scripture to a sense which they well knew to be the reverse of its real meaning, in order to support a cause which it was their interest to defend;—and with the utmost exertion of ingenuity and industry, and the most pompous display of learning, they might have laboured to advocate the faulty translation of a faulty text, and to oppose with the utmost vehemence and bitterness every attempt at improvement; and meanly to depreciate the qualifications, to asperse the motives, and to calumniate the characters of those who, with the best intentions, in the calmest and most inoffensive language and manner, and from the best authorities, endeavoured to correct the text and to improve the version.”—Pp. 70, 71.

This quotation is from Letter VII., which, with Letter VIII., contains a defence of the Improved Version, in answer to numerous objections brought against that work by the Lecturer, who, it would really appear, never saw it, but contented himself with the account given of it by Dean Magee and other like-minded authors. The Editors have something to answer for, we allow, in that they have put a stumbling-block or an occasion to fall in their brother's way.

Mr. Belsham uses very strong language, naturally prompted however by benevolence, on the subject of Eternal Torments, which of course the Oxford theologian believes and defends, though he makes a concession which is more creditable to his humanity than to his “orthodoxy:”

“To do him justice, he seems to be a reluctant advocate of this heart-withering doctrine. ‘We have all,’ he says, (p. 212,) ‘too much reason to wish that eternity of torment for unrepentant sinners were not a part of God's system.’ This language, surely, is very strange and unbecoming. Believing, as I do, in the infinite knowledge, power and goodness of God, I must and do most joyfully believe that every portion of the system which God has formed is the wisest and the best; that nothing can be added to it, and nothing can be taken from it; that evil as well as good is over-ruled for the best purposes; that even wicked agents, with all their malignant purposes, and in all the plenitude of their powers, are but fulfilling, however unknowingly and involuntarily, his wise and good designs; and that when they have accomplished his benevolent

purposes, he puts ‘his hook into their nose, and his bridle into their jaws,’ and saith, ‘Hitherto shalt thou go, and no further.’ To wish that what God has appointed were no part of his system, is to set up our wisdom and will in opposition to God's:—it is to wish, like the impious Alphonso, that God had consulted us in the choice of his plan:—it is to wish that the system which now, in all its parts and bearings, is the most perfect which infinite wisdom could devise, which infinite goodness could prompt, and which infinite power could carry into effect, were altered and deteriorated, to gratify our humour and caprice, or at least to fall within the limits of our finite understanding, our narrow views and comprehension.

“Yet the learned Lecturer is right. He feels that if human guilt is visited with eternal misery, God is an almighty tyrant; he naturally wishes that he and his fellow-beings lived under a more wise, a more righteous, and a more merciful government; and that he could contemplate the character of the Almighty Sovereign without dismay.”—Pp. 97—99.

On a text cited by Dr. Moysey to prove the eternity of punishment, viz. Rev. xiv. 11, “And the smoke of their torment,” i. e. of those who worship the beast and his image, “ascendeth up for ever and ever,” Mr. Belsham remarks,

“It may reasonably be doubted who are intended by this obscure symbolical description, and whether the passage at all refers to future sufferings. But should this be allowed, yet surely the smoke of the torment is very different from the torment itself. The smoke may remain long after the miserable victim is consumed. And some memorial may possibly be preserved to perpetuate the remembrance of the awful fact, as a solemn warning to ages yet to come, that vice once existed in the creation of God, and that it was exterminated by condign punishment.”—P. 104.

Mr. Belsham vindicates Unitarians from the reproach of being peculiarly hostile to the Established Church, and says, (pp. 133, 134,) that he knows many strict Unitarians who are decided friends to civil establishments of religion, and who, “without contending for its divine institution, approve of diocesan episcopacy and the form of government and discipline as established in the Church of England, as expedient and wise.” We were not aware that any Unitarians carried their approbation of the Church so

far: many churchmen, we apprehend, stop short of this point. To us it appears impossible to divest *diocesan episcopacy* of political patronage and secular intrigue, and these we cannot reconcile with a "kingdom not of this world;" and the confessions of episcopal writers in the Church of England had always led us to regard her *discipline* as anomalous, arbitrary and inefficient. We may also be allowed, perhaps, to express our surprise at one of the arguments alleged by the Unitarians referred to in behalf of civil establishments of religion; namely, that they are "the best means, under Divine Providence, of supporting Christianity in the world," and that "without them the religion of Jesus itself would, almost if not altogether, have perished in the dark ages." It is matter of history that the Gospel prospered most, even after the withdrawal of miraculous powers, when all the civil establishments of the world were arrayed against it, and that all the great corruptions of it were imposed upon the universal church by the secular arm. And we hazard little, in our own opinion, in saying, that civil establishments of Christianity brought in and confirmed the darkness of the middle ages, and that "the truth as it is in Jesus" has recovered its influence and prospered in later times in exact proportion as men have emancipated themselves from political churches.

But this is one of the subjects on which Unitarians will agree to differ, and on which we are persuaded they will set the edifying example of a diversity of opinion, unattended by any estrangement of heart.

To the Letters in reply to Dr. Moysey, Mr. Belsham has properly appended the Letter in Reply to Dean Magee, which appeared first on our pages, Vol. XII. pp. 81—86 and 145—152.

The whole volume is highly creditable to the able and learned Author, and has already served and will continue to serve the great and glorious cause of Unitarian Christianity, with which the name of Mr. Belsham, like that of Dr. Priestley, is and ever will be honourably associated.

ART. II.—An Appeal to Scripture and Tradition, in Defence of the Unitarian Faith, &c.

(Concluded from p. 435.)

THE 2nd Part of this valuable little volume consists of a "Dissertation on the Doctrine of the Pre-existence" of Christ, and an "Examination of the supposed Scriptural Grounds" for it.

The Arian scheme has been sometimes represented as presumptively true on account of its moderation, lying between two theological extremes; but our author very justly observes, (p. 99.) "Whatever forms a middle point between two opposing schemes, may appear abstractedly to be the safest and most probable theory; but if the two opposites be *truth* and *error*, the *medium* between them must partake of error no less than of truth."

Arianism, which for a time successfully disputed with Trinitarianism the empire of the church, is now matter of history only. Individuals may incline to the hypothesis, but the Arians are no longer a distinct sect. The following remarks appear to us just and conclusive:

"Modern *Arians* are divided into *High* and *Low Arians*. The terms properly designate (1.) Those who believe the agency of *Christ* in the creation of the world; (2.) Those who retain the simple pre-existence, and regard *Christ's* executive office as purely spiritual. Others, who hold a mysterious supremacy in the Father, and a derived and dependent deity and procession in the Son, are sometimes called *High Arians*, but improperly: they may be better distinguished as *Semi-Arians*; though they, in fact, merely re-assert the *Trinity* of the early fathers. The only proper *Arians* are they who conceive of *Christ* as a created super-angelic spirit, the first and most excellent of the works of God, and the link and limit between the *Creator* and his *creatures*.

"The separate personality of the Holy Spirit, as a creature above angels, co-operating with the Son, which was the notion of the ancient *Arians*, is generally abandoned by the modern, in favour of a divine attribute or quality. Some, however, still retain it, as did certain of the old *Socinians*. The created Sub-Creator, and the created illuminating Spirit, are equally destitute of the authority of ancient tradition and precedent, unless we seek for their parallels among the intelligences of the *Gnostics*.

"HIGH *Arianism* incurs the suspicion

of *Ditheism*. If *Christ* be the creator of the world, though only in an instrumental sense, such a being has powers and perfections, whether derived or not, which are only compatible with DEITY: he must still be strictly a *God*, though an inferior God, and, as such, is entitled to religious homage. In withholding worship from him who made the world, the *Arians* may justify themselves by the letter of Scripture, but not by the reason of the proceeding. They are Unitarians in *letter* but not in *spirit*; for though they formally acknowledge the unity and supremacy of 'the only wise God,' they divide his attributes.

"Most *Arians* conceive that they render the creative instrumentality of their pre-existent *Christ* more credible, by confining his agency to *this* world; but they are in this dilemma:—they who imagine that *Christ* is not only *our* maker, but the maker of all other beings, constitute a second God of such high prerogatives and extensive power, as inevitably to suggest a doubt whether there be any *other* God, as no other would seem necessary:—and they who limit his operations to this particular system, open the door to Polytheism; for if an intermediate agent was necessary for the formation of this globe or system, other similar agents must equally have been necessary for the construction of the rest; and thus we have a host of secondary creators, who are, in fact, Gods. The former scheme, which supposes that *Christ* created the universe, though it erect a duality of Gods, is preferable to the latter, which, by analogy, multiplies Gods without number. If *Christ* created *this* system, he created *all*; for the uniformity discernible in all the parts of nature offers a sensible refutation of the strange, capricious notion, that one system of planets and suns was formed by one Creator, and another by another. If *Christ* created *all* the worlds, why should the *Arian* hesitate to acknowledge that *Christ* is God supreme?

"That no mention should be made of a subordinate Creator throughout the Old Testament, which yet perpetually alludes to the Maker of heaven and earth, and the wonders of his hand, forms, of itself, the strongest presumption against the truth of the theory; and when both the Old and New Testament describe the renovated state of the world under the gospel æra as a *new creation*, there can be no room for doubt that those passages which ascribe creation to *Christ* contain a spiritual sense, and have only an emblematic reference to the works of material nature.

"Low *Arianism* is still more deficient in that sort of evidence which is derived from the indirect authority of opinions; as, indeed, it cannot stand on antiquity at all,

and is wholly of modern growth. This modified scheme of *Arianism* recognizes the spiritual character of the creation or construction of all things ascribed to *Christ*, but interprets literally of a pre-existent glory those texts which, in language common to Scripture, speak of things predestinated as having a previous existence.

"The *Low Arians* are more properly *Unitarians* than their elder brethren; but their hypothesis of *pre-existence* appears unnecessary. If God wrought in *Christ*, it did not require a superior *nature* or *being*, exclusive of God, to enable *Christ* to do what he did; and this applies to the original view of the *Arian* scheme, which seems to substitute super-angelic power for the power of God. A superior nature seems only called for on the supposition of a *satisfactional* purpose in the death of *Christ*; and then only on the supposition that the *satisfaction* could not be made but by a being of *infinite* or superior nature.

"The *Arians* conceive that the dignity of *Christ* is lowered by the abandonment of the scheme of *pre-existence*. But if we exclude his agency in the material creation, it does not appear why, as a man 'anointed with the Holy Ghost, and with power,' the dignity of *Christ* is less, than as an incarnate secondary God, or a spirit above archangels. Although a man, he was to us as God; the organ of his will—the medium of his wisdom—the mercy-seat of his redeeming love—the agent of his power; and, as one 'in all respects like his brethren,' 'tempted, yet without sin,' his moral dignity is incomparably greater than as a supra-human being, the meritoriousness of whose sinless obedience is lessened in exact proportion as his nature is exalted above the level of humanity."—Pp. 102—105.

The author is very successful in exposing the weakness of the scriptural arguments for *Arianism*. We insert a specimen of his "Examination:"—

"John xvii. 5, 'And now, O Father! glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.' Ver. 24, 'That they may behold my glory which thou hast given me; for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.' Ver. 22, 'The glory which thou gavest me I have given them: that they may be one, even as we are one.' These passages, compared, illustrate each other; and if the doctrine of *pre-existence* be made to rest on them alone, it must assuredly fall.

"It is plain, from these three passages,

"1. That the disciples were to *behold* that glory which the Father had given to the Son; and that it is not said that it was

given him before the ages, but because *the Father loved him* before the ages.

"2. That it was not a pre-existent glory which the disciples were to behold, or that they *did* behold, but 'the glory which should follow his sufferings,' in the diffusion, through his instrumentality, of gospel blessings.

"3. That the glory given to the disciples was the same glory which God had given to Jesus before the ages; that the disciples had not a pre-existent glory given them, but the glory 'as of the best-beloved of the Father,' 'the grace and truth' described by John, by which they had oneness of will and heart with God, and the power and spirit of miracles and prophecy; that therefore it was not a pre-existent glory of which Christ spoke in reference to them, but the same glory of wisdom and grace and power, which the disciples had seen in him, and received from him.

"If Christ had existed in God, or with God, before the ages, the observation, 'thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world' seems most unnecessary: it has only point or meaning as referring to the everlasting counsel and fore-knowledge of God; 'who calleth those things which be not as though they were:' Rom. iv. 17.

"It has been argued that the words 'glorify me,' &c. if interpreted with reference to the foreknowledge of God, would mean no more than that 'he might be glorified still in the purpose of God.' This is verbal quibbling without sense. 'Glorify me with the glory which I had in thy decrees,' is plainly, 'bestow on me the glory which thou hadst decreed to bestow.'

"The praying to be glorified with the same glory which he had with God before, in the literal sense of glory in a pre-existent state of being, is totally irreconcilable, either on the Trinitarian or Arian scheme, with the uniform tenor of Scripture, as respects the glory of Christ. This is spoken of as a glory consequent on his sufferings and obedience. 'He despised the cross for the glory which was set before him.' 'The God of our fathers hath GLORIFIED his Son Jesus.' 'God hath highly EXALTED him.' It is an abuse of terms to say that these and similar passages mean only that the glory set before him was the same which he had before; that in being glorified he had only his pristine glory restored to him, and that his exaltation referred only to his human nature; which, to a divine or super-angelic being, could not be considered in the light of reward.

"In the same pre-ordinate sense, Christ is spoken of by the prophet Micah, v. 2, 'Out of thee [Beth-lehem] shall he come forth unto me, that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.' A similar figure occurs

in Rev. xiii. 8, 'Whose names are not written in the book of life of THE LAMB slain from the foundation of the world.' The supposed pre-existence of the Son of God is clearly explained by Peter; 1 Pet. i. 20, 'Who verily was FORE-ORDAINED before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you; who by him do believe in GOD that raised him up from the dead, and GAVE him glory.'

"This figure of pre-existence may be illustrated by a passage of Clemens Alexandrinus: 'We Christians were before the foundation of the world; for we then pre-existed in God, who had decreed our future existence.' There is here an apparent allusion to Paul, Ephes. i. 4, 'According as he hath chosen us in him, before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy.'—Pp. 120—123.

The "Examination" concludes with a pertinent observation, in reply to the argument so learnedly maintained in Ben Mordecai's Letters:

"These hypotheses of Christ having been the angel who appeared in place of JEHOVAH, and the medium of all his revelations in the Old Testament history, are explicitly refuted by a passage of Paul; Heb. i. 1, 'GOD who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in times past to our fathers by the prophets, hath in these last times spoken unto us by his Son.'—P. 132.

Part III. contains a "Dissertation on the Doctrine of a Satisfactional or Propitiatory Atonement," and an "Examination of the supposed Scriptural Grounds for a Vicarious Satisfaction, or a Propitiatory Sacrifice."

The doctrine of Satisfaction, in its full scholastic sense, is absolutely modern. Austin expressly opposes the notion of Christ having taken our guilt.

"There was an idea that the price paid (the common scripture-term for the means of deliverance) was paid to the evil being. Austin thought that the sin of the first man was transmitted to his posterity, and that the human race were delivered over to the Devil; from whom God, having become incarnate in Christ, bought us by his blood; and Proclus explains the necessity of God dying for us, by no angel having the power to pay a sufficient price to Satan. This scheme, absurd as it is, is not so much so as that which is now generally thought a vital part of Christianity, and which either supposes the Omnipotent and Eternal Creator of the Universe to die, that he might enable himself to forgive his own creatures, or that his Eternal Son died to in-

duce him to forgive them. In dividing almighty power with another being, of malignant nature, the modern believers in a personal spirit of evil are not far behind these ancient redemptionists.”—P. 135.

In its present popular acceptation, the doctrine of Atonement was carried to its height by the Protestant Reformers, in their zeal to oppose the Romish doctrine of the merit of works, that is, the superabundant and transferrable merit of works of supererogation, works exceeding the necessary proportion of righteousness. The opposite extreme was the abominableness of human righteousness, and the necessity of imputed merit: into this the Reformers rushed, and their disciples have followed their wild steps. Yet no doctrine can be more self-contradictory:

“Whether we regard the *triad* in the Godhead as three different characters under which God acts, or as three attributes of his nature, or as three intelligences or essences, distinct from each other, yet united by a common consciousness, each being equally by himself God, yet all three together constituting but one single God, the satisfaction on the Trinitarian scheme is made *by God to God*; in other words, God, demanding a victim, becomes himself his own victim, and appeases himself by himself, and thus saves his justice by a *fiction!*”

“But it must be asked, which of the natures, joined in *Jesus Christ*, offered up this *infinite* satisfaction? Was it the *divine* nature; or the *human* nature? If the *divine* nature, then the Godhead, or a portion of the Godhead, immortal and impassible, suffered *death*. If the *human* nature *only*, then an *infinite* satisfaction was *not* effected; and the purpose might equally have been obtained by a perfectly righteous man, as *Enoch*.”—Pp. 139, 140.

The author is, as usual, clear and convincing in his exposition of texts of Scripture and his reasonings upon them.

“2 Cor. v. 21, ‘He hath made *him* to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.’”

“He was made ‘sin for us,’ in the double sense of having death, the condemnation of sin, ‘pass upon him,’ and in being crucified as a sinner: or ‘numbered with the transgressors;’ and in Gal. iii. 13, he is said to have been made ‘a curse for us,’ which is explained by the apostle in the next verse, as alluding to the *accursed* death of the cross: ‘cursed is every one

that hangeth on a tree.’ How we are made the righteousness of God through Christ’s dying as a sinner, is shewn in Titus ii. 14: ‘Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.’ In the same sense it is said, 1 Peter ii. 24, ‘Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sin, might live to righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed:’ *ἀνῆκεν*, bare up: bare away. This has a very different meaning from that usually affixed to it, as if Christ were *smitten* in our stead, and bare our punishment. Isaiah says, liii. 3, ‘Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted:’—that is, *falsely* so esteem him. In Heb. v. 8, 9, it is said, that ‘he learned obedience, by the things which he suffered: and being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him.’ This is the *chastening* of moral discipline, not vicarious punishment. ‘He has borne our griefs;’ 11, ‘He shall bear their iniquities;’ and 12, ‘He bare the sin of many,’ is the *bearing away*; a probable allusion to the *scape-goat*. Matthew, quoting Isaiah, ‘himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses,’ applies it to Christ’s miraculous cures: viii. 17. He surely did not take our diseases on himself, but he took them away: in the same sense, he bare our sins.”—Pp. 151, 152.

“God is also expressly said to have bought us, in a passage where he is ignorantly confounded with CHRIST, whom he made our ransom. 2 Pet. ii. 1, ‘There shall be false teachers, denying THE LORD that bought them:’ *Δεσποτήν*, the ‘only Potentate,’ or SOVEREIGN LORD GOD; a title NEVER applied to CHRIST, who is styled only *κύριος*.”

“That the title is appropriate to God only, is proved, beyond cavil, from Acts iv. 24, 27, ‘And when they heard that, they lifted up their voice to God with one accord, and said, LORD! [*Δεσποτά*] *THEU* art God, which hast made heaven, and earth, and the sea.—Against thy holy child JESUS, both Herod and the Gentiles were gathered together.’”

“They who contend, from the Old and New Testament, for the rich unpurchased mercy of God, and receive the Scripture reconciliation which God himself wrought in Christ, as the true and only atonement, are accused by the *Satisfactionists*, on this very text, of ‘denying the Lord that bought them.’ But as the Lord, in this passage, is the SOVEREIGN LORD GOD, the blessed and only POTENTATE, the *Satisfactionists* themselves, who deny that God is their redeemer, may be said to be those

who 'deny THE LORD that bought them.' The original allusion is probably to those *Gnostics*, who denied that THE FATHER of Jesus Christ was either the maker of the world, or the author of the Jewish dispensation."—Pp. 156, 157.

There is, (p. 175) a strong, we wish we could say an over-wrought, description of the anti-moral effects of the doctrine of Satisfaction, when it is not counteracted by the true doctrines of Christianity, which no system is able wholly to subvert. The author then institutes a comparison between the spurious orthodoxy of the day, and the "simplicity that is in Christ," and here he is animated by his subject to a rich strain of eloquence:

"But the prominent feature of the doctrine, in the sense of substitution and satisfaction, is the mystic idolatry which it involves, and the necessary connexion with a denial of the supremacy of 'the only true God,' and with the 'falling away' from the worship of GOD, even THE FATHER; 'the GOD and FATHER' of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is now a reproach to worship HIM whom CHRIST worshiped.

"It was the faith of Moses, that God should in the Messiah 'raise up a prophet like to himself;' it was the faith of Peter, that 'Jesus of Nazareth was a MAN approved of God by signs and wonders, which God did by him;' it was the faith of Paul, that 'there is One God, and one Mediator between God and men, the MAN Christ Jesus.' It was the declaration of Christ, that 'he was a MAN who had told them the truth which he had heard from GOD.' Yet they who represent *Christ*, as *Moses* and *Peter* and *Paul* represented him, and as he declared himself, are accused of degrading *Christ*! What shall be thought of degrading GOD?

"Who degrade *Christ*? They that behold in him a man 'in all respects like his brethren,' 'tempted as they are,' and therefore peccable, 'yet WITHOUT SIN;' 'made perfect by suffering;' 'despising the shame for the glory that was set before him;' yielding up his life with assured faith in the promises of God that he should receive it again; and giving to all an example of sinless purity and unfainting obedience to the will of God?—Or they who regard him as himself a Divinity or a super-angelic nature, superior to suffering, superior to temptation, INCAPABLE OF SIN; whose sinlessness had therefore no merit, whose devotion had no heroism, whose perseverance unto death was no proof of fortitude, no test of faith; whose resurrection is in itself no demonstration that man will be raised from the grave; whose

life and martyrdom, whose actions and sufferings, are too supernatural for example, can awaken no admiration, can excite no sympathy?

"Who degrade God? They who believe the assurances of his holy prophets, that 'he will abundantly pardon' those who return unto him; they who see in him pure and perfect benevolence and goodness, and regard his justice as only a modification of his benevolence; they who worship him as Moses and the prophets worshiped him, in the character of the ONE JEHOVAH, who 'stretched out the heavens by himself;' as *Christ* and the Apostles worshiped him, in the character of 'GOD even the FATHER;' the 'God and Father of us and of our Lord Jesus;' THE ONLY TRUE GOD; the blessed and ONLY POTENTATE, who ALONE hath immortality; they who adore him as their mighty SAVIOUR and REDEEMER; their merciful and compassionate FATHER, who 'saw them when they were afar off;' the sole Author and original Fountain of all blessings temporal and eternal, all gifts and graces and influences, which HE shed upon us of his own FREE MERCY in *Christ*, the Son whom HE had sent to be the Saviour of the world?—Or they who see in his justice only vengeance; who deny his glorious attribute of rich unpurchased mercy; who make him gracious on conditions which violate justice by substituting the innocent for the guilty; who transfer their gratitude for the work of redemption from him, 'the only SAVIOUR,' to him whom he hath sent; from the author to the instrument; who refuse to him supreme homage; who libel his justice, limit his beneficence, divide his unity, contract his power, snatch the very work of creation out of his hands, and leave him amidst the darkness of unapproachable mystery and terror, a God who, of himself, is unable to bless and to save, and who is alone able to curse and to destroy?

"If all love and gratitude are to be concentrated in the Son of God, which is early inculcated into the tender minds of children, and which must be the case if he interposed between men and God, to avert vengeance and bribe compassion, the heart is shut up from those high and holy consolations which the Scripture teaches us to expect from the 'Father of mercies and God of comfort.' If the God and Father of his creatures were to retire from the universe, with awful reverence be it spoken, what void would be left in the hearts of the worshippers of *Christ*?"—Pp. 175—177.

The "Appeal" concludes with a lively anticipation, expressed in beautiful scriptural figures, of the final success and universal prevalence of Unitarian Christian truth.

“The prejudice of habit and the zeal of ignorance must give way before the progress of knowledge. The MYSTERY of THE MASS was supported by the letter of Scripture; was defended by ecclesiastical learning; was assented to by men of erudition, talent and piety; was undoubtedly received by the people; but before the progress of knowledge it has disappeared. Like this ‘strong delusion,’ every device of human understanding, which has sown its tares in the gospel field, must be rooted out. The faith which was preached at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, preached at Athens on the hill of Mars, ‘delivered to the saints,’ transmitted through the first ages, retained by the people, sophisticated by philosophising converts, and confounded in the Great Apostacy on whose forehead is written MYSTERY, was a faith in the ‘ONE GOD THE FATHER,’ and the ‘one Mediator’ of his grace, ‘THE MAN Christ Jesus; whom God had raised from the dead.’ This was the faith of which ‘CHRIST is the corner stone, and which is built upon the foundation of APOSTLES and PROPHETS.’ Although these ‘witnesses’ may have been ‘slain and rejoiced over,’ ‘the spirit of life from God shall enter into them, and they shall stand upon their feet.’ Before the fulness of the Gentiles be come in, before the Jew and the Mahometan can ‘seek to the root of Jesse,’ the Christian Church must be purified from those errors which veil with darkness the UNITY of GOD; for it is written, ‘JEHOVAH shall be King over the whole earth, and there shall be ONE JEHOVAH, and HIS NAME ONE.’ Zech. xiv. 9.”—Pp. 178, 179.

There are many pages of Notes, some of which may be called Dissertations, relating to the important subjects discussed in the “Appeal.” One of them contains strictures on Mr. Coleridge’s late attack upon the Unitarians, in his “Lay-Sermons,” and the reader will be pleased with the happy manner in which the writer testifies his respect for poetical genius while he exposes false reasoning, and reprobates intolerant zeal, especially against a people amongst whom the accuser once found shelter.

After so many considerable extracts, we need not say any thing concerning the merits of the “Appeal;” we will therefore only express our hope that the reception of this volume by the public will be such as to encourage the learned and eloquent author again and again to employ his fine talents in the elucidation and defence of the great and good cause which he has so cordially embraced and boldly confessed.

ART. III.—*Stephen's Prayer: a Sermon preached at the opening of the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, October 13th, 1818.* By John Hodgson, M. D. Minister of Blantyre (near Glasgow). Ogles and Co.

THIS discourse has been pompously pronounced by the Edinburgh Christian Instructor to be replete with sound logic and biblical learning. The author, a man of respectable character and attainments, has chosen his subject with a view to a direct and very obvious attack upon the Unitarian scheme; the argument of his sermon bringing into controversy the leading principle upon which the worship of Unitarian societies is conducted; viz. that there is but *one* object of religious adoration, and that this object is the Father of Jesus. The preacher does make some *pretension*, it is true, to logical accuracy, and in one respect we give him credit for discernment; for he has not encumbered his defence of orthodoxy with the introduction of arguments which others of his party might, without hesitation, denounce as fallacious. He has rested the *whole question* concerning the object of religious worship (than which a more important one cannot be embraced) upon two clauses of a verse in the 7th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. He has thrown the argument of his discourse into the syllogistic form, which our readers fully understand may be adopted in many cases where no proof whatever is effected; if the *premises* be themselves in any respect inaccurate, the conclusion, though it follow naturally from the premises, is not *therefore* valid, nor does in the least advance the interests of truth. We present our readers with this boasted syllogism:

“By the unvarying tenor of the Christian doctrine and of Scripture authority, prayer cannot be made or offered up to any person or being, except the true God.

“But in the case of Stephen, prayer is made or offered up to the Lord Jesus Christ.

“Therefore the Lord Jesus Christ is *truly* God, the second person of the ever-blessed and mysterious Trinity.”

The first of the premises we are so far from denying, that it appears to us to afford the most direct refutation possible of the conclusion which the

preacher has drawn, and of the whole argument of the discourse before us. We object to, however, and totally deny the second premise in this syllogism, and maintain that, in the strict sense of the expression *prayer*, as the word is used in the first premise, the Lord Jesus Christ is never made the object of prayer and religious worship in the sacred Scriptures. The preacher's conclusion, therefore, though accompanied with all the pride of logical subtilty, and guarded round with a pompous reference to the authority of Griesbach, where Griesbach has nothing in the world to do, we hesitate not to say, is a mere dead letter, containing not even a vestige of scriptural truth, and perfectly incapable of defending or promoting the interests of sacred literature. That God is one, or, in equivalent words, that there is but one object of religious worship, is the plain and certain dictate of the natural creation. We refer for a detail of the interesting evidence on this head to Clark's *Demonstration*, Paley's *Natural Theology*, and the early part of Yates's *Vindication*. It is in the highest degree satisfactory to the seeker after moral and religious truth, that the voice of nature so completely harmonizes with the authoritative and often-repeated language of the Jewish Scriptures: "I am God, and there is none else." "I am God, and there is none like me." "Hear, O Israel, Jehovah is our God, Jehovah alone:" and that of the decalogue, "Thou shalt have no other Gods before (or besides) me." Now one of the most proper methods of using *the Bible*, which, as containing the mind and will of God, must be consonant with the unequivocal dictates of nature, arises from our conviction, that one part does not contradict another part; and that if in the Old Testament *one* object only of religious worship is proposed, with the severest penalties, denounced in case of wilful disobedience, the scheme of the Gospel, as unfolded in the New Testament, can never imply the belief and worship of *three* separate persons, such as are undeniably to be met with in the *Athanasian* liturgies. Again, if according to the general tenor of the Bible, to the very spirit and texture of the Bible Theology, God be an *immortal* and *invisible* Spirit, no pas-

sages of that same Bible, if it have any claim to a consistent record, can describe the same God as visible by our mortal eyes, and himself participating in the agonies of death!—Our pages have often contained the proofs from New-Testament Scripture, for the position that *the Father* is the only true God, and the only proper object of religious worship;* and we can at present do no more than state the divisions under which they may be conveniently reduced. 1. The practice of our Saviour in the whole course of his ministry. 2. The commands and directions which he gave to his disciples. And 3. The practice of the apostles and first Christians, so far as we can learn this from the Book of Acts and the Epistles. Under each of these heads we can produce the most striking and incontrovertible evidence, that in the primitive age, the age of the apostles, the Lord Jesus Christ was not accounted the true God, much less the only true God, and the object of religious worship. He who said, "Now ye seek to kill me, a man, who hath told you the truth which I have heard from God;" he who said, "Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is God;" he who invariably directed his disciples to the benevolent Parent of the universe, by the name of *Father*, and who, after his resurrection, commanded Mary Magdalene to go to his brethren, and say to them, "I ascend to my Father, and your Father, to my God, and your God;" he, surely, would have startled at the presumption and folly of his remote disciples in elevating him to an equality with the God that made him. And again, those very apostles who had eaten and drunk with Jesus of Nazareth, who had talked with him familiarly as a friend, who were indebted to him, indeed, for an abundance of knowledge, which he professed to have received from God, and who revered him as a prophet of the Most High, could not, without surrendering every prejudice as Jews, and every conception as men, have come to regard this same Jesus as the King Eternal, Immortal and Invisible.

* We recommend the perusal of Dr. Carpenter's judicious pamphlet on this subject.

But where does their history describe any such remarkable change? See 1 Cor. viii. 6; 1 Tim. ii. 5; Acts xvii. 31.

Now in the case under our present consideration, to grant the preacher all for which he has contended, the evidence for the sole religious worship of *the Father*, as the only true God, compared with that for the worship of Christ, may be fairly enough represented by the fractional expression $\frac{1}{100}$, in which the denominator, at a moderate calculation, will represent the evidence for the worship of the Father, and the numerator, the contrary evidence for the worship of Christ. The preacher, in his defence, has referred to nothing more than the single case of Stephen, which he considers to be demonstrative of his position, and to contain a clear revelation of *the mystic triad*, to use his own anti-scriptural expression. Now upon the first principles of moral evidence, a proportionate degree of attention should have been bestowed upon the hundred *contrary* arguments to which we allude. But such is not the case; not a word is bestowed upon any such arguments. The whole question seems to the preacher to turn upon the verses which conclude the seventh chapter of the Acts of the Apostles! And with a most unfortunate employment of Griesbach, precisely where he yields neither to the Unitarian nor to the Trinitarian any assistance whatever, (for the commonest Greek Testament will inform us that the word *God* ought not to be in the text,) he imagines that he has satisfied every scholar, and he certainly has succeeded in throwing dust in the eyes of the indiscriminate vulgar. He seems to think that he has placed the question of Christian worship for ever at rest; and with the full conviction of the justness of his argument, he calls upon his brethren in the Scottish establishment to resume the employment of that "Directory for Worship," which, by his own confession, is generally "allowed by them to remain unopened, amidst the dust and cobwebs of their shelves." While the rest of the Christian world, forsooth, are emulating each other in their commendation and circulation of the Bible, the displeasure of this divine is excited by the now prevalent and praiseworthy custom of the established clergy

in Scotland, (in which they enjoy a privilege which those in the sister country know not,) of confining their public devotions to the Father only. He would have them retrace their steps, and recur to what we should consider the darkness of ignorance, and the imperfection which naturally attached to the early Reformers who had but just emerged from the puerile absurdities of the Church of Rome. May God be graciously pleased not thus to *retard*, but to *accelerate* the work of Reformation! May every addition in doctrine and in discipline which the Gospel has sustained, be soon swept away! And may the pure religion of Jesus issue from the ruins of Calvinistic orthodoxy, with renovated and recruited power, to go forth among the nations conquering and to conquer!—The case of Stephen has naturally come under the frequent review of Unitarian writers;* because, we hesitate not to acknowledge, it supplies an *apparent* inconsistency with the doctrine and example of other parts of the New Testament. Yet we are fully persuaded that it is *appearance* only.

From vers. 55 and 56, we find that Stephen was favoured with a vision, illustrating the exalted state and extensive dominion of Christ. It is by far the most probable supposition, that this vision was continued while this proto-martyr was enduring from his brutal enemies the agonies of a death by stoning. The vision was evidently afforded him in order to confirm his faith, and to support his spirits. *God* he could not see: "No man hath seen God at any time." No representation of God could he see, for it is contrary to the second commandment. *Jesus* he did see in vision; and not to have addressed him, in such circumstances, would, we own, appear to us most unnatural and unaccountable. All that he does say, is, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit;" or, accept of my life. I will lay down my life in thy service. Receive me to thyself, as thou didst promise while on earth. But it is to be observed, that Stephen

* See Haynes on the Attributes, Belsham's Calm Inquiry, Dr. Carpenter's Unitarianism, Priestley's Notes in loc., and Lindsey's Apology, notwithstanding the criticisms of Magee, which, on this head especially, are both flippant and contemptible.

was not at this time in the attitude of devotion. It is expressly said *afterwards*, that he changed his position, and kneeling down, prayed with a loud voice, not Lord Jesus—Stephen was too well informed to consider Jesus the supreme and universal Judge,—but “Lord, lay not this sin to their charge,”—a prayer, which an attentive examination of the Scripture usage in this and other parts of the original, will authorize us to believe, is offered up to none other than the God and Father of Jesus; and therefore so far from destroying, it abundantly justifies and confirms the doctrine by which Unitarian societies regulate their worship. The sense of *Lord* (Acts vii. 60) as equivalent to Jehovah, is confirmed, (1,) by the constant employment of the same word (*Κυριος*) to express the Supreme Being, in the Greek translation of the Old Testament, made before the time of Christ, and in common use then by those who understood Greek. (2,) By the employment of the same word in Stephen's speech in the 49th verse, in quoting from the Old Testament, “Heaven is my throne, and earth is my footstool; what house will ye build me, saith the Lord, (*Κυριος*), or what is the place of my rest?” (3,) By the change in the appellation bestowed by Stephen upon Jesus, when he was standing, from the expression which he employed when he assumed the posture of devotion; in the one case *Κυριε Ιησου*, and in the other simply *Κυριε*. As Stephen spoke in Syro-Chaldaic, it becomes the more probable that this difference of expression was intended; otherwise the Greek historian would have written the same in both instances; and (4thly,) by the similarity of the sentiment expressed by our Saviour on the cross, “Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do;” where it is absurd to suppose that the Lord Jesus was both the offerer and the object of the prayer. This similarity the preacher himself has discovered in the other instance, “Lord Jesus receive my spirit,” which he compares with the words, “Lord, into thy hands I commend my spirit;” where, unintentionally of course, our Saviour's word, *Father*, exclusively applicable to the only true God, is exchanged for the ambiguous word *Lord*, *Κυριε*; which *may* be the Greek translation of two very different He-

brew words, Jehovah and Adonim; the former of which, as a whole, is never given to Jesus, or to any created intelligence; the latter, simply descriptive of authority, is capable of the most extensive and varied signification.

The Orthodox Reviewer we before noticed has flattered the preacher of this sermon, by the expression of his entire satisfaction, and intimation of his success as an author. We would conclude by urging him to attend less to the established doctrines of former days, and more to the genuine doctrines of revelation; to be less solicitous about defending mysterious and unaccountable tenets, and more desirous of exhibiting Christianity in that native simplicity, which will gain the admiration and approve itself to the judgment of man. Thus only will he have a fair claim to the character of a Scriptural critic; thus only can he share the reputation of a well-informed Christian and a useful divine.

M.

ART. IV.—*Unitarianism vindicated from the Imputation of tending to Infidelity. In a Letter to the Rev. Richard Lloyd, M. A. Vicar of Midhurst, occasioned by his Account of the Recent Conduct and Present State of the Rev. Robert Taylor.* By John Fullagar, Minister of the Unitarian Chapel, Chichester. 8vo. pp. 38. Hunter and Eaton, 1819.

THE Rev. Robert Taylor is the gentleman whose singular recantation of infidelity was inserted in our last volume, XIII. 754. He was curate to Mr. Lloyd, who has published an account of his “Conduct” and “State.” With strange ignorance or bigotry, the vicar of Midhurst has attributed his unbelief in Christianity to such infidel writers as Hume and Gibbon, *Priestley and Belsham*. With great gravity too, he relates that the young unbeliever was invited by “the Unitarians and Socinians” “to come among them, as they would gladly admit him, if he would only admit the resurrection of Christ into his creed.” (See Lloyd's Reply to Letters, &c. p. 62.) This was rather a hard condition for infidels to impose upon a brother infidel. What trash will not bigotry feed upon?

Mr. Fullagar, who is acquainted with Mr. Taylor's history, contradicts

the vicar's statements, which are erroneous in point of fact, and exposes his folly and injustice in preferring the charge of infidelity against Unitarians.

Happily all churchmen are not of the same spirit as the vicar of Midhurst, who tried to engage the Attorney-General in contest with Mr. Taylor, (See Reply, &c. p. 70); Mr. Fullagar sets a bishop in contrast with the vicar:

"I lately heard an anecdote of a worthy bishop in the vicinity of Norwich, which, though I cannot vouch for its authenticity, so coincides with the liberal sentiments and accurate judgment of the exalted individual, as to bear internal evidence of its truth, or at least, that probability is not violated by the application. One of the clergymen in his diocese went in great trepidation to inform his Lordship, that dangerous doctrines were introduced into his parish by some enthusiastic preacher, and requested to have his diocesan's advice, whether the offender should not be prosecuted? *My advice, said the bishop, is, that you endeavour to counteract the effect of his preaching, by yourself, with like energy, preaching more correctly.*"—Pp. 27, 28.

ART. V.—*The Probable Influence of the Development of the Principles of the Human Mind on its Future Progress in Knowledge and Goodness. A Discourse, delivered at Ilminster, July 8, 1818, before the Western Unitarian Society.* By T. Southwood Smith, M. D. 12mo. pp. 68. Hunter and Eaton.

DR. Smith here considers the influence of a knowledge of the human mind on education, the conduct of life, the modification of existing institutions, and the treatment of the erring and guilty. As the title might lead the reader to expect, the discourse is a *Concio ad Clerum*, rather than *ad Populum*; but notwithstanding its scholastic form, it contains much plain and useful truth, eloquently expressed. It abounds with just thoughts, wise counsels, and benevolent anticipations.

ART. VI.—*The Duties of Filial Piety stated and recommended, in a Discourse addressed to Young Persons, and delivered at St. Thomas's Chapel, Southwark, on Sunday Jan. 4, 1818.* By Thomas Rees, F. S. A. [now LL.D.] 12mo. pp. 46. Longman.

THE preacher has published this New-Year's Day Sermon at the request of some parents in his congregation. He states "Filial Piety" to consist in love and respect, obedience and submission, tenderness to prejudices and failings of parents, and support of them in want, or sickness, or old age; and he urges these duties by the several considerations of their pleasantness, profitableness, and conformableness to the will of God. His sermon may be unreservedly recommended to the young for its judicious counsels and useful admonitions.

ART. VII.—*Death and a Future Life considered, in a Sermon, delivered on Sunday evening, December 20, 1818, in Beaumont Street Chapel, Gainsborough, with a View to the Improvement of some recent Melancholy Events.* By Robert Little. 8vo. pp. 20. Stark, Gainsborough; Richardson, London. 6d.

THIS is a serious, sensible and interesting sermon from 1 Cor. xv. 26, *The last enemy that shall be destroyed is Death.* It was suggested by "some repeated visitations of Providence" in the preacher's congregation, but will be inappropriate to no readers that bear in mind the law of mortality under which they live.

We fear that we must accept this as a farewell sermon, the author being on the point of removing to America. Whether he exercise his profession or not in the United States, he will, we are persuaded, continue in the service of truth, and our best wishes attend him.

ART. VIII.—*Notes and Observations on Criminal Trials.* By a Juryman. 12mo. pp. 30. Hunter. 1819.

TRIAL by Jury is the palladium of English liberty, but the efficacy of this institution depends upon the intelligence and spirit of those that are called to sit as jurors: the public are therefore much indebted to those that, like the author of this tract, write for the information and guidance of jurymen. These pages bear internal evidence of the author being conversant with juries; and they are pervaded by a spirit of enlightened humanity which at once instructs and pleases the reader.

OBITUARY.

1819. March 17, at *Savana Le Mar*, in the Island of Jamaica, Mr. Wm. LEISHMAN, in the 65th year of his age, a native of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Northumberland. He was brought up with his parents in the doctrines of the Scotch Church, but, giving himself very early to reading the Scriptures, he, from conviction, left that church and joined a small congregation of Baptists, and was baptized at the early age of seventeen, and continued in communion with this people about eighteen years; when a dispute arising concerning the doctrine of the Trinity, he and some others separated from the society. Mr. Leishman then joined himself to the Unitarian congregation of which Mr. E. Prowitt was pastor, and a most intimate friendship subsisted between them till the death of the latter. [Mon. Repos. VI. 590.]

In the year 1796, Mr. Leishman with his family embarked for Philadelphia, America, and being introduced to the pious and excellent Mr. Thomas Dobson, a Unitarian Baptist who held a church in his own house, he joined in divine worship with him until the present Philadelphia Church was formed, when Mr. Leishman was chosen one of the twelve readers (there being no minister) who were to conduct the service on each first day of the week. The service was at that time carried on in a hired room, but now, through the zeal, activity and increase of its members, in a commodious, elegant chapel built by suscription, and aided by the suscription of every denomination of Christians, owing chiefly to the influence and high character of Mr. John Vaughan, who was indefatigable on the occasion. The public worship is still continued by two able and zealous remaining readers, Mr. R. Eddowes and Mr. J. Taylor. Mr. Leishman left America in 1812, for his native land, regretted by all of that church, (which he had seen reared,) and of which he was an honourable and useful member.

While residing in the neighbourhood of London he attended at the Gravel-Pit, Hackney, but was much abroad. At the Island of Jamaica,

on the 14th of March, he was seized with one of those fevers which are generally the sure messengers of death. He appeared to have no idea of danger till within an hour or two of his dissolution: after a slight convulsion he tranquilly resigned himself to his God, and without a sigh fell asleep in Jesus, in whom he was a firm believer.

A. L.

August * 17, in his 80th year, after a short illness, Mr. GEORGE TOWNEND, *Shoreditch*. He was a member of the Parliament Court Congregation, and distinguished by an amiability of disposition, correctness of feeling, and uniform propriety of conduct, that would have done honour to any society or denomination of Christians. He had been indisposed about a fortnight, but appeared to be recovering, and the immediate cause of his death is apprehended to have been the rupture of a blood vessel, which so speedily deprived him of sense as to spare him the pang of parting from a mother and brother by whom he was fondly beloved, and which also prevented his expressing those feelings of Christian resignation and hope to which those who were acquainted with him, well knew he was no stranger. During the last year or two of his life his constitution seemed to have risen superior to a consumptive disorder under which he had long suffered, and through which he had manifested a pious and filial submission to him in whose hand our breath is. The hopes thus excited have met a disappointment which cannot but be deeply felt; yet, however untimely his death, he had made that best preparation for it, a well-spent life; and has left the most honourable memorial in the affectionate regret of his relatives and friends.

June 18, at *Ilminster*, in the early prime of life, the Rev. Wm. WILLIAMS, minister of the Unitarian congregation in that town. Mr. Williams was a native of Cardiganshire, and received the first part of his classical educa-

* By a mistake of the writer in the date, this article is out of its proper place. Ed.

tion under the able tuition of the Rev. John James, then of Lloyd-Jack in that county, but now minister of Gellionnen in Glamorganshire. From Mr. James's school he removed to the Presbyterian College at Caermarthen, where he past through the regular course of four years, with exemplary regularity of conduct, and with great diligence in the prosecution of his studies. At the public examination of the students of that institution in 1817, he particularly distinguished himself, especially by his proficiency in the classics, and a prize was in consequence awarded him by the visitors (Dr. Rees, Dr. Lindsay, and Mr. James Esdaile) as a testimony of their approbation. It was his earnest wish, at the close of his academical course at Caermarthen, in 1818, to have prosecuted his studies for some time longer at the University of Glasgow, on Dr. Williams's foundation, and an application was made for this purpose to the trustees, which failed, only because there happened to be then no vacancy at their disposal. After this disappointment, which, in the event, proved to himself a fortunate circumstance, he accepted an invitation from the congregation at Ilminster, where he settled in the autumn of the last year. Shortly after his removal to this place some alarming symptoms began to display themselves of an internal disease, which, it was evident, had been for some time silently preying upon his frame. His liver seemed at first to be the principal seat of his disorder; but it soon became apparent that his lungs were also deeply affected. As soon as it was deemed necessary to have recourse to medical advice, he was favoured with the able and gratuitous services of Dr. Southwood Smith, of Yeovil, whose kind and unremitting attentions he duly appreciated, and acknowledged with sincere and affectionate gratitude. Writing to a friend on the subject, he says, "Dr. Smith has behaved towards me, throughout my whole illness, more like a brother than a medical gentleman." Dr. Blake, of Taunton, also, in the handsomest and kindest manner, gave him occasionally the benefit of his professional advice. Neither the skill, nor the kindness of these estimable persons was, however, of any avail,

except to alleviate the present sufferings of the patient, and to soothe and support his spirits in the prospect of the fatal result which, at an early period, was anticipated as almost inevitable.

Mr. Williams's conduct, during the progress of his insidious, lingering, and often acutely painful disorder, to the last hour of his existence, evinced that he had not entered on the profession of a Christian minister before he had become deeply imbued with a Christian spirit, and acquired some of the most essential graces of the Christian life. All his complicated sufferings were sustained with exemplary meekness and patience, and he bowed, throughout the whole, with the most entire resignation to the will of the great Arbiter of life and death. "To the last he was comfortable in mind, and perfectly satisfied with all the infinitely wise dispensations of Providence. He was sensible to the last hour of life, and exhibited no symptom of terror as he approached the awful period of dissolution."

The attentions which Mr. Williams experienced during his protracted illness from his congregation, and from other persons in the neighbourhood, are equally to the honour of those from whose benevolence they proceeded, and of the individual whose character and behaviour could, on so short an acquaintance, command such general and marked esteem. Besides Dr. Blake and Dr. Smith, who have already been mentioned, he received the most prompt and cordial services, professional and otherwise, from some neighbouring ministers, among whom may be named Mr. Fawcett, of Yeovil, Mr. Blake, of Crewkerne, and Mr. Edwards, of Exeter. The last gentleman undertook the regular charge of his congregation, travelling weekly a distance of upwards of thirty miles to officiate for him; and had it in his power by these visits greatly to relieve the mind and spirits of his young friend by conducting an occasional correspondence, and transacting some other little matters of business to which he was himself unequal. The members of his congregation, also, vied with each other in their affectionate zeal to mitigate his sufferings, and to supply him with every accommodation and comfort of which his

situation admitted. Nothing was left undone that it was conceived could possibly alleviate his affliction in the least degree, and cheer and fortify his spirits: nor did his friends cease to testify their esteem when death dissolved their connexion and rendered him unconscious of their regards. Their affection and respect were shewn in the last remaining act of human friendship, in consigning him to the tomb. It may perhaps seem to matter little with what ceremonies, or by whom attended, a young man who had but just entered on his professional life, was conducted to his grave. But there are circumstances connected with this case which impart some interest to the statement; for it is pleasing and instructive to learn, that at this day, when the hearts of professing Christians are too apt to be alienated by the differences of judgment and conviction which distinguish their creeds, persons of the most opposite religious sentiments could meet together to follow a fellow-creature to "the house appointed for all the living," with one feeling of friendship and one impression of solemnity, forgetting all their differences in these two considerations, that they were all mortal, and looked with one common hope for a victory over death as the gift of God through Jesus Christ.

The funeral took place on Friday the 25th of June, and was arranged with great liberality on the part of the congregation. The officiating clergyman of the parish, and Mr. Edwards, of Exeter, preceded the corpse to the Unitarian Chapel; the pall was supported by Dr. Southwood Smith, of Yeovil, Dr. Henry Davies, of Taunton, Mr. Fawcett, of Yeovil, Mr. Blake, of Crewkerne, Mr. Partridge, a Calvinistic minister, of Ilminster, and a young Welsh Calvinistic student from Axminster.—The under bearers were six young men of the congregation, selected from the singers.—The body was interred in the chapel yard close to the grave of Mr. Harries, a predecessor of Mr. Williams's, who died about ten years ago, and was succeeded by Mr. Evans, now of Caermarthen. It had been the intention of Mr. Edwards to preach a funeral sermon the Sunday following the funeral, but having

been engaged for some weeks previously to preach a charity sermon on that day at Taunton, in aid of the County Hospital, Dr. Henry Davies delivered an appropriate discourse on the occasion to a numerous audience. A friend, by whom many of the preceding particulars have been communicated, writes in conclusion:—"The incessant flow of benevolence and beneficence exhibited towards Mr. Williams both by males and females, especially the latter, of his connexion in this neighbourhood, in furnishing him with all the possible means of comfort, and to smooth for him the pillow of death, is not only honourable to them, but highly creditable to human nature. Finer examples of what human beings and Christians ought to be, and to do, I, who am not young, never witnessed. 'Their reward no one can take from them.'"

Thus has closed the brief career of a young man of high promise in the profession to which he had devoted himself, distinguished by his natural talents, by his extensive acquirements, and by his early proficiency in Christian piety and virtue. The ways of Providence are to us inscrutable; they are, however, infinitely wise, and just, and benevolent. He who planted the vineyard will provide in his own manner and season for its cultivation. Let those who are engaged in the work labour while it is yet day, "for the night cometh," and may be near to the youngest, "in the which no man can work."

T. R.

July 14, the Rev. JOSIAH TOWNSEND, on the day he completed his 67th year. His father was the Rev. Meredith Townsend, who, for upwards of thirty-nine years, was the minister of the Dissenting congregation at Stoke Newington, much respected as a divine, and endeared to his friends by the suavity and kindness of his manners. He was himself a correct and accomplished scholar, and under his instruction his son Josiah had made such proficiency in classical knowledge, that he was admitted a student at the academy at Daventry, then under the superintendence of Dr. Ashworth, at the early age of fourteen. Here, as may be inferred from his su-

ture attainments, he pursued his studies with great diligence and success. He remained at this seminary a year longer than the usual period, advantageously employed in theological pursuits, and in the study of the Scriptures, occasionally officiating as a preacher in the neighbouring congregations. It appears, from the very exact minutes which Mr. Townsend made of his engagements from the commencement of his ministry to the close of it, that when he left this respectable institution, he was much and usefully occupied in supplying vacant congregations, and more fixedly as the assistant of the Rev. W. Whitaker, minister of Call-Lane Chapel, Leeds, in which situation he continued a year and a half. Mr. Townsend was afterwards engaged, for nearly the same time, in conducting the religious services of the congregation at Narborough, in Northamptonshire, by which society he was invited to become their minister, which he declined. His first settlement as a stated minister was with the congregation at Rotherham, Yorkshire, in the year 1776, of which society he was ordained pastor April 17, 1777. About two years afterwards, Mr. T. married Miss Moulton, the eldest daughter of the Rev. Samuel Moulton, whom he succeeded as minister of the congregation at Rotherham. In the year 1787, Mr. Townsend removed to Fairford, in Gloucestershire, where he officiated to a small society till the close of the year 1796, when he removed to Ealand, near Halifax, Yorkshire. After a period of eighteen years, having lost his wife, and feeling the approach of some of the infirmities of age, he was desirous of withdrawing from stated service, and resigned his charge July 24, 1814. He continued a short time in the neighbourhood, and occasionally assisted his brethren, till he removed to Mansfield, Nottinghamshire, to reside with his daughters, where he spent the remainder of his life, at all times ready to engage in any service suitable to his age and declining health; and especially desirous of promoting any plan of utility and benevolence.

He was a man of considerable learning and abilities. His reading was extensive, and he was well acquainted with the best writers upon

moral and religious subjects. As a preacher, his manner and delivery were not the most engaging or popular; but his sermons were plain, serious and practical, often affectionate and impressive; and in conducting the devotional service, when the occasion required, he was peculiarly happy in adapting his expressions to the circumstances of the society or of individuals. He was the author of some single sermons and small tracts, which do credit to his sentiments and feelings, particularly by the interest which they manifest for the welfare of the rising generation. He was educated in the tenets of Calvin; but his inquiries terminated in a full conviction of the truth of the simple doctrines of the gospel, which are usually denominated Unitarian, of which he was the mild, but steady and consistent advocate. His last illness, which was severe and painful, he bore with great fortitude and patience, expressing an earnest wish, that every tendency to the contrary feeling might be noticed and repressed by his children, of whose assiduous attention and kindness he was fully sensible, receiving them with affection and thankfulness. He retained his faculties almost to the last hour, and was particularly gratified by an interview with his son, Mr. Samuel Townsend, of Brompton, Middlesex. With his daughters he conversed with much tranquillity, sensible of the near approach of his death, not unconscious of his own errors and imperfections, (and from error and imperfection, alas! no one is exempt,) but happy in himself, and in the belief of those important truths, which he considered as the leading and interesting doctrines of Christianity.

J. W.

Mansfield, August 14, 1819.

Death of Professor Playfair.—Professor Playfair, who has been for some time past in a declining state of health, died at his house in North Street, Edinburgh, on Tuesday morning. His death is universally regretted. No man ever perhaps deserved or enjoyed a larger share of the public esteem. By the world at large, he was respected for his great and various acquirements, both in literature and science, while to the circle of his private friends he was in a peculiar

manner endeared by his mild and unassuming character.—*Times*, Wednesday, July 28.

On the 3rd instant, at *Enfield*, near London, WILLIAM, fourth son of the late Mr. Benjamin MARDON, of Exeter. At the early age of twenty years he was cut off from his friends by a rapid typhus fever. He left his native city for the metropolis about a year and a half since, the better to improve and prepare himself for the active duties of future life: during this time he obtained the approbation and confidence of his employer, and the respect and esteem of his associates and intimate acquaintance. Those seeds of virtue and piety, which his friends had sown in his early youth, were putting forth their blossoms, and promised an abundant harvest. He was a young man of sterling integrity, spotless purity and practical piety, and had the all-wise Disposer of events seen fit to prolong his life, his friends fondly anticipated he would have made a useful and worthy member of society.

August 4, at *Saffron Walden*, Essex, after a few days' illness, in the 17th year of his age, GEORGE NUNN, a youth of promising talents, unexpectedly snatched away from his friends, from the enjoyment of health and from society, by the unsparing hand of death, and consigned to an early but not dishonourable grave. The short period allotted him on earth he employed in the active and cheerful discharge of the duties of the station in which he was placed, in which he ever displayed the greatest industry and fidelity; and the short and painful illness which brought him to a premature grave, he bore with exemplary patience, cheerfulness and resignation. He was interred in the burying ground belonging to the General Baptists in *Saffron Walden*, at which place of worship he constantly attended, when an impressive discourse was delivered on the occasion by the Rev. S. Philpot, from Luke vii. 12—15, to a numerous, attentive, and sorrowing audience, who assembled to pay their last sad tribute of respect to the memory of a youth who, by his engaging manners, had gained the respect of all who knew him.

Aug. 8, Mrs. JACKSON, wife of Mr. Jackson, of *Prescot*, sincerely respected and deeply lamented.

The solemnity and painfulness of this deplored bereavement were greatly increased by its suddenness, and the crisis of its occurrence. Mrs. Jackson was apparently fast recovering from a serious illness, that some weeks ago assumed an alarming aspect, and hopes, the most gratifying to her affectionate husband, family and friends, were encouraged by the opinion and reports of her skilful medical attendant. But alas! these pleasing hopes were not to be long cherished; they vanished ere they were realized. So unexpected was the awful event of the death of the venerable friend we mourn, that a daughter and son-in-law, who reside in the town, had not left their venerated mother more than half an hour before it occurred, and without harbouring the slightest expectation of being speedily followed by a messenger charged with such agonizing tidings. And her widowed husband, whose affectionate and tender attentions had considerably alleviated the scenes of her affliction, returned from a short and hasty evening walk, little suspecting that he was approaching the house of mourning. The painful task of announcing the heart-rending intelligence to the bereft husband, fell to the lot of the writer of this humble memoir and her medical attendant; and painful indeed was the task. It compelled them to check the cheerful smile, which as usual played upon the countenance of their much esteemed friend; and to interrupt the amicable salutation with the announcement of news the most distressing to so affectionate and happy a husband.

Imagination can much better conceive than language can paint the affecting scene that ensued. No wonder that the shock for a time overpowered his fortitude, and that the branches of the bereft family which were present intermingled tears of heart-felt sorrow and poignant grief.

By this unanticipated stroke of death a protracted and very happy conjugal union was instantaneously dissolved, and grief and sorrow, which time alone can assuage, were

diffused through the domestic and friendly circles in which the deceased had long moved, displaying a disposition peculiarly amiable, and exhibiting many pleasing traits of character that rendered her friendship highly valuable, and will cause her memory to be cherished with a melancholy pleasure and veneration.

The eminence of her piety, the regularity of her attendance upon the public ordinances of religion, and her firm and Christian-like adherence to principles, which she had espoused from a full conviction of their correctness and salutary tendency, and the candour and liberality with which she treated all conscientious and well-meaning Christians, commanded general esteem; and tend to recommend her praiseworthy example with double energy to her surviving progeny, relations and friends.

The interment of so esteemed and lamented a friend and a Christian was a deeply-affecting scene. nor was that of the ensuing sabbath, exhibited in

the Presbyterian chapel, which she had long frequented, less affecting. A large majority of the congregation appeared in the habiliments of mourning, and evinced indubitable symptoms of cordial grief. Several strangers of various religious sentiments were present, mingled their tears with those of her late fellow-worshippers, and participated in the general lamentation.

The reporter does not remember having addressed a more attentive or sympathizing audience; and he fervently hopes, that the impressions made upon the minds of any present will, through a divine blessing, prove lasting and edifying; and that a testimony thus voluntarily borne to the excellence of a departed friend will stimulate them to tread in the pious and virtuous steps that, through mercy, conducted their revered fellow-mortal tranquilly and hopefully along the chequered paths of life, and brought her to her grave in serenity and peace.

W. T. P.

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC.

RELIGIOUS.

Opening of the Unitarian Baptist Chapel at Headcorn.

THE General Baptists of Headcorn, in Kent, have long been respected for their benevolent hospitality, and though they have not always been a Unitarian congregation, they can boast of having in their society one of the oldest Unitarians in the county; one who, for some years, stood almost alone, as the champion of the cause in that neighbourhood. And an inscription, upon a stone in the front of a building which they have lately erected for public worship, ("Unitarian Baptist Chapel, 1819,") shews that they are not less open to conviction than kind, sociable and friendly.

The building alluded to was opened on the 11th instant, and three appropriate discourses were delivered on the occasion; the first by Mr. Pound, of Dover, from the prediction respecting the glory of the second temple, by the prophet Haggai; shewing how the prophecy was accomplished by the promulgation of the gospel; for the promotion of which, in its genuine purity, the chapel had been erected.

The sermon in the afternoon was by that

zealous and liberal patron of the General Baptist cause, Mr. Sampson Kingsford, from 1 Tim. i. 11: "The glorious gospel of the blessed God;" in which, with great zeal and energy, he maintained that the benefits of the gospel were intended for all mankind, concluding with practical reflections, and an appropriate application of the subject.

In the evening Mr. B. Marten, of Dover, delivered a very judicious discourse from Isaiah lvi. 7. He enlarged on the several heads into which the subject is naturally divided by the text, and concluded by earnestly exhorting his hearers to be zealous and active in the great and good cause in which they were engaged; not to satisfy themselves with being merely hearers of the word, but to make it the uniform rule of their lives and conversations; to exert themselves to the utmost in diffusing a knowledge of the most important truths, and to live in amity and friendship with their neighbours, however discordant might be their religious opinions.

The Scriptures were read, and the hymns given out by Mr. Kite, of Dover. The devotional parts of the service were conducted by Mr. Cundill, Mr. Farren and Mr. Pound.

A dinner was provided under a canopy

erected for the purpose, to which nearly seventy ladies and gentlemen sat down; and in the evening tea was provided in the meeting, for as many as chose to accept of it, and the day was concluded with that harmony and devotion, which the Christian religion is so eminently calculated to inspire.

J.

Dudley Double Lecture.

THE Anniversary of the "Double Lecture" took place at Dudley, on *Whit-Tuesday*, June 1, 1819.

The Rev. Richard Fry, of Kidderminster, conducted the devotional service. Two sermons were preached, the one by the Rev. Thomas Warren, of Stourbridge, from Rev. xix. 10: "*The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.*" The other by the Rev. Robert Little, lately of Gainsborough, from Psalm viii. 5: "*For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour.*" Fourteen ministers were present, and the congregation was larger than it had been on a similar occasion for several years.

J. H. B.

Association of Methodist Unitarians.

ON the 4th day of June 1819, was held at Newchurch, the Annual Association of the Methodist Unitarians. Mr. Elliott, of Rochdale, preached in the morning a most edifying sermon, on Christian Fear, from Heb. xii. 28. And in the evening, Mr. Harris, of Liverpool, delivered an excellent discourse on the Doctrine and Fellowship of the first Christians, from Acts ii. 42. Both services were well attended, but particularly the evening's, that being much the better time for people leaving their work. There were present of our friends from Rochdale, Oldham, Todmorden, Bolton, Padiham, Burnley and other places. Forty-three sat down to dinner, and many more, whose hearts are strongly attached to our cause, would have indulged in the same gratification, but were unable, even though the expense of dining was only one shilling and nine-pence. These, however, with many of our females, joined us after dinner. Mr. Harris was called to the Chair; and, according to a previous arrangement, in the course of the afternoon an account was given of the state and progress of Unitarianism at all the places forming the Association. Mr. Ashworth gave an account of Newchurch, Mr. Taylor of Rochdale, Mr. Wilkinson of Oldham, Mr. Robinson of Padiham, and Mr. Sudhurst of Todmorden. All agreed that the doctrine was spreading. One observed, that Unitarianism with them had

made converts from the world, whose conduct was such as might silence the reproaches of a Wardlaw. Another noticed particularly the amiable, zealous and unwearied conduct of the women in their church; that though there were many men amongst them whose lives were irreproachable, and some amongst these whose Christian zeal was equal to their means of using it, yet he could not but lament that there was not a more general and active cooperation among all the serious members of the church. A third observed, at our place we are but a few very poor cotton-weavers, unable to defray our own expenses, and must long since have given up our room had it not been for the donations sent us by our more able Unitarian brethren, but particularly the Unitarian Fund. When these donations have reached us, (continued he,) I believe we have felt happier, and thought them of greater value than if we had received thousands from some other quarter and for another purpose. It did us so much good to know that, poor as we were, there were some who noticed us and cared for us. Mr. Harris gave an account of the progress of Unitarianism at Liverpool, of the Fellowship Fund, and the pleasure the members felt in assisting poorer places; and gave a convincing proof of this by presenting Mr. Ashworth with a donation of £5., toward liquidating the remaining debt upon the Rossendale Chapel.

At this meeting it was resolved,

1. That the next Association be held at Todmorden, on the Thursday, in Whitsuntide-week, and that Mr. Harris, of Liverpool, and Mr. Kay, of Hindley, be requested to preach.

2. That every society in connexion with this Association be requested to transmit to a committee, now to be appointed, an account of its state and progress, and that this be done one week before the annual meeting.

JOHN ASHWORTH.

Case of Glasgow Chapel.

To the several Committees of the Fellowship Funds, established throughout the kingdom, and to such other societies as have for their object the building of Chapels for Unitarian worship.

At the request of some of your number, I take the liberty of transmitting for your consideration the following arguments, to shew the necessity of farther assistance in liquidation of the debt upon Union Chapel, Glasgow.

B. MARDON.

Exeter, August 18, 1819.

A considerable sum has at different times been subscribed by the English Unitarians, in order to promote the progress

of the Unitarian Reformation in Scotland, which has served to establish, in the city of Glasgow in particular, the regular worship of the Father, the only true God.

But several debts remain which are a very heavy incumbrance upon Union Chapel, and the tendency of which is to depress the zeal and spirits of the members. These have been reduced to about £200., exclusive of Mr. H. Gaskell's loan, more than the yearly interest of which is derived from the rent of the cellar.

The preaching and writings of my predecessor have removed every fear of the failure of the cause of Unitarianism in Glasgow, if the present debt be liquidated.

Our orthodox opponents have now given up the expectation of "preaching out the Unitarians" from Glasgow, though they have often prematurely calculated, that we could be "purchased out."

The position of Glasgow, in reference to the spread of Unitarianism in the West of Scotland, is obvious and highly important.

The congregation are exerting themselves, according to their best abilities, to pay their annual expenses.

The help which is needed will be more serviceable now than at any future period.

Any contributions will as usual be thankfully received, either by Mr. Morrison, Hosier, Argyle Street, or by the Rev. B. Mardon, No. 100 George Street, Glasgow.

The Epistle from the Yearly Meeting, held in London, by Adjournments, from the 19th of the Fifth Month, to the 28th of the same, inclusive, 1819, to the Quarterly and Monthly Meetings of Friends, in Great Britain, Ireland and elsewhere.

DEAR FRIENDS,

WE have renewed cause of thankfulness to the "Father of mercies and God of all comfort," for having permitted us to be again sensible that we are under his protecting care. His love and his ancient goodness have not been withheld from us in this our annual assembly; and under a fresh persuasion that He is still graciously willing to do us good, we invite all our dear friends to offer their hearts to his disposal. In the wilderness of this life, dangers assail us on every hand: but if we look with entire reliance unto Christ, the great Head of the Church, he will lead us safely along; he will protect us from being entangled by the briars and thorns; he will shield us from the sun, and from the storm; he will permit us to know his voice, and to distinguish it from the voice of the stranger; and humbly to believe that we are of that "one fold," of which

VOL. XIV.

3 z

he is the everlasting Shepherd,—that he will give unto us eternal life, and that none shall pluck us out of his hand. How inviting are these truths! how animating are these assurances!

But this attainment is to be ours, only as we look in faith unto Him who declared, "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me." To deny ourselves, and to take up the cross, are duties which we desire earnestly to press upon all. If we seek for divine aid that this may become the daily engagement of our lives, we shall be induced to make a narrow scrutiny into our thoughts, and into the motives which influence our conduct. Frequent self-examination will convince us that we are frail, and unworthy of the Lord's mercies. A conviction of our own weakness and transgressions will make us fearful of speaking of the errors of others; and tend to restrain us from tale-bearing and detraction. At the same time, divine love operating on our hearts, and begetting there the love of our neighbour, will constrain us to offer a word of counsel, in a way most calculated to produce the desired effect on such as we deem deficient in moral or religious duty.

Precious and very desirable is a humble, contrite, teachable state of mind, in which the earnest prayer is raised, that we may live in the love and fear of our great Creator, and in all things walk acceptably before Him. Oh! that all may be kept in the low valley of humility, where the dew remains long; where they will know the Lord to be "as a hiding-place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest." Here preservation is witnessed within the holy inclosure, here we are guarded against the snares which beset those who would make haste to be rich. How safe, how necessary it is, for the humble Christian to set out well; to watch against the first temptation to covet great things! Sweet is the condition of the grateful mind: sweet is a state of contentment and of daily dependence on the Lord.

The amount of the sufferings of our friends in Great Britain and Ireland, as reported to this meeting, is upwards of fifteen thousand six hundred pounds. A very small proportion of these has been incurred for military purposes, whilst the remainder has arisen from the support of our Christian testimony against the payment of tithes, and other demands of an ecclesiastical nature.

We have received an epistle from our dear friends in Ireland, and one from each of the Yearly Meetings in America. It is satisfactory to find that in several parts of that continent, friends are alive to the rights and interests of the natives of Africa

and their descendants resident among them; and are endeavouring, by the establishment of schools, to promote the education of their offspring. Their attempts also, to introduce the benefits of civilized life among the native inhabitants of the wilderness, continue to be steady and persevering; and to be marked in some parts by a cheering degree of success. We are also glad to learn the favourable result of an application to the government of the United States, to secure to some of these natives a title to their lands, previously to an intended subdivision of this property, in order to its being transmitted by legal inheritance.

The continuance of the blessing of peace to this nation has warmed our hearts with gratitude. Our refusal to bear arms is not only a testimony against the violence and cruelty of war, but against a confidence in what is emphatically termed in Scripture, the "arm of flesh:" it is a testimony to the meekness and gentleness of Christ, and a resignation to suffer, in reliance on the power, the goodness, the protection and the providence of the Almighty. Let us, even now, seek to have our trust so firmly fixed on this unfailing source of help, that if our faith should be ever again put to the test, we may have ground to look with humble confidence to him in whom we have believed.

Dear Friends, if we are quickened by the power of the Son of God, we shall not be idle spectators in the world, nor indolent occupiers of the talents with which we are entrusted; and, however varied our allotments may be, each will see that he has duties, and very important duties to fulfil, in this state of existence. We shall, however, find that it becomes the pious Christian to wait to know his exertions for the good of others regulated and sanctified by the Spirit of his Lord. We shall seek to be preserved from suffering by the friendship and intercourse of the world; and we shall see the necessity of continued watchfulness, that neither our own minds, nor those of our tender offspring, may be drawn aside from the simplicity and purity of the truth as it is in Jesus. Our early predecessors received this truth by conviction; they made great sacrifices to obtain an establishment therein, and having thus purchased their possession, they were careful not lightly to esteem it, nor to exchange it for any inferior object: but let us ever bear in mind, that the salvation of the soul cannot be inherited by birth-right, nor imparted by education. It is an individual work, indispensably necessary for every man to know wrought in him through Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour. Let us, then, each seek to fill his allotted station in the church, that in the

day of righteous decision, we may all be found worthy to stand before God in Zion.

"The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen."

Signed in and on behalf of the Meeting,
by

WM. DILLWORTH CREWDSON,
Clerk to the Meeting this Year.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The Lord Chancellor has given judgment against the Jews in the *Bedford Charity*. This people are wholly excluded from all its benefits. Legally, the decision may be right; we wish, however, that the law were more conformable to the benevolent spirit of the gospel. We gave in our last Volume, XIII. 586—594, a full account of the proceedings in Chancery in this interesting case; and the same valuable correspondent, by whose means we were enabled to do so, has furnished us with an accurate report of the Chancellor's Judgment, which will be inserted in our next.

The following notice has been sent to us from the Committee of the Society who are so laudably engaged in the attempt to reduce the Poor Rates.

King's Head, Poultry,
August 18, 1819.

It is hoped that those owners and occupiers of land, and parishes, who, from a conviction of the utility of the plan, are now in so many parts engaged in furnishing labouring poor with small portions of land, will by their example be the means hourly of exciting others to the adoption of this very important mode of ameliorating the condition of the poor rates. What is effecting in Kent by Lords Abergavenny and Le Despencer, as well as by parishes in that county, merits universal notice.

There can scarcely exist a doubt but that the government will ere long co-operate in granting land at no great distance from London, on which a number of metropolitan poor may be employed.

His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, accompanied and assisted by the Bishop of Exeter, has made the circuit of the county of Kent within the last month, for the purposes of Visitation and Confirmation. The number of persons on whom holy hands have been laid on this ecclesiastical tour, is computed at 11,633. The Archbishop's charge has appeared, in substance, in several newspapers. It turns on the political as well as religious signs of the times. His Grace complains of "the united attacks of *Dissenters* and *Infidels*," (he cannot surely be correctly reported,) "which require all the learning, zeal and

industry of the Church to repel them." "The meanest and most ignorant of the people," he goes on to lament, "are now united to employ themselves in inquiries for which *they are by no means qualified.*" Sedition, his Grace further represents, keeps pace with schism, which latter evil he expects will be remedied by the measures taken for building new churches. A million of money has been voted for this purpose by Parliament, and there is a voluntary association in aid of this legislative design, but the good Archbishop says that "the number of subscribers has hitherto been *singularly small.*" He then adverts to the education of the poor, which he asserts must be confided to the direction of the parish-priest, or there will be "hazard to the Church and State;" complains of "the mistaken liberality" which would "leave religion to assert its own rights;" and directs the clergy to look for the interference of Parliament on behalf of Church-of-England education, and in the mean time to protect the poor from "the misguidings of the "sturdy enemies" of Church and State, who "would introduce a mode of education in direct opposition to both." Calculating on this future interference, as well as on the effect of measures already adopted, the zealous metropolitan solaces himself, and cheers the clergy with the persuasion, that "in a few years the difficulties and labours of ministers will be greatly diminished, and *their principal duties brought nearer to the strength of man,*" that the progress of dissent will be checked, and there will be restored to the Church "many involuntary seceders, who, when the doors of our places of worship," he adds, "are more widely opened, will gladly re-enter them." This charge was, no doubt, applauded by the clergy; and we presume that parts of it must have been received with a smile by some of the assembled churchwardens of Kent, amongst whom were not only Dissenters, but also Dissenting ministers. These latter departed from the Visitation, we presume, charged with excellent matter for their next Sunday's sermons.

The late Wiltshire Election.

SIR,

IMPORTANT matters connected with the Dissenting interest, and even the Unitarian cause, have been blended with the recent election of a Member of Parliament for the county of Wilts. If you think the following brief statement worth preserving in your valuable Repository, it is at your service, from

A WILTSHIRE FREEHOLDER.

August 12, 1819.

At the last General Election for 1818, Paul Methuen, Esq., John Benett, Esq.,

and William Pole Tylney Long Wellesley, Esq., started as candidates for the county of Wilts. After a severe contest of eight days, Methuen and Wellesley were declared the sitting members, with a determination on Benett's part to come forward at the next opening for the county.

This his determination met with the warm support of all his friends, amongst whom John Dugdale Astley, Esq., a Major in the Wiltshire Militia, ranked as one of the first.

A few weeks ago, Mr. Methuen tendered his resignation, by accepting the Chiltern Hundreds, and a new writ was issued for another member for the county of Wilts.

Whether an understanding had taken place on the subject between Major Astley and Mr. Methuen, before it was known to other people, must remain in partial darkness; but it was soon buzzed about, that counties could be bought as easily as rotten boroughs; that a long purse and a family name could send what member they pleased to the Commons' House of Parliament. These reports soon obtained greater credit from Mr. Astley having written to another of Mr. Benett's friends the following letters:

"Notton, June 29.

"My dear Locke,

"Methuen retires, and your humble servant, urged by the kindness of his friends, offers himself.

"Yours most truly,

"J. DUGDALE ASTLEY.

"Wadham Locke, Esq."

This letter not being answered, was followed by another thus:

"Notton, Monday, July 5, 1819.

"Dear Locke,

"I shall call on you early on Thursday, to beg you to accompany me through Devizes. I trust you will have no objection. Every thing depends on the respectability of attendants, &c. &c. &c.

"Mum—Mum—Mum.

"Yours very truly,

"J. D. ASTLEY.

"Wadham Locke, Esq."

By the bye, I ought to have mentioned that though both Astley and Benett are members of the sect established by law, yet the one, it is said, is tinged with bigotry, whilst the other is free and liberal in his views. These things could not escape notice; therefore, in their squibs and placards, Benett was charged with Atheism, and Astley with persecution. Proofs were demanded, and facts were sought after; and the following matters were brought to light:

"John Bricker, of the parish of Lacock, in the county of Wilts, on his oath saith, that on Good Friday, April 9, 1819, Mr. Astley threatened to withhold from him

parish relief, in case he should apply for it, if he continued to go to that house, namely, the Dissenting Chapel.

“Sworn July 16, 1819, before me,
“THOMAS CALLEY.

“The mark ✕ of JOHN BRICKER,
a Dissenter.

“Witness, M. J. SEMPER.”

This fact put Astley's agents to their shifts; for it roused a spirit of inquiry amongst the Dissenters, and they began to draw comparisons between the candidates in a way they had not thought upon before. It was now generally believed that, which ever way the Dissenters leaned, they could easily turn the scale; and if they could be kept divided in their opinions respecting the two candidates, things would be balanced; therefore papers issued from the press, stating that Astley was no bigot, but a very humane man, and friendly to “*Toleration*.” And certain Militiamen Dissenters were applied to for their signatures, affirming that the Major never interrupted them in their worship whilst in the regiment, but actually suffered them both to pray and preach!

On the other hand, Benett's claims on Religious Liberty rested not on negative qualities. He had advocated the injured, and in his magisterial character on the bench, had claimed for Dissenters freedom of worship as their *right*. He also met the charge of Atheism with manly boldness. After noticing a letter he had received from a Rev. Mr. Lucas, on the subject of his religious faith, he said to the company present, “I will repeat the words which I used, with the utmost sincerity, in my reply to Mr. Lucas,—I believe in God and his revealed will, and endeavour to make that will the rule of my faith and conduct. I further declare, that, as a Protestant Christian, in a Protestant country, I will ever uphold the rights of conscience and religious liberty to all. I would ask, Gentlemen, who can have read with attention that book of beautiful and sacred history, the Bible, without acknowledging these truths? Who can have observed the conduct of our Saviour himself on earth; who can have read his divine precepts, without admitting the principle of universal toleration?” But, no! this would not do, his enemies perceived even in this speech shocking heresies; and it was soon in circulation, that Benett was friendly to the Unitarians, and that the Unitarians throughout the county had promised him their votes.

On Friday, July 16th, John Benett, Esq. and his quondam friend, John Dugdale Astley, Esq., were put in nomination, and the polling commenced at the hustings erected on the Down, between two and three miles from Salisbury.

The most provoking insults and slanders were now resorted to; but these not an-

swering the purpose, (for a spirit of independence was raised in behalf of Benett that made corruption tremble, he having polled a majority of 103 on the first day,) it was determined that violence should be used in keeping back the voters of Benett, and this plan began to be acted upon.

Astley's committee at Trowbridge entered into an agreement with a ferocious mob, hundreds of whom, armed with bludgeons, for the sum of half-a-crown and three shillings each, marched upwards of thirty miles to hinder Benett's voters from coming up to the poll. Having arrived at the theatre of action, a most serious affray took place: the hustings were beat down; and the High Sheriff was under a necessity of adjourning the electors to a large malting-house in Salisbury, where the polling continued for the space of fifteen days, the utmost period the law allows for tendering votes. In the mean time, the most shocking scenes were displayed at Trowbridge; for the dregs of the committee having given orders to the dregs of the bludgeon-men, particular houses were devoted to destruction; and it is said about forty men had thus sold themselves to work wickedness; whilst infatuated women carried in their aprons stones that had been torn from the pavement for this work of ruin. Providentially for the town, a heavy and continued rain fell during the night, or it is believed the town would have been fired in many places. Upwards of thirty houses were partly demolished, and others were threatened with being razed to their foundations the next night. Though the military were called in from the neighbouring districts, and special constables perambulated the streets, still the work of destruction went on, and a “Benett,” as he was called, durst not stir out of doors after dusk, but at the hazard of his life; and, shocking to relate, some of the principal clothiers, *strict Dissenters*, sanctioned and lent their names to these horrid abuses; and to the disgrace of men professing Christianity, bigotry and intolerance gained a petty triumph, whilst brotherly love and charity were left to mourn and weep. However, Wiltshire at large has gained a greater victory, as, by a majority of one hundred and sixty-six votes, she has brought in the man of her choice: a man who is a real friend to civil and religious liberty; for whatever his enemies may say of him, John Benett, of Pyt House, wishes to see the poor of the land prosperous and happy; but he well knows their prosperity and happiness can arise only from a reduction in taxation, and England's expenditure always kept within her income.

At the Meeting of the Royal Burghs of Scotland, in July, it was resolved that the Burgess oath should no more be required

in any of the Burghs. This is some gain to religious liberty. It will facilitate the reunion of the Burghers and Anti-Burghers, as it takes away the ground of difference between them.

A writer in the Times Newspaper, reporting the proceedings at Carlisle at the late Cumberland Assizes, remarks that divine service was nearly assimilated to the Presbyterian model, and thence indulges an anticipation of the union of the Churches of England and Scotland. He builds his hopes upon an attempt, which however failed, to introduce the organ at Glasgow. Another "delightful symptom of agreement" is the reconciliation of two Scottish sects. Being in a hoping mood, the reporter proceeds to expect the union of all Christian Churches, including the Roman Catholic; and concludes with an elaborate piece of silliness, relating to "the volcanic eruption" of the Reformation, and the now verdant and fertile lava.

THE *Evangelical Magazine* appears to exercise a severe discretion in the advertisements which it admits on its blue covers. In the last Number, the Editors gravely say in their notice to Correspondents, "Mr. B. P. is informed we do not allow our Publisher to insert advertisements for WIVES." This is rather hard upon Mr. B. P., since other advertisers are allowed great license of subject and expression: e. g. in the same Number, p. 11 of the cover, is announced the anniversary of a chapel at Woolwich, "formerly St. Patrick's," the Rev. W. B. Collyer, D. D. to preach, and the following invitation is held out—"An economical dinner will be provided, and we doubt not many of the Redeemer's London friends will realize a peculiar gratification, by beholding in this place the peaceable triumphs of truth over Rome and error." The "religious public" are informed in the same advertisement, that contiguous to the chapel is a dry burial ground, "where they may find a most interesting repository for their dear deceased relations or friends." [This folly is, we see, exposed in *The Examiner* of the 29th inst.]

FOREIGN.

FRANCE.

Agreeably to an estimate presented to the Chamber of Deputies by the Minister of the Interior, the expenses of the Clergy of France for 1817, amount to 20,700,000 francs (£862,500).

GERMANY.

THE German States are violently agitated. Religious as well as political pas-

sions divide and disturb the several communities which constitute this great country. A new persecution has arisen against the Jews at Frankfort, Wurzburg, in Bavaria, &c.; their houses have been attacked and pillaged; some of them have fled; and such as remain are obliged to seek the protection of the military. The riots were put down by the soldiers, and several of the rioters were either killed or wounded. The occasion of this tumult is said to have been the high tone assumed by the Jews in their memorials to the late Congress, which has given mortal offence to their Christian neighbours! A proclamation of the government condemns the proceedings of the Christians, but at the same time exhorts the Jews to moderation in their views.

AT Tubingen has recently been formed a Society for the Re-establishment and Preservation of the Belief of Divine Revelation [Offenbarung—Glauben]. The title indicates the object of this society. Excesses naturally lead to the use of remedies. It is known that for a long time past, especially during the last half century, many of the Protestant clergy, the Germans in particular, have indulged in a hardy style of biblical criticism, which has tended to shake the basis of revealed religion. The number of these innovating critics, it is said, is diminishing; nevertheless, the journals frequently announce works which shew the constant struggle between rationalism and supernaturalism.

The Protestant theologians of Tubingen, who have distinguished themselves by their attachment to revealed religion, are at the head of this newly-formed society, and already are enrolled among its members several distinguished German divines: M. Hess, of Zurich, M. Moller, of Schafhausen, M. Marheinecke, of Berlin, M. Schott, &c.—*Chronique Religieuse*, July, 1819.

PRUSSIA.

A REVISED Liturgy has been introduced in the garrison churches of Potsdam and Berlin. This is understood to intimate the wish of the Prussian Court, that similar emendations should be adopted by the clergy in places of worship less immediately under the control of the sovereign. This Liturgy is very simple: it consists of two prayers, the one of which terminates with the Paternoster, and the other with a concise creed approaching that of the apostles. A Litany or Hallelujah set to music, in which the congregation joins, constitutes the third part of the short ceremony. Analogous changes are expected to follow in all the national places of worship.—(*Monthly Mag.*)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.
Unitarianism in America: Extracts from Letters.

Philadelphia,
May 19, 1819.

DEAR SIR,

The first or opening sermon at *Baltimore* was delivered by Dr. Freeman, of Boston, the American Lindsey, and who was "the exciting cause" of the formation of the society and erection of the building. During the winter the pulpit was ably supplied by ministers from Boston and its vicinity, and, about three months ago, Mr. Jared Sparks, of Harvard University, who had preached at *Baltimore* about six weeks, was elected the minister. He is a young gentleman of learning, talents, and great moral worth; was highly recommended by President Kirkland and other respectable gentlemen, and bids fair to be, under the blessing of heaven, the means of extending the interests of Christian truth as taught in the New Testament. It is a happy circumstance that his election was conducted in the true spirit of conciliation, so that he will have the advantage of ministering to a united and friendly people. His ordination took place at *Baltimore* on the 5th instant, when no less than eight ministers attended and took part in the services, viz. two from New Hampshire, two from Boston, and four from other places. This fact proves the lively interest that was taken in Mr. Sparks's success, and in the success of what we regard as genuine Christianity; for all these gentlemen travelled from 400 to 500 miles or more in order to reach *Baltimore*. The order of the services may be acceptable as a matter of curiosity. [Here follows a similar account to that in our last, p. 458.]

The whole of these exercises are said to have occupied near four hours and a half; but the congregation listened with close and unremitted attention.

The sermon alone was about one hour and a half in length. The preacher was the Rev. W. E. Channing, of Boston, a gentleman of high talents and exemplary character. To save time, a considerable part of it was omitted in the delivery; but the whole is to be published, and I hope to be able to send you a copy along with this letter.

Last Sunday Mr. Channing, and Mr. Palfrey who succeeded Mr. Everett, preached publicly in New York, the medical hall having been procured for that purpose, for they could not be admitted into any orthodox pulpit. Although the weather was unfavourable, the place, which was large and commodious, was crowded both morning and afternoon, and many people were disappointed by not being able to get admittance. At the

evening service, for there were three services, the concourse that assembled was still greater. This is the first time that Unitarian preaching was heard in New York. There are there several families of that faith, and it remains yet to be seen whether they will have sufficient energy, fortitude and zeal, to follow the example of their *Baltimore* brethren. It was a favourable commencement to have two of the very best preachers there in one day: but, if they succeed in forming a society, the church will be supplied until a minister can be chosen. Harvard University has had the honour of sending forth many young men of distinguished talents and acquirements: it is richly, though not extravagantly endowed; and the professors are men of great professional respectability. The style of preaching among the New England *heretical* clergy is vastly superior to what was common among the *generality* of the English Dissenters about twenty-five years ago. This may easily be supposed, because the students at Harvard possess much greater advantages than can be had at the English dissenting institutions. I mention this fact because it may be supposed that this country will be in want of ministers, and that in consequence of the progress of Unitarianism, young men of promising talents from England might find eligible situations. This is a mistake: our folks have strong prepossessions in favour of *Americans*. When ministers emigrate, conjecture is afloat as to their motives; and several unhappy cases have occurred to prove that some had left England because their reputation was gone.

Philadelphia, June 18, 1819.

I now send a copy of Mr. Channing's sermon, mentioned in my letter of the 19th of May. That discourse has already had an extensive sale: two editions have been printed at *Baltimore*, and two at Boston, one of the latter on a *cheap* plan for the purpose of distribution; one hundred copies for £1. 16s. sterling, or eight dollars. It has made a strong impression on the public mind. The author, although not forty years of age, has for four years past been the *oldest* minister among the congregationalists at Boston, and is esteemed by all who know him as a man of exemplary character, as one whose heart is in his work; he is also considered one of our best preachers. You will perceive that he is of the Arian school; but that scheme is rapidly losing ground with us; I mean in the United States.

I am now happy to say, that our friends at *New York* are going on well. At a private meeting called for the purpose of concerting measures, thirty gentlemen gave their names as supporters of the worship

of the one God, even the Father. A room capable of accommodating with ease 400 persons, has been rented for a year at 500 dollars (£112. 10s. sterling) and fitted up as a chapel, where service is now regularly performed twice every Lord's-day; and I understand that the attendance is respectable and the prospect encouraging. Our hymn-book has been adopted, so that the second edition is now almost out of print.

The supporters of the cause at New York are desirous of having those settled ministers of Boston, who are of the highest talents, to supply them for some time; and as the distance is little more than 200 miles, and the greater part of it can be got over in a steam boat, they will have little difficulty in procuring such supplies until they shall take root.

A GENTLEMAN of BOSTON has purchased and presented to the University of Cambridge, the very large and valuable library of the late Professor Ebeling, of Hamburgh. Besides being very full and rich in other departments, it is said to contain the best collection in the world of books and works relating to America.

THE following is the estimate of the mortality in the city of PHILADELPHIA for 1817, the population of which is estimated at 120,000:—Adults, 1293; Children, 924; Total, 2217. Fewest Deaths in November, viz. 142; greatest number in September, 233. Under 1 year, 548; 1 to 5, 272; 5 to 20, 169; 20 to 30, 256; 30 to 40, 325; 40 to 50, 222; 50 to 60, 162; 60 to 70, 106; 70 to 80, 84; 80 to 90, 61; 90 to 100, 11; 100 to 110, 1.—Died of Consumption, 349; Convulsions, 167; various Fevers, of which 95 were Typhus, 216; Inflammations, 121; Dropsy, 64; Ditto in the Breast, 20; Ditto in the Brain, 65; Cholera Morbus, 137; Still-born, 110; Child-bed, 5; natural Small Pox, 52.

THE following are from the Bills of Mortality for BALTIMORE, for 1817; the population estimated at from 60,000 to 65,000: Males, 746; Females, 577; Total, 1323. Of this number, 390 were people of colour. Greatest number of deaths in August, viz. 213; fewest in April, viz. 73. Under 1 year, 430; from the age of 20 to 30, 258; from 80 to 90, 23; from 90 to 100, 4; upwards of 100, 2.—Of Consumption, 239; Cholera Morbus, 214; old age, 57; suicides, 5.

On application from the AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY, Congress has passed a Bill for the remission of the duties upon stereotype plates, and upon Bibles and Testaments in foreign languages, imported by

societies or associations, for the gratuitous distribution of the Holy Scriptures.

Observance of CHRISTMAS DAY in United States.—"The different manner in which the anniversary of the nativity is observed in different parts of the United States," (says Niles in his Register, Jan. 17, 1818,) "is worthy of remark. In Boston, it seems to have been partially observed on the 25th ult., by a recommendation in the public papers to abstain from business, and by some concerts of sacred music in the evening. In New York, some of the stores were shut up, but the theatre was open in the evening, and Mr. Cooper played George Barnwell. In Philadelphia, about one half of the people paid some attention to the day—but in Baltimore, and to the southward of it, the stores were generally shut up, the banks closed, and business suspended as on a Sunday. The Churches also were for the most part opened in the morning, and the afternoon was given to refreshment and mirth, being an almost universal holiday. The only daily papers published in the United States northward of New York are two at Boston, and they only, I believe, were published on the day."

EAST INDIES.

The *Literary Society* of Bombay, established in 1804, has published the First Volume of its Transactions, which commences with a "Discourse at the opening of the Society, by Sir James Mackintosh, President."

A dispute exists between the Archbishop of Goa and the Governor of Bombay, which is reputed to be in his diocese. During the war, Father Donat had acted as the archbishop's representative; but on the return of peace, his grace sent over an ecclesiastic of the name of François Parras to displace him. The parishioners petitioned the government to allow them to retain Donat, who was generally esteemed. The government acceded to their request, and suspended Parras' mission; giving the Archbishop of Goa to understand, that in any change, the parishioners must be allowed to choose their successor. The affair has been laid before the Court of Directors of the East India Company, who very properly dispute the Archbishop's jurisdiction over the Catholics of Bombay.

NOTICE.

THE Subscribers to the Rev. Mr. Well-beloved's Bible are respectfully informed, that the First Part is now ready for delivery at Mr. Eaton's, High Holborn. To prevent trouble and disappointment, gentlemen who send orders from the country, are requested to order payment for the same at some house in London.

NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

The Holy Bible, with Notes Explanatory and Critical, and Practical Reflections. Designed principally for the Use of Families. By the Rev. C. Wellbeloved. 4to. Part I. 10s. 6d. and fine paper 15s.

The Duties of Christian Ministers: considered in a Sermon, delivered at the Old Meeting-House, Birmingham. By the Rev. S. W. Browne, A. B. 8vo.

The Causes, Evils and Remedy of False Shame in the Affairs of Religion. A Sermon, delivered Wednesday, June 30, 1819, at Lewes, before the Southern Unitarian Society for the Distribution of Books and Promotion of Virtue. By John Evans, A. M. 12mo. 1s.

A Treatise on the Existence of a Supreme Being and Proofs of the Christian Religion. With an Appendix concerning the Earlier Opponents and Defenders of Christianity. By Thomas Moir, Member of the College of Justice, Edinburgh. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

Immanuel's Crown; or the Divinity of Christ demonstrated. By the Rev. Richard Newman, Feversham, Kent. 12mo. 2s. 6d.

Immanuel; being a Collection of Scriptures, relating to the Person and Work of the Lord Jesus Christ, with Cursory Remarks, in Twenty-five Letters to a Friend, designed to shew that the Bible is against Socinians. By the Rev. Joseph Herrick. 12mo.

The Confession of our Christian Faith, commonly called, The Creed of St. Socrinus.

Select Scriptural Proofs of the Trinity. By Richard Graves, D. D. M. R. I. A. 8vo. 7s.

Scripture Proofs on the Pre-existence and Deity of Christ, as the God, revealing himself in the particular Dispensation, the

King of the Theocracy, &c. with Observations on the increasing excess of Impiety and Infidelity as the Prophetic and Natural Indications of the Millennium drawing near. 8vo. 5s.

Lyra Davidis; or, a New Translation and Exposition of the Psalms, grounded on the principles of Bishop Horsley, that these Sacred Oracles have an immediate reference to Christ. By the Rev. John Fry, B. A., Rector of Desford, Leicestershire. 8vo. 18s.

Italy: its Agriculture, &c., from the French of Mons. Chaleauvieux, being Letters written by him in Italy, in the years 1812 and 1813. Translated by Edward Rigby, Esq., M. D., F. F. and H. S. 8vo.

Maurice and Berghetta; or, The Priest of Rahery. A Tale. 12mo. 7s.

Dialogues on Botany, for the Use of Young Persons; explaining the Structure of Plants, and the Progress of Vegetation. 12mo.

Observations on the Idiom of the Hebrew Language, respecting the Communication of power from Concerning Verbs, and the Induction of it into Verbs Subordinate connected with them. 2s. 6d.

Remarks on Scepticism, especially as it is connected with the Subjects of Organization and Life, being an Answer to some recent Works, both of English and French Physiologists. By Thomas Rennell, A. M., Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge and Vicar of Kensington.

An Index to Subjects not noticed or imperfectly referred to, in the Index to the Principal Matters, contained in Mant's Family Bible. By H. B. Wilson, D. D. F. S. A. 4to. 3s. Superfine Royal Paper, 6s.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from Messrs. Joseph Jevans; W. Hincks; Dr. Carpenter; and Captain Graham; also from J. O. H.; A Zealous Unitarian; B. H.; J. T. (Philadelphia); J. B. (Lyons); T. C. H. (Edinburgh); F. B.; M. N.; and R. D.

A. B. is informed that his MS. is returned, with a Letter, according to his directions.

ERRATUM.

Page 449, col. 2, line 39, for "Stanger, Esq." read *Mr. W. Stanger.*