

THE
Monthly Repository.

No. CCXLII.]

FEBRUARY, 1826.

[Vol. XXI.]

*Observations on a Passage in the History of Naaman's Conversion.**

“ — c'est une sorte de cas de conscience qu'il lui propose.” Lettres de quelques Juifs, &c.

“ — his [Naaman's] whole behaviour, both before and after the cure of his leprosy, shews him to have been very free from the *esprit fort*, which scorns all religious offices, as marks of a weak understanding.” FINDLAY.

SOME part of Naaman's language to Elisha, illustrates the case of *conformity to worship that even the offerer of it deems unscriptural.*

This Syrian general, in the ardour of his gratitude, and under the natural influence of his juster sentiments of religion, had been urging on the man of God the acceptance of a present. Elisha, with the disinterestedness belonging to his character, declined to receive any: yet Naaman was not the less earnest to give undoubted proof of his attachment to Jehovah, and asked for two mules' burden of the soil of the land of Israel, with which he designed to erect an altar; erroneously imagining that none other would be pleasing in the sight of the Being to whom it was to be consecrated, and who, henceforth, was to be the sole object of his religious homage.

Here, nevertheless, a difficulty, before unthought of, occurred to Naaman. He was a great man with his master, the king of Syria, whom he had been in the habit of accompanying to an idol-temple. It would still be expected from him to attend the monarch thither: on that spot, and in the act of his own worship, this prince would still lean on the hand of Naaman, who, together with him, would bow himself down in the house of Rimmon; † because, say some of the

commentators,* the king could not well bow, if Naaman stood upright, and did not incline his body with his sovereign's. The explanation is doubtful: nor can I easily determine whether Naaman's posture was significant of religious homage, or simply of civil obedience and duty.† Let the case be put as favourably as possible for the new-born convert. One thing is certain: Naaman himself was apprehensive that the action of which he speaks might be deemed at variance with his recent avowal of belief in Jehovah. Therefore he frankly states the matter to the prophet, and solicits the permission and forgiveness which he considers himself as needing.

Naaman's compliance, however interpreted, will not justify any Christians in stated or occasional conformity to worship known by them to be unscriptural.

Christians possess religious advantages to which Naaman was a stranger: they have a written law before them, and see the path of truth and duty in all its length and breadth. The examples of Jesus, his evangelists and his apostles, are fully in their sight: the precepts, to which they avowedly render obedience, are sanctioned by promises and threatenings the most fixed and solemn. Naaman, at the point of time that we are contemplating, was unacquainted with even the law of Moses. It was but at this instant that he knew any thing concerning religious virtue, except from the light of nature and of reason. In such circumstances, how can his compliance, whether real or seeming, with an idolatrous ceremony, bear upon the case of Christians, or justify, on their part, any similar compliances?

* 2 Kings v. 18.

† Who this Syrian divinity was, appears uncertain: according to some (Findlay, *Vindication*, &c., p. 122, and Houbigant, in loc.) the same with Jupiter Cassius; according to others, (see Le Clerc, in loc.) Saturn.

* Bishop Patrick, in loc.

† 2 Kings vii. 2, 17, would seem to determine for its being an act of civil obedience and duty. But the phrase, or, at least, the custom to which the phrase refers, is obscure.

Nor can stress be properly laid on the language of Elisha, in reply. The prophet's inspiration was not universal and continued: it did not reside in him "without measure."* We do not perceive that he had authority, even if he possessed ability, to silence the scruples of a doubting conscience. Here, as in the case of Hazael,† he does not go beyond his commission: he waives an answer to Naaman's inquiry, and simply wishes him prosperity,‡ on his departure. Situated as Elisha was, his conduct was honourably prudent.

Expositors have said much, by way of reconciling Naaman's language and intended behaviour with our correcter views of religious virtue. Some inform us that only *native* Jews were forbidden to participate in the idolatry of their neighbours.§ But this is said at least without, if not against, evidence, and was the comment of a later age. Other annotators|| allege that Naaman speaks of his *past* habits; not of any which he designed still to gratify. Here again the statement is destitute of proof. But, however this be, Naaman himself was quite aware of the equivocal and ambiguous nature of the action for which he asked indulgence. In his own judgment, it was either idolatry or the semblance of idolatry. For so young a convert, his ingenuous acknowledgment does him the greatest honour: and yet, while we cannot presume loudly to censure him, in respect of his design, while we behold with pleasure his wish to be honest, while we leave his case to the merciful and righteous decision of the God whom he now owned, we cannot, in reason, look upon that case as a precedent, warranting like compliances from Christians.

As the thing regards Christians, it has been solemnly determined by an inspired teacher of our religion.¶ The members of the Church at Co-

rinth lived in the midst of Heathens. Their unconverted neighbours regularly offered sacrifices to idols, and afterwards feasted on what remained of the victims, nor unfrequently invited their friends from among the Christians of the city to be guests at these banquets. The question arose, and none could be more natural, whether the presence of Christians, on such occasions, was an act of idolatry or no. They asked Paul's opinion; and he gave it against the practice, but made, at the same time, a distinction which so wise and good a man could not fail to make. It would in many instances happen that disciples of Jesus Christ partook in such meals, with a perfect ignorance of the flesh of the victims offered to idols being set before them: in such instances, according to Paul, there is and can be no guilt. The action became criminal, only when the Christian guest had a knowledge of the feast being furnished by the remains of a Heathen sacrifice.*

Now whether we regard the Apostle's office or his argument, he has determined for us the case of stated and of occasional conformity to what in our understandings and our hearts we disapprove. He has with clearness pointed out the course which common honesty, and, still more, religious integrity, demands that we pursue. No pleas for compliance could be more plausible than what the Corinthians urged: yet, though plausible, they were unsound; and they were instantly overruled by Paul.

The professor of Christianity, therefore, who bows himself down in any house, which to him is the house of Rimmon, must be without excuse. In vain does he appeal to Naaman's example. That example, with the nature and the circumstances of which we are still but inadequately acquainted, cannot be a precedent to the believer in the gospel. At most, it could only be his guide and justification, were he a courtier, a personal attendant on his sovereign in the hours and the place of that sovereign's worship;† though I cannot

* Diodati Ann. in loc.

† 2 Kings viii. 13.

‡ Schulz. Schol. in V. Test. in loc. This language was, I think, the Eastern *Salam*.

§ Selden, De Jur. Nat. &c. L. ii. C. 11.

|| Bochart, Geog. Sacr. (ed. 4,) pp. 892, &c.

¶ 1 Cor. viii. ix. x.

* 1 Cor. x. 28, and see Ezek. xxxix., with Newcome's valuable notes, in loc.

† See the curious note of Grotius on Luke iv. 27.

admit that it goes even thus far. There is no evidence that the prophet had authority to pass judgment on this part of the behaviour of his convert; while the disciples of Jesus, as we have seen, are expressly commanded to flee from all approaches to idolatry. If Naaman erred, (and he seems to have had a worse opinion of his meditated conduct than the commentators on his history deliver,) he erred with comparatively few and slender means of information; while the conformity of the Christian to rites which he disapproves, is exercised amidst the full light of religious knowledge.

Is it pleaded that though Naaman's case might be an act of idolatry, and though that of some of the Corinthians was undoubtedly such, yet those compliances, on the part of Christians, to which I refer, merit no such name? "It is not," you say, "Heathen worship in which we engage: we are no partakers in Gentile idolatry; in the real or supposed adoration of Rimmon, or in a feast on an idol sacrifice." Be it so; still your departure from duty, your violation of integrity, is, in the judgment of sound reason, and of Scripture, as glaring as though your case were literally the same with either of the two that I have been describing. Is there no such thing as idolatry among professing Christians?

The essence of your guilt lies, after all, not so much in the quality of the worship to which you conform, as in your countenancing, by your presence, what in your understandings and hearts you disbelieve; in your signifying, by your lips, your gestures, your conduct, an assent which you can with no sincerity express. Besides, that may be, and is, *idolatry* to *you*, which your neighbour may not esteem such in respect of himself: you know it to be *unscriptural* worship: and this is or should be sufficient. Such being your conviction, there can be no great necessity for inquiring, whether it be not therefore idolatrous.

I do not ask, what your motive is for thus bowing down in the house of Rimmon; because I am persuaded that no motive can justify the deed. You are not to do evil, that good may come: much less are you to

compromise your religious consistency and faith for any worldly advantages, imaginary or actual.

Further; in all these cases, it is not so much the deed itself, on which stress should be laid, as the thing signified, and intended and understood to be signified, by it. Abstractedly, it may be innocent enough for Naaman to bow down in Rimmon's temple, or for a Christian at Corinth to partake in the sacrificial banquets of his Heathen neighbour, or for an early believer to cast a few grains of incense on an altar, as he passes, or for the Protestant to throw himself on the ground when he beholds a certain procession, or for the Protestant Dissenter to receive the communion of the Lord's Supper in a particular building, and in the use of a particular posture. But do you suppose that this is all? Naaman, though a courtier, and only a recent proselyte to Judaism, had, nevertheless, suspicions and fears that his appearance, his gesture, in Rimmon's temple might cause him to be regarded as a partaker in the idolatrous worship rendered by his sovereign: and truly there was cause of such apprehensions and suspicions. So, if men's actions and signs are a language, he must be considered as sanctioning idol worship, who consciously eats of meat offered in sacrifice to idols. The early believer justly and nobly refused to purchase his life at the expense of insincerity and apostacy; well aware as he was that to scatter a few grains of incense on a Heathen altar, was to acknowledge himself a Heathen; and from the same reasoning it follows, that if, in our own times, any individuals occasionally engage in the characteristic offices of an ecclesiastical communion, from which they otherwise avow dissent, and engage in them, too, by way of passport to civil posts and honours, this act is too significant to be mistaken: it is an act of conformity. This is to bow down in the house of Rimmon, and to become Rimmon's worshipers. Where is the value of *religion*, if it have not taught us to be honest and consistent in respect of God as well as man?

N.

Thoughts on the Punishment of Death.

THE foundation of all law must finally rest on the consentaneous moral sense of mankind. The immediate demand for public safety, and the general confidence in the knowledge and good intentions of the higher and more enlightened portion of society, occasion the necessity of entrusting the right to form the laws to a limited number of individuals. The prosperity, the virtue and the happiness of the community are thus committed from age to age to persons of distinguished abilities and authority; the laws undergo, at the same time, many modifications from the influence of custom, the prevailing opinions of the people at large, and various minor and accidental causes. It is a great benefit to have established laws; and this benefit is thus secured; but there has been one important evil hitherto attendant on it, which is, that laws, when once they are established, are not sufficiently open to improvement, and do not keep pace with the spirit of the times. It is only in the infancy of nations that we find this is the case. Then, the superstition or the ignorance, the virtues or the vices of the people themselves, have generally been reflected in their legislative enactments. Thus the burning of witches, the ordeal of hot iron, and other equally absurd regulations, have marked the period of fear and fanaticism, and the cutting off of hands, and torturing of criminals before execution, have stained the annals of a more bloody and inexorable age. But the savage and revengeful laws which have taken their rise in a period of darkness, are too seldom annulled by the increasing knowledge and improvement of a country; for long usage, and the familiarity which the human mind naturally imbibes with the repetition of even disgusting and horrible occurrences, may, and often does, occasion their continuance. To this may be added, the great difficulty of effecting any alteration in laws once sanctioned and apparently established, and also the great responsibility, in some degree, always involved in a change of measures. From these causes it follows, that a Christian and enlightened people sometimes retain in their code the

relics of a more barbarous age; and, as an instance of this, the laws, if examined into, in almost all civilized nations, will be found to be behind the spirit of the times; they will not be found equal to the general sense of the nation at large, far less to the views of the superior and benevolent portion of the community. The first of these classes, namely, the middle, including almost all who are not sunk in low or brutal ignorance, bring the spirit of the laws to the ordeal of their own hearts and feelings; and nature and conscience are their principal guides in the judgments which they form. Cruelty is naturally repulsive to the human breast, and too severe a retribution of crime always wears this aspect; the harshness of the condemnation often awarded to small offences, is therefore the reason why persons of this description are averse to have recourse to it, and would rather suffer in some measure themselves, and even remain contented with some loss of property, than reduce their fellow-creatures to severe punishment or probable ruin. They feel within themselves that so far as the laws exceed the bounds of reason and moderation, so far, to *them*, they are useless—and their aversion to have recourse to them occasions the entire escape of the offender, and consequently the increase of crime. Even in cases of great crimes the same objection occurs; for, however strong the desire of retribution or revenge may be, there is a natural and instinctive abhorrence to taking away the life of a human being, even under the sanction of the law, which few persons can overcome. On this account the general opinion of the people is *opposed* to the execution of the laws respecting criminals, and the universal feeling that prevails is the desire of the entire escape of the offender. In mild and humane laws no such confusion can ensue, for then there is nothing to impede either the course of justice, or to prevent the injured person immediately seeking redress or retribution; and, therefore, if only on the score of expediency, a moderate system is to be preferred.

The second class of the community, over whom the same objections hold even a superior force, are the enlight-

ened and religious part, who judge of human laws by a higher and more exalted standard than mere feeling or transitory opinion, and bring the decisions of fallible men to the tribunal of Reason and of Scripture. The views of this class are founded on a consideration of the attributes of the Deity himself, as the great source of all moral knowledge, and on the spirit and evidence of Revelation, as connected with the subject of penal jurisprudence. To them (as they believe to be the case with their merciful Creator) benevolence is the only end of punishment, nor would they inflict one moment of pain or evil which they did not believe to be for the production of greater good than could otherwise be obtained. In endeavouring to serve the public, they do not cast out the *sinner* from their compassion and consideration, but taking all the unfortunate circumstances of the case into view, they remember that he is a man and a fellow-creature, and they endeavour to do what is wisest and best for the benefit and security of *all*. They bear ever in mind that as *God* has set no bounds to his mercy, but has opened a provision for every sinner that lives to return to him, even from the extremes of vice and wretchedness, so it becomes them to temper punishment with humanity, and to beware lest, by excessive severity or cruel sentences, the execution of the laws does not become as bloody and as unjustifiable at the bar of heaven as perhaps the crime itself; for they tremble to remember that a thirst of vengeance and of human blood may be as offensive in the impartial eye of the Deity as a desire of plunder, or even murder itself. To minds like these, no circumstances, and no seeming necessity, can palliate the inconsistency of the infliction of the punishment of death with the revealed character of God, the precepts of Christ, and the whole tenor of Christianity. It appears to them to have originated in the former ignorance and vindictive passions of men, and to be continued through that fatal indifference to our best interests, which, combined with other formidable obstacles to a change in legislative measures, form a sort of moral bulwark against all future and progressive improvement. They believe that there will be a time when

the accounts of executions, now common, shall be read with abhorrence, and they shall be regarded in the light of legal murders; when no man shall be called to the loathsome and dreadful office of destroying a fellow-being, and breaking through all the holiest and most sacred feelings of his own nature. They anticipate (surely not too confidently) a period when the lives of human beings shall no longer be shortened, or their health ruined, by the slow decay of damp, unwholesome abodes, and the effects of secret privations, not the less cruel because they are brought before no human tribunal. They believe that there will be a time when solitary confinement shall not be injudiciously or inhumanly prolonged till it produce disease or insanity, and that there may arise philanthropists in the far distant future who will shudder to learn that prisoners, having been first deprived of the power of self-support, have perished for want of food, and of the coarsest and most simple necessities of life. There is even now abroad a noble spirit of enlarged and compassionate reform. Something has been effected, and there is reason to hope that more will be done; but it is greatly to be lamented that the good hitherto contemplated is so partial and limited, and that on very solemn and important subjects, most nearly affecting the welfare of human society, the world still sits in darkness, and it may emphatically and truly be said under the shadow of death. We see and feel daily that our laws, our executions, and many of our public proceedings, are entirely opposed to the whole spirit and tenor of Christianity; that they are in fact heathenish and barbarous in their origin, cruel in their nature, and not unfrequently defeat the very intention for which they were first framed; that their effect on public character and public virtue is extremely injurious, and that the spectacles of bloodshed and wretchedness continually exhibited before the eyes of the people, are searing their consciences and hardening their feelings. We may, indeed, be told that it is better all punishment should be open and public before the eyes and judgments of the nation; but have we yet to learn that revengeful and cruel deeds do not really change their

nature by being sanctioned by legal power, and boldly done in the face of day? And that what would be called *murder* by its right name if done in private, deserves not a much softer appellation, because it has the mid-day sun upon it, and is a spectacle of curiosity and horror to surrounding crowds? On this part of my subject I cannot refrain from extracting some excellent remarks from a little work,* equally distinguished for its ability and its striking and benevolent views.

"The right to put an offender to death must be proved, if it can be proved at all, either *from an express permission of the Christian Scriptures*, or, supposing Christianity to have given no decision either directly or indirectly, from a necessity which knows no alternative. Now, every one knows that this express permission to inflict death, is not to be found; and upon the question of its necessity, we ask for that evidence which alone can determine it, the evidence of experience; and we shall probably not be contradicted when we say, that that degree of evidence which experience has afforded, is in our favour rather than against us. But some persons seem to maintain an opinion that in the case of murder, at least, there is a sort of immutable necessity for taking the offender's life: '*Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.*' If any one urges this rule against us, we reply, that it is not a rule of Christianity; and if the necessity of demanding blood for blood is an everlasting principle of retributive justice, how happens it that in the first case in which murder was committed, the murderer was not put to death? The philosopher, however, would prove what the Christian cannot, and Mably accordingly says, 'In the state of nature I have a right to take the life of him who lifts his arm against mine. *This right upon entering into society I surrender to the magistrate.*' If we conceded the truth of the first position, (which we do not,) the conclusion from it is an idle sophism; for it is obviously preposterous to say, that because I have

a right to take the life of a man who will kill me if I do not kill him, the state, *which is in no such danger*, has a right to do the same. The danger which constitutes the alleged right in the individual, does not exist in the case of the state. The foundation of the right is gone, and where can be the right itself? Having, however, been thus told that the state has a right to kill, we are next informed, by Filangieri, that the criminal has *no right to live*; he says, 'If I have a right to kill another man, *he has lost his right to life.*' Rousseau goes a little farther; he tells us that in consequence of the '*social contract*' which we make with the sovereign on entering into society, '*life is a conditional grant of the state;*' so that we hold our lives, it seems, only as tenants at will, and must give them up whenever their owner, the state, requires them. * * He says, 'The preservation of both sides (the criminal and the state) is incompatible; one of the two must perish.' How it happens that a nation '*must perish*' if a convict is not hanged, the reader, I suppose, will not know. I have referred to these speculations for the purpose of shewing that the right of putting offenders to death is not easily made out: philosophers would scarcely have had recourse to these metaphysical abstractions if they knew an easier method of establishing the right; even philosophy, however, concedes as much. '*Absolute necessity alone,*' says Pastoret, 'can justify the punishment of death;' and Rousseau himself acknowledges that 'We have no right to put to death, *even for the sake of example*, any but those who cannot be permitted to live without danger.'"

The above observations have great force, and the more it is considered, the more evident it will appear that the danger is an imaginary one: the guilt attaching to such a punishment cannot be palliated, for it cannot be proved to be necessary. As long as there are prisons to confine, and other punishments to correct, this final resource might certainly be avoided. And what is the testimony of experience on this subject? Does it not tell us that where crimes are *not* punished with death, so far from being *more* frequent they are actually

* An Inquiry into the Accordancy of War with the Principles of Christianity, and an Examination of the Philosophical Reasoning by which it is defended, &c.

much less so? In fact, the mildness of the law humanizes and softens the dispositions of the people, and, like a family governed by a judicious and benevolent parent, they are much less likely to be disobedient or troublesome, than if under a severe and, consequently, disgusting controul. Besides, is it a small thing to cut short the existence of a misguided being in the midst of unrepented sin? Is it a right or a justifiable thing to put him to death in cool blood, because, under the excitement of passion or despair, perhaps under provocation, he has put an end to the existence of another? The deeper his soul is involved in guilt, is it not so much the more sinful to send him to his awful account without giving him time for contrition or amendment? As to the application of the punishment of death to *smaller* offences, it really does appear to be a great injustice, and equally opposed to reason and revelation; for there is a law of God written on the heart, there are feelings intuitive in the nature and conscience of man, which cannot lightly or with impunity be violated, and there is also another law in the merciful revelation of his own character and will, in the declaration of his intentions towards his creatures, and in the call he makes upon *them* to co-operate with and follow him in their own treatment of their fellow-creatures, which he who dares to turn away from, must on his own soul abide the issue.

When we consider the numbers who have gone to untimely graves for offences, which, if we knew all the previous circumstances, we should perhaps pity as much as we condemn; offences which, placed in their worst light, can, to no reflecting mind, appear to deserve the punishment of death; when we remember, too, the many who in the course of time have innocently suffered, and gone to a disgraceful end in unmerited anguish and shame—this punishment does seem not only the greatest infatuation, but the greatest cruelty that can possibly be perpetrated. In another point of view it may also be called cruel and unjust; for it involves, not only the possibility of the innocence of the condemned person, but the certain and severe suffering (even where the

sufferer is guilty) of a number of innocent and, in many cases, worthy persons. Some people may call this a weak consideration, but none who have witnessed the deep, heart-rending distress of such scenes, none who have been made to feel the intense interest and sympathy they excite, who have beheld the agony of suspense terminated in the deeper wretchedness of disappointment and despair, will deny that, in common humanity, such suffering ought if possible to be alleviated, and, if it *be* compatible with the safety and well-being of society, to be spared altogether. Let the offenders against the law be punished, let them be imprisoned, sentenced to hard labour, be cut off from the common pleasures and advantages of life, which they have perhaps justly forfeited; deprive them, if you will, of liberty, of home, of a social existence; let their fare be coarse, and their labour hard (so that it exceed not the bounds of humanity, or partake of the nature of torture, like the treadmill); but why involve the good, the virtuous, the afflicted, in their punishment? Surely the knowledge of the wickedness of a beloved and cherished object is sufficient grief, without filling the cup of misery till it overflows, without adding another pang to those which are already scarcely supportable. Surely the time is hastening on when a humane and enlightened penal jurisprudence will put an end to all such additional calamities; when our fellow-creatures shall no longer be “in jeopardy of life,” or the innocent endure an infliction worse than death; but it must be by a greater attention than has hitherto been paid to the true principles of a Christian legislation, and by the combined efforts of the intelligent and the good, by the extension of a more persevering and comprehensive benevolence, and by the irresistible power of public opinion. When these principles are recognized as the general sentiment, petitions to Parliament, from the most respectable inhabitants of different towns, against the punishment of death, would express the real feelings and wishes of the nation, and there can be no doubt but that a cordial co-operation in a measure of this nature, would eventually be successful, would abo-

ish for ever the reign of barbarism and bloodshed, and that it would in time fully effect that desirable reformation which every heart that glows with the feelings common to human nature must anxiously and fervently pray for.

SIR, Tadmorden.
REGARDING the Christian revelation as the only source from which the human mind can gather satisfactory information respecting God and duty and futurity; feeling, too, the vital importance of Christian faith to support the mind under the evils of life, and in the prospect of death, I have seen with sorrow the many instances in which the immense gulf which subsists between the Christian and the Unbeliever is *apparently* annihilated, by the manner in which both characters are equally acknowledged in Unitarian congregations.

I have no hesitation in admitting to the world, what is sufficiently notorious, that our places of worship are frequented by unbelievers, who not only join in our devotions, and listen with complacency to the discourses of our ministers, but take an active part in the management of the internal concerns of our churches, and are, in some cases, the principal pecuniary supporters of our cause.

I have not always been a *Unitarian* Christian, and I am prepared to make great allowance for the views of those who think that the circumstances I have mentioned furnish a strong presumption against Unitarianism being the truth of the gospel. If there be two things in nature utterly incompatible with each other, they are the genuine spirit of Christianity and the spirit of Infidelity. Between the man who receives the word of revelation and him who rejects it, there can exist no religious sympathy. Our blessed Master and his apostles drew the line of separation between the two in the strongest manner. May there not then arise a just suspicion against that *professedly* Christian society in which these opposites are united? Is it no reproach, to say the least, to the faithful members of such a society, that they can, without any complaining feeling, join in public worship with those who think them believers in a

lie, and pity their honoured Lord as an enthusiast, if they do not brand him as an impostor? Must there not be something strangely perverted in that mind which perceives no discordance in the united homage of Hume and Paul, Paine and Jesus?

I have felt, and do still most strongly feel, the injury done to our views of the gospel by the existence of unbelievers amongst us. It is a common charge against Unitarianism, that it is little better than a system of cowardly infidelity. The justice of such charges we resolutely deny; but what can we say when our attention is directed to actual instances in which acknowledged unbelievers are active, efficient and highly respected members of Unitarian churches? I shall be told, that we cannot shut our gates against them, that the portals of our temples, like those of all others in the land, are open for the admission of all who choose to enter, and we cannot prevent any person, whatever may be his principles, from uniting in our worship. What then? Because we cannot exclude the unbeliever from our public services, can we do nothing? On the contrary, we can do much; we can do every thing that is necessary to vindicate the character of our body. We cannot help the appearance of the Deist in our chapels, but we can help claiming fellowship with him as a brother Unitarian, taking him into the very bosom of our churches, and requesting the privilege of his religious instructions. This we *can* do, and whilst we do it *not*, we ought not to be surprised that our orthodox opponents question the sincerity of our faith, and condemn us as imbued with the spirit of infidelity.

If we have any concern for the reputation of our Christianity, it greatly behoves us to look to ourselves in this matter, and to remove this reproach from us. To expostulation with the unbeliever there can be no possible objection: and might we not with propriety say to him, "When you first came into our assembly, you knew us to be worshipers of the God and Father of the risen Christ. We adore no God but by Christ. We did not ask you whether you were coming to worship as our Saviour's disciple, and we have only since discovered

that you do not own that Saviour. We think that you made a great mistake when you thought it your duty to join in our devotions, and that you ought to have hesitated before you destroyed our existence as a Christian body. If, however, you have such a pressing sense of obligation to the God of truth, that your conscience cannot rest, unless from time to time you openly support what in your conscience you believe to be a lie, and unite in religious services which abound in declarations addressed to the Supreme himself, which you have long thought to be false, at least when you have obeyed this imperious monitor, 'Depart in peace.' Surely you are under no such pressing obligation to stay and manage the internal affairs of our community; surely it is not your 'bounden duty' to trouble yourself with discussions on plans for the promotion of error; nor need you give your advice and your vote in the election of its teachers. If you *cannot* believe, and *must* worship, and find our mode the most convenient, preserve a little decorum in your conduct amongst us. Whether you come to humble yourself before God, it is not for us to decide; but we should have better evidence on which to judge, if we saw exhibited a little more modesty in the sight of men. Your very appearance amongst us is a sufficient injustice, without your seeking further to identify yourself with our interests."

Experience shews that such appeals are unproductive of the desired effect. No sense of his own inconsistency deters the Deist from lifting up his voice in ascriptions of praise to the God of Jesus, the only true God; no sense of propriety induces him to leave us to the management of our own concerns; nor does any regard to justice forbid him to hold out to the world his profession and ours as one. Expostulation fails: some other remedy must be sought. Our duty to truth and to ourselves demands it of us. It is incumbent on us to say to the Deist in a manner that shall be attended to, "We are a society of Christians. We have formed ourselves into a society for a certain definite purpose, to enjoy the privileges and vindicate the truth of the gospel. If

you think that gospel possesses no superior privileges, and is not founded upon *revealed* truth, you must not, you cannot, be one of us. By frequenting our worship, you have identified, in the eyes of mankind, a total rejection of revealed religion with that system of faith which distinguishes us from our brethren, and we are desirous of removing a stigma which has thus been cast upon us through you. You have been unwelcome in our councils, your presence disturbs our feelings, and your interference is injurious to our interests; we have, therefore, to request, that as you are not of us, you will go out from us. To every one who believeth in our Lord Jesus Christ, we will give the right hand of fellowship. As a man, we refuse it not to you. We respect you as a member of society; rest assured that our respect will not be diminished by your becoming consistent."

If I am asked, whether the course thus recommended would not render necessary a confession preparatory to a person's admission into our body; it is replied, Certainly, the confession of Christ. Without such a confession no person can be a member of a *Christian* church. Let it be decided, then, whether our societies are designed to be Christian expressly and exclusively, and there will be little difficulty as to the propriety of asking every one who wishes to become a member of one of those societies, whether *he* is a Christian. If unbelievers may, with impunity, mingle as intimately as they please with our body, there can be no just reason assigned why we should not have our societies consisting of a mixed assemblage of Christian believers, and antichristian Deists, Jews and Mahometans—a curious sort of Christian church.

My chief design in this communication is to ascertain the general sentiments of Unitarians upon the subject, and if they should be found to coincide with those here advanced, to induce a discussion which may issue in the adoption of an adequate remedy for what I consider a very great evil.

NOAH JONES.

Critical Synopsis of the Monthly Repository for January, 1825.

UNITARIAN FUND REGISTER. It is melancholy to observe the desponding tone in some parts of William Roberts's communication.

Professor Sylvester's Letter. The last sentence of this translation is obscure. Does it mean that Transylvanians are educated at Vienna, "in defect of any public funds"? But suppose the public funds are supplied, where are they educated then? They are not allowed, it seems, to go out of the limits of the Austrian empire.

People are thrown into strange company, and are induced to utter strange things, by the combinations which take place in this sublunary world. In order to keep his Protestant subjects well balanced against each other, the Emperor of Austria protects the Unitarians, and therefore we hear an *Unitarian* Professor lauding to the skies *Francis First*, "of glorious reign, our most gracious Prince—illustrious by his achievements both in Church and State," &c.

Plan of a General Unitarian Association. There appears to me one feature in this project, which mars its simplicity, uniformity and symmetry, and might, I should fear, be liable to introduce some confusion into practice. I allude to the circumstance of intermingling individual subscribers on the same platform of rights and privileges with corporate Societies, Churches and Fellowship Funds. Could not the elements of the Association consist of materials less heterogeneous? Let all the metropolitan subscribers, for instance, first unite themselves into one or more subordinate, auxiliary societies, who should elect their representatives, and send up their contributions to the General Association. Since the Unitarian public of England is already organized by means of various minor bodies, which it is proposed shall be benefited by the General one, it seems right that the latter should consist only of representatives delegated from corporate bodies. The number of these representatives might

reach to any extent, the apportionment being always made, as much in reference to the sums contributed by each subordinate association, as to the number of individuals it contains.

Might there not be an article providing for the admission into your General Meeting of delegates from Foreign parts? The year, it is to be hoped, is not distant, when you shall receive, at one time, representatives from India, America, Transylvania, Germany, Switzerland and elsewhere.

Under the auspices of this Society, I look forward to authentic lists, from time to time, of Unitarian congregations, their numbers, their pastors, their dependence or independence with regard to property, &c. Perhaps, however, this is a measure to be discussed and adopted hereafter, rather than provided for in the constituent articles.

What a strong tendency exists in the human mind, when enlightened, towards Republicanism! If this grand Association shall go into operation, what will its supporters be, but a *Respublica in Imperio*? It will have numbers and wealth, and therefore power. It will be a general Congress, or something like a Congress and Convocation united. The day may not be distant, when its influence shall sway the decision of some critical vote in Parliament. Its professed object is even now partly political. Who knows how rapidly, during the next twenty years, the ranks of Unitarianism may be increased, by one of those sudden and resistless movements which so frequently take place in the sentiments of the enfranchised human mind? Who knows what political connexions Unitarianism may form, and what powers it may set into action, by the innocent machine which it is now organizing? At all events, coming in, as it will, on the heels of the retreating Catholic Association, some future historian may wonder at the boldness of its supporters, and at the leniency with which an inconsistent Parliament shall permit its existence.

I have one or two remarks to suggest on particular articles.

Art. 12. Suppose any of the societies in London should wish to merge itself into the Association and

to give up its funds to the General Fund—ought not the acceptance of such a proposal to be specifically provided for?

Art. 13. Entitles persons to become members, with different amounts of subscription. Will this never cause clashing?

Art. 16. Why render ineligible those members of the Committee, who have attended most punctually to its concerns, and have thereby demonstrated that their leisure and inclination best qualify them for the duties?

Art. 30. Many of the deputies could well afford to bear their own expenses, and many could undoubtedly make the business of the Association and their own in London to coincide.

Art. 15. I am of opinion that G**** the F****, if asked to subscribe to this building, would give one hundred guineas. How would such an act of laudable munificence confirm the loyalty of a fine, noble and obstinate body of men!

I will only add, that the representative system, which forms a leading and excellent feature of the plan, would seem to preclude the necessity of an immediate dissolution of the Unitarian Fund, Unitarian Association and other such bodies. Why not permit these societies to continue still in existence—to have their regular writings—to consider themselves as auxiliaries to the main society, and to send their representatives and contributions to the General Meeting? Under such circumstances, the peculiar business of each society might with great facility revert into its own hands, if the proposed Association should be found too unwieldy and multifarious to carry all its departments into complete effect. I should suppose, too, that this arrangement would abolish the troublesome and expensive business of legal transfers, which the proposed plan of amalgamation would render necessary,

Lord Byron's Infidelity. The little correspondence between Lord B. and Mr. Sheppard, here inserted, places the character of the former in a more lovely and interesting light than any thing that has yet been recorded of him, and must be inexpressibly valua-

ble as a material for some of his future biographers. Who will write in a proper manner the life of Lord Byron?

Mr. Cogan on Dr. Channing's Sermon, is equally to be praised for the clearness and closeness of his analytical reasoning, and for his conciliatory tone towards a writer on whom he felt bound to pass these strictures. As for his eulogium on Priestley, it seems to me somewhat too exalted and unqualified. But I am unprepared to enter here into the details of my opinion, and I would not venture to oppose my mere authority on this subject to that of Mr. Cogan. That portion of the world, who will not or cannot judge for themselves, must make up their minds between Dr. Channing's personal authority, and that of the host of Dr. Priestley's defenders who seem to be starting up on every side.

Translation of Rosenmüller on Isa. ix. 5, 6. I have frequently thought that no articles more characteristic and appropriate could be prepared for the Repository than translations of some of the longer notes of the German commentators. The Rosenmüllers, Kuinoel, Paul, Eichhorn, Thiess, Wolf and many others, have furnished invaluable materials for such articles. The extravagancies and errors into which some of them have been betrayed, ought on no account to blind our eyes to their numerous excellencies. Kuinoel's note, for instance, on the Temptation of Christ, is a compact and lucid account of the whole subject. In thousands of other instances, he sheds a most glowing and unexpected light on the obscurities of the evangelists. He is not an Anti-Supernaturalist. Paul, it is well known, is; but often surpasses even Kuinoel in the acuteness of his philological criticisms.

As an enlightened commentator, the younger Rosenmüller seems to me much inferior to his father. His principal excellence is his Hebrew scholarship. Take him off the ground of philology, and he is but an ordinary man. He seems to be swayed by a system, rather than by the genius of truth. He leans and gropes along amid a wilderness of learning, instead of marching independently

through it, by the light of a serene philosophy. The very note before me is an appropriate instance of these qualities. If the man were serious and wise, what could be more unfortunate for him than the illustration taken from the Brahminical philosophy? But he could not resist the temptation to make a learned quotation out of the Asiatic Researches, even though it threw a suspicion on the sincerity of his whole note, and tended to bewilder even his Trinitarian reader with doubt and Transcendentalism.

In the repeated sentiment, *Unto us a son is given*, instead of a peculiar mark of exultation, one sees nothing more than the usual intensity lent to every sentiment by the parallelism of Hebrew poetry.

An unfair play upon a term in another part of the note, shews the spirit of a miserable word-catcher, rather than of the liberal-minded critic. "The appellation of *plunderer*," he says, "would little comport with the other splendid epithets with which the prophet adorns his hero." Surely not, if by *plunderer* is meant a petty robber. But if a *victorious conqueror* be represented by the expression *father of spoils*, the phrase, we may contend, is full splendid enough for the passage. In the next sentence, he assumes, in the face of the passage, that the Prince of Peace there spoken of, was to reign *over a world*. Isaiah speaks only of the *throne of David*. In short, a leading defect of the whole note is, that it evades encountering at full length the very common and obvious objection that Isaiah is only predicting the rise of a hero in his own age. Not one word is said to account for the expressions all over the passage that support such an objection; whereas these surely are of much more weight *à priori* than the lofty, figurative epithets which are the only support of the other side of the question.

I know not why "it is contrary to common sense" that Isaiah should "bestow several appellations upon the person by whom the name was to be given, and only one upon the individual named." I would not contend, however, for the criticism against which this part of the note is directed.

In other remarks I am more than anticipated by the present correspondent.

Strictures on the American Quaker Creed. The observations on the impossibility of corrupting reason are new and fine.

Questions to Dr. Smith. When these questions are satisfactorily answered, I may have some others to propose, before I can clearly comprehend and adopt the common doctrine of Justification.

Thoughts on Religious Education. A happy illustration of the intrinsic excellence of a devotional spirit is here taken from the parental relation.

In abandoning the severe and morose maxims of their predecessors, and rendering religion as captivating as possible to the young and uneducated, have not Calvinists made one very great advance towards the essential principles of Unitarianism? We must not be so sectarian as to regret their success with the youthful mind, if they will really conceal the deformity and prevent the mischief of old-fashioned Calvinistic principles. Perhaps, indeed, they will make more nominal converts. What then? The gospel is preached, and we ought to rejoice and will rejoice.

The Geneva Catechism is "hailed in America," not so much on account of our "little children," as in the light of a text-book for more advanced classes.

Mrs. Hamilton's "thanks to the Almighty for the happiness enjoyed at a dancing-school ball," was beautiful and correct for her age. How far can such a sense of devotion be made to mingle with the pleasures and innocent dissipations of after-life? Why might not the pious man after retiring from the theatre, the ball-room, or the rout, read his chapter in the Bible at two or three o'clock in the morning, and thank God for the enjoyments he has received? This seems to be an incongruous combination of ideas; but if a minister of the gospel acquiesces in the indulgences above-mentioned, and at the same time inculcates the necessity of personal devotion, he cannot, to be consistent, wish the two species of occupation separated in the same individual, but,

on the contrary, conjoined. That it borders on the mystic and dangerous quietism* of the old French school of

* The following original translation of a passage from the Tenth Satire of Boileau, (on Women,) may convey some idea of the attempts made in the satirist's time, and encouraged by ecclesiastics, to unite a life of dissipation with one of religion.

The very saints she beats in pious cares,
She reads in Rodriguez,† cons mental
prayers,
Ransacks the town to find the wretched
out,
Visits all hospitals and jails about,
Speeds from her duty and her home
away,
To hear at church six masses every day.
But all her faults to combat and subdue,
To stem her love of paint, and rage for
loo,
To bound her mad ambition to its goal,
To quell the pride of her rebellious soul,
Over her luxury to cast a rein,—
All this the will of Heaven requires in
vain.
But *can* it be the will of Heaven? she
cries,
Her ghostly father—he is surely wise.
For him she means without delay to
send,
And to his precepts reverently attend.
Good! by my soul, the monk is just in
sight:
How plump and red he looks! how
sleekly bright!‡
The flush of spring, with all its blooming
grace,
Seems to be painted on his reverend
face.
But hark! 'tis difficult to hear him
speak,
An ague yesterday has left him weak;
And had not prompt assistance then been
sped,
He might have now lain shiv'ring in his
bed.
For of all mortals in this world of woe,
Thanks to the souls that with devotion
glow,
None are so coddled with unceasing care,
As ghostly fathers to your pious fair.
If they betray the slightest mark of ill,
If they but gape, touch'd by some sudden
chill—

† Rodriguez, a Jesuit, who composed an excellent work on Christian Perfection.

‡ Of all the characters in this Satire, Boileau gave the preference to the ghostly father. The author, says one of the commentators, had a particular allusion to a M. H

pietists, is to my mind no objection. Thin partitions separate all the virtues from all the vices. True sentiment

A hooded squadron rushes to their aid,
One heats a broth, one gets a cordial
made;
Syrups, preserves and ratafias fly,
The best that art can make, or wealth
can buy;
Since no sweet viands, of delicious taste,
Liquid or dry, or wrought of sugar'd
paste,
In sacred stomachs, ever were misplac'd.
For them, methinks, the first march-
pane was made,*
For them, at Rouen, rose the citron
trade.†

Our doctor solves all scruples in a
trice,
And smooths for her the path to para-
dise;
And far from reining her wild passions
in,
He takes all pains to justify her sin.
“Why should a foolish censure cause
alarm?
Why should they fret that rouge sets off
a charm?
Is rouge,” he cries, “so horrid an af-
fair,
That thus the brutes your innocence
would scare?
While all must bend to customs as they
go,
The sex, a tribute, sure, to fashion owe.
You dress too splendidly, some censor
cries,
Your dazzling rubies almost blind our
eyes.
Can Heaven endure such luxury to see?
I answer, Yes, if but the rank agree.
But then you play—how authorize *that*
crime?
Oh, may not one beguile one's heavy
time?
One cannot always read, or work, or
pray,
And none talk scandal when engaged in
play.
The deepest rounds, when play'd with
this design,
I class with actions virtuous and divine.
If you possess a faithful, pious soul,
Fear not, for that shall sanctify the
whole.”

* * * * *
Thus does the father settle every
doubt,
That seems to agitate his fair devout;

* A kind of cake.
† The most exquisite preserved ci-
trons were prepared at Rouen.

often runs into false. There is but a step from the sublime to the ridiculous.

To speak of "objectionable" passages in the Bible is perhaps itself

While she, as if she heard an angel's voice,
Bends low, and bids her troubled soul rejoice;
And to these awful mandates from the sky,
Subscribes of course, nor dares presume reply.*
Her tranquil virtue cherishes a crowd
Of sins and errors, which she thinks allow'd;
Invests within a sacramental dress,
Her pride, her vanity and waywardness;
And thinks her frequent sacrilege will prove
A certain title to the world above.
Such is the course her sacred mentor takes,
And such the fruit which his instruction makes.
Oh, who would wonder if the treacherous guide
Should quickly make his docile pupil slide
Within those flowery paths, those tempting bowers,
Where gentle Quietists breathe out their hours?
Where her weak breast, with every folly fraught,
That ever Molinoz or Satan taught,†
Down the descent of hellish pleasures driven,
Shall bless her calm career, and call it heaven!

* Miss Hannah More, in her *Moral Sketches*, draws an exquisite satirical picture of a young lady applying to different clergymen for the solution of her spiritual doubts. A writer in *Blackwood's Magazine* pronounces Miss More's *Essay on Prayer* her best production. Does he not confound it with the *Moral Sketches*, of which the *Reflections on Prayer* constitute the second volume, and are about as dull as any thing that could well be written? The first volume, above alluded to, on the contrary, can scarcely be surpassed for its vivacity and good sense.

† Quietism was introduced at Rome by Molinoz, a Spanish priest. His system, among much that was philosophical and edifying, was dangerous in confounding the limits between virtue and vice, teaching its disciples to see and acknowledge God in every pleasure which they chose to prosecute.

objectionable. My prejudices would require the epithet to be exchanged for one of a milder colour.

I doubt whether what is stigmatized as "lip-labour" in teaching children to repeat prayers and elements of common learning by rote, be so dangerous as is generally supposed. Words are nearly all that can be introduced into their little minds. Let the most impressive and useful forms be fastened on their memories, and as their powers of reason and reflection imperceptibly expand, they will have the food of thought and sentiment already prepared for them, connected at the same time with all the advantages arising from order, from habit, and from the influence of particular seasons. I speak now as much from the recollection of my own juvenile experience, as from the reason of the thing.

Could this interesting correspondent's suggestions on the subject of moulding the infant mind to piety be realized, the consummation would be indeed desirable; but, I fear, in our imperfect world, where children will be *children*, it is scarcely ever practicable. Still, attempts at its approximation should be indefatigably made, and still more, I agree with this correspondent, that the subject is deserving of indefinite discussion.

One great obstacle to refining on the present mode of religious education, consists in the existing prejudices of our surrounding fellow-Christians. I know a judicious mother, who, on finding that her child of four years old had acquired an incorrigible habit of repeating every night the Lord's Prayer incorrectly, ordered the nurse to cease imposing the repetition of it upon her, much to the surprise of nurse, servants and neighbours, who chanced to hear of it. The Lord's Prayer, they thought, ought to be repeated punctually every night, and that a wrong collocation or enunciation of the sentences would very little injure *the charm* supposed to be connected with the exercise.

Anti-Supernaturalism. Surely there is much weight in several of these considerations. But is it correct to say, that Anti-Supernaturalists must entertain one of the two opinions specified by this writer? Paul, the German commentator, and Eichhorn, pro-

fess to believe in the sincerity of Jesus and his apostles, and the general truth of the gospel history, but would reduce all that seems to us *supernatural* to Jewish modes of speech, exaggerating habits of thought, &c., which prevailed in the time of our Saviour. This then is a third resort for the Anti-Supernaturalist.

Does not the Christian, who believes in a particular Providence, approach very nearly to the ground of the Anti-Supernaturalist? They both place the miracles of the gospel on the same level with the ordinary operations of nature, the only difference between them being, that the former considers every event that ever happened, whether in Christianity or common life, as miraculous, while the latter *denies* that character to every event.

Once more. In what light ought we Christians to regard that Anti-Supernaturalist, who, possessing the deepest reverence for the character of God, and having examined every system of religion and morals that ever prevailed on earth, is led at last to embrace the code of moral and religious doctrine delivered by Christ, as calculated to promote, in the greatest degree, the happiness of man and the glory of his Creator? He further believes, we will suppose, that Christianity held a prominent place in the Divine counsels and foreknowledge as a scheme to bless and improve the human family, and even to prepare them for a future state of felicity. Being grateful for a thousand other things, he may be pre-eminently grateful for this. He may regard it as the most unspeakably precious among the gifts of God. He may look upon it as of equal and indeed superior authority to his own reason and conscience, after he has discovered that its precepts, doctrines and legitimate influences have stood the test of ages, and have been found, on the whole, to contribute most surely to human happiness and perfection. Considering the destiny to which Jesus was originally designed, as the founder of such a religion, he might believe him to be the Son, the Messiah, of God. He may be penetrated with the deepest reverence and admiration for the character of Christ, and join with sincere emotion in an act commemora-

tive of him. But he waives his assent to the merely miraculous features of the gospel-history, and believes that Providence might have allowed its favourite system of truth and righteousness to have been surrounded for centuries with traditions of supernatural accompaniments, in the same manner as it has permitted nearly the whole of Christendom to believe in the Trinity by means of interpolated passages of Scripture, Platonic admixtures and oriental figures of speech. Let us suppose that such a man were to come forward and claim of the present age the *distinctive name of Christian*, on account of the foregoing positive, and not unimportant or improbable grounds, and especially, on account of his love and preference of the Christian system over all others. Let Bishop Magee, Mr. Belsham, and Rammohun Roy be the committee on claims to decide this question. What would the judgment be?

Instead of "the question whether the New Testament *is or is not* the revealed will of God," may we, with the permission of this writer, read, "whether the New Testament *contains, or contains not*," &c.

Allowing, with Porteus, that God has authorized no one human being to *add to or diminish from* the doctrines of Christ, yet, has he not authorized us to *explain* them as rationally and satisfactorily as we can?

Propriety of a more distinctive Appellation for Unitarians. Since, with the indiscriminating multitude, the odium is general and equal on all who depart from pure Trinitarianism,—since there are certainly some great valuable principles of belief and of interpretation which are common to Anti-trinitarians,—since the word Unitarian is, at once, both etymologically and correlatively, expressive of the leading doctrine of those who are not Trinitarians,—and since one general term is as much needed to embrace all those who reject the Trinity, as several terms are needed to distinguish their several divisions,—I hope the name of Unitarian will never lose that broad and comprehensive acceptation which includes the highest Arian along with the simple Humanitarian. At the same time, I agree with this writer, that it is very con-

venient and useful (but certainly it is quite consistent with the employment of the more general name) to adopt such distinctive terms as will describe the several subdivisions of Unitarians. After all, no classification, whether scientific or theological, can exclude every anomalous case. And it is, I am persuaded, the occasional occurrence of such anomalous cases, which leads the present writer and others to aim at the vain task of imposing names on classes of men with precision and exactitude. It is a matter which cannot be forced. Mankind will consult their own convenience in the use of general terms. It is as difficult to alter common habits on this subject, as to legislate away a long established currency.

The present writer appears to me to have laid a greater stress than facts would warrant on the supposed difference between the opinions of Unitarian hearers and those of their pastors. A large portion of the article consists of good arguments, but directed against something like a man of straw.

The extract from Archdeacon Powell is latitudinarian enough. If its principle is right, what prevents Unitarians, with a little, very little mental reservation, and slight struggles of conscience, from creeping up to the highest seats of the Establishment? It is one great objection to the Church of England, that it has forced so many of its divines to split hairs with this shameful ingenuity, and while apparently defending its foundations, to undermine those foundations, and explain them adroitly away.

Right of Unitarians in their Chapels. Suppose a Court of Law should admit the principle maintained by this Orthodox Dissenter, who wishes to deprive Unitarians of their chapels. First, how will the Establishment retain its Cathedrals and Churches against the Roman Catholic claims? Has a statute converted those buildings into places of Protestant worship? Secondly: Is there probably a Dissenting Chapel in the kingdom, the proprietors of which have retained the theological sentiments of their ancestors without some slight variations? Thirdly: May it not be con-

tended, that our Dissenting ancestors themselves would have spurned the narrow-mindedness and illiberality of some of their modern descendants, and that although their chapels were originally devoted directly to the cause of Calvinistic orthodoxy, yet, indirectly, but practically, they were consecrated to that nobler and loftier orthodoxy which consists in freedom of opinion and a conscientious adoption of what appears to be scriptural truth? Thus, even on our opponents' own ground, Unitarians have as strong, if not a stronger right in the chapels they occupy, than our Calvinistic brethren have in theirs. Lastly: Let the Evangelicals beware how they stir up the already fluttering sympathy of the English people and Government in behalf of Unitarians. Such a monstrous and palpable violation of justice as is involved in the plan which has called forth these few obvious remarks, would meet with a different fate in the House of Lords from that of the semi-triumphant Marriage Bill.

Brief Notes on the Bible. Eichhorn denominates the first chapter of Genesis by the very expressive term, *Shield of Achilles*.

I do not quite agree with this able and successful defender of Moses, in supposing that the sacred writer's allusion to the stars was parenthetical. I think he meant expressly to include them among the lights which rule over the night. Their perceptible benefits to our globe are quite as obvious as the moon's. Indeed we might part with the latter less injuriously to ourselves than with the former. But this affects not at all the admirable and truly philosophical main argument of B.

On Ordination Sermons. This writer speaks with contempt of the "furious zealot," while himself attacking one of the most simple, innocent, useful and interesting ceremonies in the world with amazingly furious zeal. What would he say of dedications and dedication sermons? Are they dangerous? Are they liable to abuse? What of preaching from texts? Did Christ ordain that? What is there on this earth that cannot be abused?

Our fighter sticks not always to the thread of his own argument. In attempting to shew that the practice of

ordination is objectionable on far "other grounds than its superstition;" one of his reasons is, that "in general it is calculated to impress men's minds with *superstitious notions*, especially in regard to the validity and sacredness of the clerical office and character." Now it is unfair to manufacture a great show of arguments in this way, and not to keep one's promises.

As to the single argument itself, which the writer has thus made two of, I am persuaded he would abandon it altogether, if he could witness the excellent effects produced by ordination services in New England, where they are still kept up by an universal spirit and interest that have never been surpassed. There, at the close of two centuries, no superstitious notions whatever are as yet attached to the ceremony; it is only regarded as a beautiful, impressive and instructive form, attaching the people to our common Christianity, and inspiring them with tender and solemn sentiments with respect to the pastoral relation.

I cannot believe that Christ has "abolished" whatever is lovely. Besides, there is, in this same word "abolished," as applied to the authority of Christ over ancient forms and ceremonies, something illusive, to which, if we do not carefully attend, we shall be seduced to part with some valuable portion of our Christian liberty. It ought to be recollected, that in abolishing the *obligation and necessity* of ancient positive ordinances, Christ was very far from entirely *prohibiting* them. This distinction must be sacredly observed. Jesus had no authority and no wish to deprive men of perfect *liberty* in things innocent. If he had, his religion would have been as oppressive as the Mosaic itself. For it is as irksome to the human mind to be *restrained* from acting as it chooses through the wide range of circumstances in which God Almighty has set it down, as to be *compelled* to pursue a particular and specific course. "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing." I might quote and write more to this purpose, but let the reader continue to think upon it, and he will, I am persuaded, soon arrive at similar conclusions. In fine, there is no dan-

ger that ordinations among Unitarians will be ever abused, as long as Unitarianism signifies a bold and independent adherence to the principles of truth. When it means any thing else, when it adopts a slavish *interior religion*, it is possible that external ceremonies may exert a corrupting influence. Let us not be for tearing up *every thing*, branch, root and fibre. Ancient systems were not *all* poisonous. Unitarianism cannot make men at once angels. Let us beware of the error of the Quakers. Can "Ruris Colonus" endure the sound of an organ?

On the Rev. John Baker's Prayer-Book. Yes, the "Immortal God," and the "Father's Co-eternal Son," are expressions not to be twisted by any mental, secret ingenuity into a compatibility with *Jesus dying on the cross*.

On a Canon of Criticism relating to the Greek Article. The alternative which this acute critic adopts is certainly the most inoffensive of either. He might even have softened and rendered his supposition less exceptionable still, by ascribing to the Apostle merely an idiomatical *impropriety*, rather than an *ungrammatical* mode of expression; for I think the peculiarity in question comes rather under the former than the latter species of error. In this manner, then, the Greek canon which Mr. Cogan and the present writer have been examining, needs not be formidable to Unitarians, since I presume no intelligent Trinitarian will contend that the apostles were even inspired to write the Greek language in the utmost classical nicety of which it was susceptible. The whole strength of the Trinitarian argument, however, rests on the supposition that such was the case. But, surely, on our side, there is an antecedent probability that such would *not* be the case. And when this probability is moreover fortified by the general doctrine of the New Testament in favour of the strict unity of God, the difficulty sinks to nothing, and the classical journal may multiply its canons on the subject to any extent it chooses.

The conjecture on St. Paul's "large letters" is ingenious.

Mr. Parkinson on the Habitats of the Papyrus. Multum in parvo.

London Unitarian Book Society. This seems to be a movement somewhat opposed to the agitated project of Unitarian consolidation.

Sunday-School Books. All suggestions of this kind deserve to be recorded. Few men are engaged in the education of youth, who do not originate some facilities and improvements in the art, that ought to be promulgated (perhaps in some specific publication) and copied according to circumstances.

Mode of pronouncing Greek. As a discriminating and appropriate improvement of the plan here announced, it may be suggested that it would be worth while for each subdivision of Unitarians to adopt such a portion of the project as would correspond to the extent of their respective departures from orthodoxy. There might thus be something in our whole body resembling initiation into Masonic degrees. For instance, high Arians might be distinguished by simply using Greek, but pronouncing it after the *English custom*; low Arians might advance a little farther, and pronounce the Greek *vowels* only, according to the continental usage; Socinians might still farther enunciate the *consonants* according to the principles explicated by this writer; and lastly, ultra-humanitarians might make their Shibboleth to consist in the ancient Demosthenéan *accent*. Thus, the advantages recommended by the philologist before us, whatever they are, might be multiplied and ramified to a very considerable extent.

Letter from Ex-President Adams. What a letter from a past octogenarian! What a youthful imagination, to be comparing an elegantly bound volume of Sermons to "a chain of diamonds set in a link of gold"! Might not the name of *Derring*, to which a quere is here affixed, have been mistaken by the transcriber from the original for *Disney*? I have no doubt of it.

Gleanings. It were to be wished, that this interesting and instructive department of the Repository might be enlarged.

REVIEW.—*Wellbeloved's Three Letters.* Spirited.

Memoir of Mrs. Fordyce. Interesting too. From my recollection of

Dr. Fordyce's Sermons to Young Women, read perhaps ten years ago, I should disagree with the Reviewer, and not much wonder at the living preacher's reputation. I thought it one of the most charming books ever written.

Cobbett's History of the Reformation. "Enough—aye, and much more than enough!"

General Baptists. Would the Reviewer abolish the ordinance of Baptism altogether from the Christian Church?

Christianity and Slavery incompatible. Many slaves in America regard their lot, compared with their former condition in Africa, as one of the greatest blessings which Providence could confer on them. How far this may result from their believing that in their unconverted Heathen state they were doomed to everlasting damnation, I am unable to say. I believe it has had some influence.

Christ Crucified. There was room to vindicate this much-abused expression.

Obituary. Honest John Davis. An interesting and masterly picture! The following stroke is an inspired one: "His mind was strong and clear, but it was not subtle enough to pierce and confound its own conclusions." This is an exact description of thousands of respectable and excellent men. Does it not hint the secret too of the slow progress which truth makes among a majority of those who are in many respects enlightened? The remark above quoted is to me an original position. It is highly philosophic, felicitous and practical. It deserves to be reduced to a maxim, and treasured up among the results of the Baconian system of mental philosophy.

I should call "a readiness and propriety of utterance," rather a happy accomplishment, than "the sure indication of a well-furnished and well-ordered mind."

Intelligence. Evangelical Magazine on Unitarian Chapels. Could there be mustered a sufficient number of Calvinists at the present day to occupy these devoted chapels?

Manchester,
January 26, 1826.

SIR,
IN a communication inserted in the Repository, (XX. 739,) entitled, "Dr. Carpenter on his Reply to Archbishop Magee," the following sentence occurs :

"My opinions have acquired greater stability and precision; and though I have not seen reason to change them materially (I think) in any instance, yet my sentiments have increasingly become what I may be allowed to call *evangelical*," &c.

The term *evangelical*, in this sentence, gave rise to some discussion amongst a small party of friends who differed in opinion as to the meaning and propriety of the term as thus used by Dr. Carpenter, considering the received notions which are attached to it in the present day. It was, therefore, agreed that one of the company should respectfully solicit, through the medium of the Repository, an explanation of the word *evangelical* as applied, in the above sentence, to Unitarian sentiments, being generally used as descriptive of those most opposed to them. Such an explanation it will be satisfactory to myself and the friends at whose request I write, to find inserted in the next number of your valuable publication: and we shall all feel ourselves obliged to Dr. Carpenter if he will, with his usual candour and condescending liberality, enter into it.

A FRIEND TO FREE INQUIRY.

On the Correspondence between a Calvinist and an Unitarian in the last Volume, by one of the Writers.

SIR,
Feb. 1, 1826.
NOW that your ingenious correspondent in America has closed his remarks upon my controversy with a Calvinist, I feel it proper to offer some explanation as to the origin and progress of that controversy. The Calvinist is, in fact, an elder brother of mine, and, from his earliest youth, has been eminently religious. His integrity and benevolence are not less conspicuous than his piety; and I have, through life, looked up to him with sincere respect. It is nearly forty years since I was first apprised that any sect of Christians denied the

eternal duration of future punishments; I was easily prevailed upon to listen to the arguments which were urged against that doctrine; but it was not until I had perused the writings and attended the ministry of the late Mr. Winchester that I became a thorough convert to the doctrine of the final restitution of all men to a state of purity and happiness. Having myself derived unspeakable delight from the knowledge of this grand scriptural truth, I was eager to communicate it to my excellent brother, but had the mortification to find that what I had considered to be an invaluable discovery, he regarded as a dangerous, if not a damnable, error. Our religious communications, which had formerly been frequent and profitable, were thenceforward in a great measure suspended; and the few which have since taken place have always been conducted, on his part, upon the presumption of my utter incapacity to judge of spiritual matters. The result of conversations carried on upon such a ground as this, could not possibly be very agreeable, and although we have always been on friendly terms, we seldom touched upon the most interesting of all subjects. I can, however, truly say, that my respect for him was not at all impaired by the contrariety of our opinions; and, abating my heresy, I have reason to know that he thinks well of me. It chanced that about the autumn of 1823, I overtook him going homewards, and, among other desultory matters, I mentioned the Rev. Mr. Irving, whom every one was then talking about: this plunged us at once into our old controversy. He waxed warm, told me, as usual, that I was to all spiritual purposes blind and dead; I retorted; we began to talk loud, and when we reached the place at which we were to separate, we parted rather abruptly. He, good man, fancied that he had hurt my feelings, which, however, was not the case, and the next morning, on returning to business, I found upon my table the note which laid the foundation of our correspondence. It was carried on for about a month. My endeavours were mainly designed to bring him down from the mount of infallibility on which he was seated,

and to induce him to reason with me upon terms of equality, in which attempt, however, as upon all former occasions, I totally failed. My letters were written at a place and at times when I felt that I ought to be attending to other matters. I can assure you that I never dreamt of giving publicity to our very desultory correspondence; but, after it had proceeded to a considerable length, finding that he attached no value to my arguments, I requested him to return my letters; and on receiving them from him, I communicated the whole of the correspondence to a near and dear relative who took the trouble of transcribing it, and, without saying a word to me, forwarded the copy to you. I was by no means pleased with his zeal, being conscious that, in point of composition, our letters were not suited to the public eye: but it was too late to recall them, and accordingly they stand, with all their faults, in the pages of your Repository. You, Sir, can bear witness to the fact of their having reached you all at the same time. Your American friend appears not to have been aware of this circumstance, and accordingly many of his observations are monitory, under the erroneous supposition that the correspondence was still going on. If this had been the case, I should gladly have attended to his hints. Should he, after this explanation, still continue sceptical, as to the personality of my antagonist I shall be most willing to send him some of the original pieces.

He is right in saying, that the correspondence ought to have been designated as between a Universalist and a Calvinist. When my object was to come to an understanding with the Calvinist upon one grand point of difference, it would have been very injudicious on my part to have offended his prejudices by agitating a distinct question on which, if possible, we are still more at issue than upon that to which our correspondence related.

I regret to find, that your friend thinks that I ended "the controversy in a somewhat pettish style." I certainly had become weary of labouring in vain. Finding that I could no more make an impression upon the

mind of my excellent opponent, than I could tie knots in the water or in the air, I was anxious to bring the argument to a close. I have reason to know that he himself did not consider me as having broken off in a pet.

With regard to my young friend W. W., I beg to say, that although his partiality to me, naturally enough, led him to speak favourably of my views, he loves the other party too well to offer him an insult. The Calvinist has never seen the correspondence in print, and would care very little what you and your readers may think of his opinions. Rest assured that he does not consider any of us to be capable of judging in the case.

I must say that I am rather disappointed to find that our American critic is not absolutely an Universalist himself. I cannot wish him better than that he may speedily become one. To me it is quite incomprehensible how any man of deeply reflective habits can be at ease, so long as a doubt hangs upon his mind as to the happy destiny of the human race. Every family of man is, we are assured, to be blessed through the agency of Abraham and his seed. This assurance is full of comfort; it is one upon which the mind can obtain perfect repose. I shall add but one further observation. If God be infinitely powerful, wise and good, he either is so in the same sense as men are powerful, wise and good, or he is not. If goodness in God be of the same nature as goodness in man, (and how else can men be imitators of God?) then we are sure that he will, without partiality, employ his wisdom and power in promoting the happiness of all men. If goodness in God be in its nature different from goodness in man, then it may be absolutely contrary to all our ideas of goodness, and, for aught that we can tell, it may consist with Divine goodness and truth to break his promises, and to inflict endless evils upon those who have flattered themselves with the hope of finding heaven a place of perfect happiness.

SIR, I HAVE read with pleasure the ingenious remarks of T. F. B. in your last Number (p. 20). I think that I have in effect already replied to them in my communication for December last, (XX. 729,) particularly by the quotations from Philostratus and the Scholiast on Theocritus. I will only add one or two brief remarks. *The word has been flesh* would in Greek be expressed by *φῆσιν*. It is true that the aorist in Greek is often used for the preterpluperfect, but this use is confined to cases where the meaning of the tense cannot be uncertain. The same observation may be made respecting the perfect, or rather the aorist in the Latin language. Your correspondent's rendering of *Ἄισος ἰαδμενος εὑρετο*, would seem to imply that Æsop was born free, but afterwards came into a state of servitude. But of this Herodotus evidently knew nothing. To sum up the whole in a few words—my doctrine is, that in certain cases the primary meaning of *γινεσθαι* had as little force in the aorist *γεγενεσθαι*, as the meaning of the Greek *φύο* had in the Latin *fuisse*. But whether the primary meaning of *γινεσθαι* was lost in the aorist or not, if *γεγενεσθαι* was used as an aorist of *εἶναι*, which your correspondent grants that it frequently was, all that I have contended for is, in fact, conceded. As to the distinction which my ingenious opponent makes between the imperfect and the aorist, it is not founded on any principle with which I happen to be acquainted.

With respect to the import of the term *mystery*, (see p. 3,) I should have no objection to apply this term to certain truths which surpass the comprehension of the human intellect, had it not been so egregiously abused. Your correspondent is well aware that *words* operate as a charm, and the word *mystery* has been perpetually employed as a charm to silence reasoning and to disguise absurdity. A proposition is submitted to my consideration couched in terms which either mean nothing or destroy each other, and when this has been demonstrated, the advocate of the proposition tells me that his doctrine is a *mystery* which I must not expect to understand. But I ask, what is it

which I must not expect to understand? I understand most clearly that his proposition, if it means any thing, is self-destructive and contradictory, and the only *mystery* to me is that he should not understand the same. But he urges that the *subject* to which his doctrine relates is too sublime for the limited faculties of the human mind. Be it so; but my concern at present is with an individual proposition upon the falsehood of which I feel myself competent to pronounce. But my adversary still tells me that I am not competent to pronounce upon the falsehood of that which relates to a *mysterious* subject; and by the magic of a word he would willingly close my eyes as effectually as he has closed his own. *Mystery* has been made the last refuge of baffled argument, and the term has been employed to awe the human mind into a blind submission to dogmas at which reason stands aghast, and to which Scripture gives no countenance. Your intelligent correspondent will now see on what my dislike of the term *mystery* is founded, and I feel persuaded that we cannot materially disagree.

E. COGAN.

Hampstead,
February 9, 1826.

SIR, ALLOW me a part of a page in the Monthly Repository, to inform your readers that I shall present a copy of M. Malan's *Conventicule de Rolle* to Dr. Williams's Library in Red-Cross Street, as soon as it is returned from the bookbinder. It is a curious and authentic document of the doctrines of the modern Swiss Calvinists, and its perusal will afford a triumphant refutation of Dr. Smith's charges against me of unfair quotation. (XX. 730—734.) It seems passing strange that Dr. Smith should defy me publicly to prove from M. Malan's writings that he ever maintained the doctrine, "that the elect cannot fall from salvation whatever sins they may commit." I say it seems strange, after this defiance, that Dr. Smith should be angry with me for shewing that M. Malan has asserted this doctrine in the very strongest terms he could possibly use, and enforced it by various illustrations. This Dr. Smith cannot now deny, though, with the

Conventicule de Rolle in his hand, he formerly said that neither M. Malan nor any Calvinist author of credit had maintained such a doctrine.* Dr. Smith is, I am sure, too sensible a man, and too good a logician, to expect that his bringing other passages from M. Malan's writings in praise of a holy life, should be received as proof by the readers of the Monthly Repository, that he has not written what I have alleged, and what may be found in the *Conventicule de Rolle*. The man who is convicted of uttering base coin, cannot clear himself by shewing that a few pieces of good money were mixed with it to make it current: after the most plausible arguments of the most skilful pleader, the base coin will still remain base. The letters of Dr. Smith are, I believe, intended to influence a very different class of readers, men with "self-opening Bibles," that shew, without effort, all the texts that support their own opinions; men who view only one side of a question, and carefully close the other eye against the admission of contrary testimony: such readers, Dr. Smith well knows, will receive implicitly all that he says, without farther inquiry. One of these religious *monoculi*, a worthy Calvinist divine, was lately in company with an old friend of mine from the North, and said to him, *How could your friend Mr. Bakewell get so far wrong, and commit such errors as he has done in his controversy with Dr. Smith?* To which my friend replied, *What are the arguments or statements which Mr. B. has advanced, that you consider as the most objectionable?* The Calvinist minister paused a moment, and then candidly confessed that he had never seen or read a page which I had written, but that all his information on the subject was derived from Dr. Smith. Among readers of this kind Dr. Smith knows that he is sure of an easy triumph, whatever position he may maintain, if he keep within the pale of orthodoxy. On such ground he may unfurl the banner of victory, and "torture one poor creed a thousand ways" to prove that it does not contain the doctrine which it most expressly enforces.

Here I conclude with seriously and

respectfully suggesting to Dr. Smith, that if the following assertions, "*No sins, however grievous, can finally separate the elect from God;*" "*All the sins which the elect commit or fall into after justification take place within the house of safety, and cannot endanger their salvation*"—I say, if such or similar assertions do not mean what the words imply, in the name of truth and common sense discard them at once. We cannot doubt that Calvin and the authors of the Westminster Catechism gave a fearful substantiality to their doctrines; to soften them down and explain them away, as Dr. Smith attempts to do, appears to me, to use his own expressive words, to be drawing the heart's blood from the system, and leaving it a lifeless and unmeaning form.

ROBT. BAKEWELL.

SIR,

Dec. 21, 1825.

THE following illustration of a well-known passage in the proem of John's Gospel may perhaps gratify some of your readers.

The celebrated French Chronicler, Froissart, describes in the following terms the authority of William of Wickam, who was Chancellor of England under Edward III.:

"En ce temps regnoit ung prestre, qui an appelloit messire Guillaume de Wickam; I celluy Guillaume de Wickam estoit si bien in la grace du Roi Angleterre que par lui estoit tout faict, et sans luy en lee faisoit riens."

In the New Testament the gospel dispensation is continually represented as the *kingdom*, or rather the *reign of God* upon earth. Jesus Christ is uniformly described as the principal agent, or, if we pursue the same metaphor, as the prime minister of the Deity, in the government of the moral world. The Evangelist John, in order to represent how high he stood in the favour of the Sovereign, and how superior he was to all the other instruments of Divine power, uses metaphorically almost the identical language, which the French historian employs literally: "Through him all things were done," (or came to pass,) "and without him nothing was done that was done."

A YORK STUDENT.

* See Mon. Repos. XIX. 673.

Mr. Emlyn to Mr. Manning.

SIR,

April 8, 1704.

By yours I find you wish I had not discover'd any thing of the Arian principle, which yet I think I have but barely intimated, and that rather by way of supposition than of assertion; but if I must be put on it in my defence, I judge it the same thing. It may be, none will defend the controversy as stated in all points, but that will only concern the argument from the creation, not any of the other matter in the Answer. I don't think it difficult to give a reply if I had the use of some few books, or if it cou'd be done without suspicion of the author, which would be prejudicial at present. I find one great inconvenience wou'd attend a reply, *viz.* the bulk and tediousness of it, which has been no advantage to the Answer itself with many. I have been thinking on some general reflections on the preface and book, in which I wou'd shew two things. 1st. That the Father and Son are two distinct beings or persons in the vulgar sence, by the scripture account, and that this will follow (as you observe) from the several parts assigned to them by the Answerer himself, and other such, which are most inconsistent with a numerical unity of being. 2d. That the distinction between 'em is that of a greater and a less, and that the Son is a derivative, dependent being, as to his nature, which the Answerer allows, and therefore infinitely different from the first Original Cause; and here I would consider the business of emanation, as no better than creation, which is by emanation of power and virtue from the Father, tho' it may be remote and mediate, also the unreasonableness of asserting a necessity upon the Father for such emanation, and then the little relief this itself will give towards the proof of an æquality between the necessary cause and the *causatum*, and wou'd intersperse some other occasional remarks on the Answer, and in relation to the supream deity of the Son.

This wou'd be enough for one part, and might strike more at the bottom of the controversy, about the Unity, which he has left so obscure and uncertain.

Then one may hereafter consider his principal arguments apart, espe-

cially about creation (which, I think, may be dispatch'd in a little compass on my principles) and religious worship, where he has not done so well as he seems to imagine: for this latter also there are some rude materials at hand.*

As to the Nestorians, I think they will be answered by proving the Son of God in the highest sence not to be the Supream Being. But, indeed, as to the deity of Jesus Christ who lived on earth, I take them to be a real branch of the Arians, and as much to deny the deity of Christ as the Unitarians do; I find many of the Trinitarians are aware of this, not only the animadverter on the Bishop of Sarum's Exposition of the 2d Article, but also Mr. *Jurieu*, who says, in denying a personal union they can only be for a union of grace and assistance as Photinus and Paulus Samosatēnus; so that one may instance in their vast numbers and long succession in the East, in answer to the popular argument against the Unitarians from their want of visibility and succession.†

Next you give me an account of what you take to be my scheme in these matters, as to which I wou'd give some remarks that may better illustrate it, and obviate many of those objections you suppose it attended with. As to the præexistence of all human spirits, I see not that it must follow from Christ's præexistence; there is no necessity that his original must be the same with others; 'tis certain it was not.⁽¹⁾ You say *mens generat mentem*; but sure Christ's soul cou'd not be generated as others, when he had no human father. So that he must differ. So that no more may be intended by the Scripture account of his likeness to us, but that he was really such as to his natural passions and infirmitys and temporal condition.⁽²⁾ The matter of the origine of human spirits is in the dark, and the Scripture enters not into the philosophy of that point,

* An Answer to Mr. Boyse was published in the year 1706, and called a Vindication of the Worship of the Lord Jesus Christ on Unitarian Principles.

H. R. B.

† Not so; the Arians were for an information by the Logos, the Hypostatic Unity; the Photinians not. M.

but only speaks of things that appear to vulgar apprehensions, and so far he was really like other men. And verily if *anima generat animam*, with divine concurrence, it will be no great matter to believe Christ might with a more full concurrence be able to generate men and other less noble parts of the creation. I allow Christ's soul to be superangelick in its capacity, and I find the Arians held (many of 'em) that the *logos* was his soul as well as Apollinarius; as to the same or different *species* with our spirits, 'tis another philosophick point which the gospel minds not; according to vulgar account, the human *species* is determined by the bodily shape and parts⁽³⁾; a beast's soul with an human body wou'd pass for a man, as there be some such who excell not a beast in sagacity; so that I take a man to be only an embodied spirit, (that is in an human body,) especially if born of a woman, as that phrase Gal. iv. 4, may import, yea tho' it had been an angel before, (which is but a name of office not of nature,)⁽⁴⁾ for they are called men in Scripture when they appeared in human shape tho' only transiently, much more if they had been so fixed and subject to the laws of our condition; so that, according to me, a spirit either in or related to a human body, is a man; else take spirits abstractedly from all such relation, and then, for ought I know, there may be many distinct *species* among them we call human souls, if we judge by their various capacitys and operations; for that spirits generate and are generated of one another, and so are ranked into their *species* this way, is not manifest, at least Christ was not of the common *species* upon this ground, not being generated by a human father, but by him who is the Father of spirits; but he became of the same *species*, according to me, when he took an human body and birth, and⁽⁵⁾ his spirit might grow up in the exercise of wisdom with his organs; and so for a little while he was lower than angels. Heb. ii. 7.

⁽⁶⁾ As to the *Logos*, John i., I think I am not mistaken in Philo, who speaks also of an hypostatical *logos*, whom he calls (as I remember) the oldest of the creatures and the instrument of God in creation, and

calls other spirits *λόγος*. This Sandius proves, and Mr. N. denies not; and Dr. Owen, I find, grants that he spoke after the Arian opinion about the *Logos*. If Christ's coming down from heaven and from God, note no more, as you hint, than his coming into the world and his commission from God, why are not others ever said to come down from heaven, neither prophets nor apostles; but he alone of all that were commissioned from God? 1 Cor. xv. 47. I remember not to have granted there is no proof of Christ's præexistence *à priori*, (tho' I said there might be sufficient otherwise,) for I think such texts as Col. i. 15, 16, 17, speak fair for it, in their most open sense.

But you are most stumbled at the ascribing the old creation of all to him, being incommunicably proper (say you with the Answerer) to the Supream God; and that 'tis harsh to say a man gave being to all things which the Scripture makes the proof of a Deity.⁽⁷⁾ To this I have a few things to reply. 1st. That he was not a man till he took flesh and was born of a woman; but (2nd) I say not that he is the Creator of all things, but that God created all by him, which is a⁽⁸⁾ vast difference and nicely observed by the Scripture. I suppose the power of God to be exerted thro' him in this, as in working other *miracles*. Life is the noblest part of the creation, and yet he caused it when he raised the dead, by power from God, and can he not as easily, by the same power, cause the less noble creatures? Tho' this power be given out at the Father's will, and no otherwise inherent in him than as the fullness of the Deity dwells in him, or at least than those words *John* v. 26, 28, do intend, which you must answer to as well as I. (3rd.) That he is never honoured with the title of the *Creator*, but it belongs to the Supream alone, not to the minister, (just as 'tis God's peculiar to be he who raises the dead and makes alive, 2 Cor. i. 9; it is not said of any apostles, &c., tho' they might minister in it,) so that 'tis still the Father's peculiar, and the Scriptures never speak of Christ's agency in this, but expressly as ministerial, *God by him*. (4th.) To say that by him God created all things, is no harsher in sound than that in

Eph. iii. 9, and Col. i. 15, not harsher in meaning than to say a man shall judge the world, Acts xvii. 31, tho' it be the peculiar of God to be judge of all, Heb. xii. 23. That text *Rom.* i. 20, only says⁽⁹⁾ a Deity may be proved from the created frame because it supposes a first cause, not that every one concerned in forming the parts is that first cause, but it leads at last to one that is such, because no secondary cause or instrument cou'd act without a first cause. (5th.) That his ministration in the creation gave him no such dominion or propriety as is the reward of his obedience, for which he is now made a Lord and Saviour, as the apostles became not lords over them they raised from the dead or healed. You say his being a Creator will prove his capacity in knowledge from *Ps.* xciv. 8, 9, but it will be said that text speaks of the Creator and Master-builder, not the subordinate minister, and I believe I may as well argue from your concession, Shall not he that judges all men and hearts know? which you will allow Jesus Christ to do. You say it will drive⁽¹⁰⁾ to an inferior God; I allow it if by a greater God and a lesser be meant one Supreme God and one Lord *Jesus*; 'tis just the Scripture style; and tho' *Gal.* iv. 8, speaks of the Supreme God, yet may Christ be allowed to be an inferior Elohim or Lord, *φύσει*, or in reality, in opposition to the fiction and usurpation of the Pagan dæmons, and thus there will be an infinite distinction between the one God and one Lord, which is all I am concerned to maintain. I find so great things said of Jesus Christ, that I am ready to suppose he is as great as will consist with his subjection to his Father, and I wish they had kept to the Nicene Creed, *God of God*, which never pinched the Unitarians, but only the *homousiōs* added, for that phrase will not imply the original and derivative God to be of the same kind; rather I think it is impossible they shou'd be so, as much as for God to create another God like himself. I had almost forgot to observe, that since you grant *John* i. 1, to speak of the natural creation at the beginning,⁽¹¹⁾ it will be hard to make out a transition afterwards from the natural to a mys-

tical sense, there being no appearance of an allegorical sense as in such places which you wou'd parallel with it, as *Gal.* iv. 24, &c., and as hard will it be to perswade that the *Logos* there is not a proper person, and the same with *Jesus*: to make a double transition, one from the natural to the moral creation, and another from the Divine *Logos* or wisdom to the human *Logos* or Man Christ, will be judged very violent and arbitrary, like an accommodating the text to our opinion, which will raise a great cry. If ver. 10 speak of the old world made by the *Logos*, then the 12th verse shews it was a person, and Christ too, by the phrase of believing in his name, so often said of the Son of God. I must finish with adding that my affair is just as it was, and that I am sincerely yours.

T. E.

Mr. Manning's Notes.

What is within asserted doth not indeed infer more supream Gods than one, but the Arian notion gave the rise and introduction to the owning of more than one very God, tho' the begotten God (Christ) be subordinate in his subministration, (as Dr. Fowler asserts,) and begetting a Son sounds not like the making of a creature of nothing.

But to what is returned to mine, I have yet to reply in short. (1) That tho' the Son of God, so termed, begotten of the Virgin, was not generated or made like as other men be, yet answers it nothing to my main allegation, that he was the Son of Man, and if so, his whole person was seminally in the loyns of David, *Acts* ii. 30, and to spring of such a tribe. (2) The doctrine of the origine of human souls, Adam's and all his progeny's, I think is not left to us in the darke, but 'tis that Christ generated Adam's and Eve's, or any other. (3) It appears to me that the term angel is not a bare appellative, but a name also of nature, *Heb.* xii. 22, 23, in distinction from human spirits, and that neither a beast's soul, (contrary to nature,) imbodyed in an human shape, would constitute a man, nor that the human *species* is determined only by the bodily shape. (4) Neither can I assent to it, that the *angels* of

old, appearing in human shape, and by misprision called such a while, as Judges xiii. 6, 8, 21, were truly men, nor did ever any one inform a human body. It would subvert the institutions of nature. ⁽⁵⁾ Nor admit of it readily, that an angel, much less the Creator or Maker of them all, should, if incorporated, be divested of the use of his memory and reason, to grow up to it by time and exercise, all anew and at full age to need still the Holy Spirit's endowment, John iii. 34, Isa. xi. 2, 3, whom he made. No angel appearing in human shape ever was divested of the use of his faculties, good nor bad spirit. Neither to remember any thing past with him, to lose his knowledge, that never came in by *sensation*.

⁽⁶⁾ Mr. Nye* has confuted Sandius's fathering upon Philo the Jew, the assertion of the Logos, (or Word, Joh. i. 1,) a person being instrumental in the old creation, and denies that any Jew ever affirmed it of the archangel superintendent over it, much less of the Messiah then existent. And for the term coming down from heaven, (a criticism,) it may import no more than John viii. 23, 2 Cor. xii. 3, &c., no local removal, tho' so from heaven as no other ever was, John viii. 42.

⁽⁷⁾ True it is, that the same is no little stick with me. That *Gods* made the world (a plural) we read Gen. i. 1. So of our Makers, Job xxxv. 10, and Creators too, Eccles. xii. 1. What made our translators flinch from the so rendering it then, if it ought so to be believed, or what curse should follow it? Jer. x. 11. The thing is true ac-

* This is the Mr. N. mentioned in Mr. Manning's answer to the letter of December 23rd, an eminent Nonconformist divine who, in 1633, fled into Holland to avoid the persecution of Laud; on the change of affairs he returned to England, and, 1643, was sent with the commissioners into Scotland. He was one of the boldest and ablest advocates of Independency, and in 1658 was one of the principal managers in the assembly of the Congregational Churches. After the Restoration he was ejected from the rectory of St. Bartholomew, and preached privately to a congregation of Dissenters till his death, 1672.

H. R. B.

cording to the Arian hypothesis, and of easy conception too. ⁽⁸⁾ But then why belongs not the title of Creator as well to Christ? Is not Christ said to work miracles himself, as well as God by him, John iii. 11, iv. 54, simply without that distinction, John xii. 1, &c.? But to quicken the dead, 2 Kings viii. 5, Acts xx. 9, is no simple *creation*, so John v. 21, requiring a greater (not less as you suggest) power to it. Whence 'tis the appropriate style of God alone expressly said, *per se*, Isa. xlv. 24, &c.; not so to raise the dead nor to judge the world, John v. 22, Acts x. 42, 2 Cor. v. 10, &c.; 'tis no peculiar of his; nor any effect or operation at all, if that of the creation be not incommunicable. While too the creation of the heavens and the earth (the common epithet of the old creation) is no where attributed to Christ in any sense at all, but of angels. ⁽⁹⁾ For that text, Rom. i. 20, 25: If Christ be the immediate efficient, the Creator and Builder of *all things*, Heb. iii. 4, how then is God contradistinguished from him by those titles, and Christ never applied unto by them, as Acts iv. 24? Why claims he not that style as well as that of Lord and Saviour? His efficiency being in nothing but ministerial all, no first cause, and Ps. xciv. 8, 9, is an argument *à fortiori*, and more than to know *some things* only as you assert of him that made *all things*, and if so must needs be capable of *inspecting* them equally; and no title of superiority, tho' subordinate, can have an higher spring than what is founded in giving being to any one, if but secondary in it. Is. x. 12.

⁽¹¹⁾ Neither did I grant, that I know of, that John i. 1, treats of the natural creation. I said that the old translation bespeaks the Logos impersonal, but that John, alluding only to the first creation in speaking to another subject-matter, uses the same term of a person, *viz.* applying it to Christ, the *word* or wisdom too of God. 1 Cor. i. 24, as of old is spoken of the *fiat* or divine command, nor doth John i. coincide with Gen. i. 'Tis God here, the Logos there, and not God by him. ⁽¹⁰⁾ But the close falls in with much of my thoughts what the Arian notion will at last issue in, (*viz.*) two Gods, Creators or Makers of the heavens

and the earth, tho' not coequal, (that dropt in after, and Nestorius took it up of God the Son as well as Eutyches,) God in some sense by *nature*, very God of very God, saith the Nicene Creed, before it comes to the *consubstantial*, not after it, neither asserting the coeternity or coequality so early, at which you also stick, as also at the one essence or *substance*, whether in number or *kind*, denying the omniscience of Christ *de facto*, but owning the omnipotence of the derivative God Christ Jesus, as John v. 26, tho' not *à se*, as ver. 30; a creative power speaks it, as having nothing beyond it attributed to the Supreme God to demonstrate his power in. And why may he not be as well omniscient too at the Father's will, as well *know* as *do* all that God the Father can do? Dr. Fowler holds that God can and may beget his kind, yet dependent on and inferior to the begetter, tho' of the same nature. You will not positively say how or of what Christ was originated, only that he is not of the same kind with the Father, nor proceeding from him as an eternal necessary emanation, but was voluntarily begotten. I should not contest with Dr. Fowler, if but of your mind so far in all the rest.

By denotes oft the principal efficient and the sole too, Rom. xi. 26, Col. i. 16, 1 Cor. i. 9.

The sun too communicates life to animals, or vivifies disposed matter capable of it, in the course of nature. Sine Deo nihil is true, but is it so sine Christo? Or that the operation of the second cause doth denominate him distinct or conjunctly, as to creation, Providence, or any efficiency?

SIR,

IN my former letter, (pp. 15—20,) I have shewn that the text of the three Heavenly Witnesses is a summary of the evidences for the divine mission and simple humanity of Christ, in opposition to the Gnostics, who maintained his divinity. The design of the text lies on the surface of the whole Epistle; and must inevitably have been known to all men in the first and succeeding centuries. The advocates for the divine nature of the Saviour, such as the Greek and Latin fathers were, had therefore a

powerful motive either to suppress the verse altogether, or to represent it in a modified or mutilated state.

The text of the three Heavenly Witnesses, newly modified and mutilated, is the *foundation*, and the *only* foundation, of the Trinity. There are, indeed, passages which have been alleged, as favouring the deity of Christ and his unity with the Father; but Trinitarians never have referred, nor ever can refer, to a single place throughout the whole New Testament, which could even suggest the idea, not to say countenance or prove, the doctrine of three persons in one essence, besides the controverted verse. And it is to this same verse that the very name of Trinity (Trinitas, Tri-unitas, three in unity) owes its existence.

Such was the genius of Heathenism that its votaries, when fully assured of the miracles of Jesus, irresistibly inferred that he was a supernatural being. The early Greek and Latin fathers, on emerging from the Pagan superstition, were strongly tinctured with the same predilection. They knew that the Gnostics had formed the artful scheme of destroying Christianity by insisting on the divinity of its Founder. They knew also that the apostles gave to this scheme the most decided opposition: but their early prejudices flattered them into the belief, that the Gnostic creed, if modified and cleared of its most offensive parts, might be made an instrument to remove the scandal of the cross, and induce the Heathen world to embrace a divine Saviour in the person of the crucified Jesus. This would be to combat the prince of darkness with his own weapons, which might be thrown aside as soon as he should be defeated, or the end of this pious fraud accomplished by the universal establishment of the gospel. The disputed text itself readily suggested the modification required, and thus became the basis of a system which it was the immediate object of its author to overthrow.

The Gnostics distinguished between Jesus and the divinity within him, and withal represented that divinity as not only independent of the Creator, but directly opposite to him in character and object. These impostors had their Trinity: it consisted of the unknown

God, revealed by them, of the God which descended on the man Jesus, and of another principle, which in derision they called *Wisdom, Truth, or the Mother of all things*. The reformers of Gnosticism rejected this fiction, with the exception of the divinity of Christ, and gave to this divinity the name of *Logos*, making him thereby one with the Father. Thus far they were countenanced by the Gospel of John; and only one step more was necessary to complete the scheme. The whole strength of the antichristian teachers was levelled against the Holy Ghost or the Spirit of God, which animated the holy Jesus during his ministry, and afterwards descended on his apostles, enabling them to work miracles, and thus to prove his divine mission and simple humanity. To answer their end, the reformers had only to make the Holy Ghost, like the *Logos*, a real being, and then assert his unity with the Father and the Son. The text in the Epistle of John seemed thus far to be their guide; and they had only to interpret the clause, "These three are one," to mean unity of *essence* and not unity of *consent* or *testimony*, to make their system complete. By this interpretation the words of the Apostle were diverted from their original object, without any apparent violence; and the supporters of the new-fangled Trinity had the strongest possible motive to quote the verse in support of their new system. But the original design of the Apostle was natural and obvious; and the abettors of the scheme could not dare to produce the very passage on which it was founded, without the certainty of immediate explosion. What then was to be done? The reformers had powerful inducements to repress the text, and they had inducements equally powerful to cite it, or their doctrine might appear a baseless fabric. What, I again ask, was to be done? The advocates of the Trinity at first, when the danger was most imminent, were compelled to be silent, to *refer* only to the disputed text, and *suppose* its notoriety, its authenticity and its purport in their favour. Then, as the danger diminished with the lapse of time, they felt themselves free to quote it, but quote it in part, and that part only which, detached from the

rest, favoured their interpretation, thus carefully guarding the system, as a serpent does its head, against being crushed under the broad and ponderous foot of Unitarianism. Now, the clauses in the disputed text and its context, fatal to the Trinitarian faith, are the two following: the representation of the Father, Word and Holy Spirit *as three witnesses*, and the clause in the eighth verse, which explains the unity asserted in the seventh to be unity of *consent* or *testimony*. For if it be asked, as it is natural to do, What were they witnesses of, or what did they bear testimony to? The whole Epistle supplies the answer, That Jesus is the Christ or the Son of God. The testimony of the Father in the beginning of the Gospel answers, That Jesus is the beloved Son of God. The *Logos* of God, which became flesh, answers, That Jesus is the Son of God. The descent of the Holy Spirit on the apostles answers, That Jesus is the Christ, now sitting at the right hand of God. And if it be further asked, In what respect are these three witnesses *one*? The testimony which each gives supplies the true answer, that they are *one in consent*: and the same answer is given by the clause in the next verse, which says, that they "agree in one." We are then to expect that these clauses, one or both of them, should, as much as possible, be kept out of sight by the ancient advocates of the Trinity, whenever they notice this celebrated text. I propose next to examine briefly their writings without much regard to the order of time.

Porson, in his Letters to Travis, p. 155, gives the following quotation: "Abbot Joachim compared the final clauses of the seventh and eighth verses, whence he inferred, that the same expression ought to be interpreted in the same manner. Since, therefore, said he, nothing more than unity of testimony and consent can be meant by *tres unum sunt*, in the eighth verse, nothing more than unity of testimony and consent is meant in the seventh. This opinion the Lateran Council and Thomas confuted, *by cutting out* the clause in the eighth verse. Thomas tells us that it was not extant in the true copies; but that it was said to have been added by the Arian heresies, to

pervert the sound understanding of the foregoing authority.

This Abbot Joachim was an Arian: and he here at once puts a torch in our hand to guide us through the intricate windings of this subterraneous controversy. The verse pressed as hard against the Arians, as against those who denied the pre-existence of Christ. And how does this champion of Arianism repel its force? By denying its genuineness? By pleading its absence from MSS. and versions? No; he admits its authenticity, and meets his antagonists by pointing out the true sense of the verse. And how did Thomas Aquinas answer? In a way which fully accounts for the silence of the more early fathers, and for the erasure of the text from manuscripts and translations: They cut out the clause which led to the true understanding of the verse.

The venerable Bede flourished in the eighth century: this monk wrote a commentary on the canonical epistles: and we are given to understand, on high authorities, that he was a total stranger to the verse in question.—“If any person,” says Professor Porson, “will read through Bede’s commentary on the fifth chapter, he must see, unless he be wilfully blind, that Bede was totally ignorant of the seventh verse.” After this the Quarterly Reviewer adds, No. LXV, p. 86, “If any one fact may be assumed, as certainly established in this controversy, it is, that Bede was unacquainted with the seventh verse.” Griesbach, in his note on the place, asserts, without any qualification, that the verse did not exist in Bede’s copies. It is fortunate for the interest of truth, that men of high reputation, in the plenitude of their confidence or self-importance, are apt in an unguarded hour to say something that necessarily exposes them to ridicule and contempt. By this means the spell that dazzles the generality of readers is broken, authority loses its undue influence, and error is forced to give way, when, through caprice, prejudice or interest, it is supported by great names. Bede had the verse before him, and in part comments upon it: I appeal for this to Bede himself, and his own commentary shall decide the question. Bede, it is true, does not quote the

verse altogether, nor at all in its proper place. But it is a known fact, that the verse, for reasons which I shall explain, was often transposed and made to succeed what ought to follow it. In the true place of the text, Bede has these memorable words: *Taceant blasphemi, qui hunc phantasma esse dogmatizant. Pereat de terra memoria eorum, qui eum vel deum vel hominem esse verum dene-gant.* “Let the blasphemers become dumb who dogmatize that he (Jesus) was a phantom: let the memory of those perish from the earth who deny either that he was a real God or a real man.”

Now, reader, look back to my former letter, and see what I have there established. It is this, that the Apostle wrote the disputed verse against certain impostors who, to sink Christianity in Heathenism, taught that the founder was a man only in appearance. Bede, then, so far from not knowing the verse, knew that it was written for the purpose which I now state; otherwise, how came he, in the very place of it, to use the words, *Taceant blasphemi, qui hunc phantasma esse dogmatizant?* According to the interpretation of the orthodox, and of Bede in the number, John, in the seventh verse, teaches the divinity of Christ; in the eighth, that of his real humanity. But, in my views, the seventh verse is but a summary of the evidences of his divine mission, and of his simple humanity, against a set of artful deceivers who taught that he was a God, and these were the views of all the Unitarians in ancient times, whom Bede here so heartily curses with the Gnostics—“Perish from the earth the memory of those who deny him to be either real God or real man.”

The clause *ἐν τῇ γῇ* of the eighth verse, points to *ἐν τῇ ἐραυῇ* of the seventh, and by consequence supposes the genuineness of the whole verse. Accordingly, the adversaries of the disputed text impugn the authenticity of *ἐν τῇ γῇ*, or *in terra*, and Griesbach has not scrupled to put it out of his text. “The truth is,” says the Quarterly Reviewer, “that not a single manuscript can be produced wanting the seventh verse, and also reading *ἐν τῇ γῇ* of the eighth.” If this be true,

the converse of it must be true, namely, that the manuscript which contained this clause of the eighth verse, contained also the seventh verse. On the Reviewer's own principle, then, the disputed text was in the copy of Bede; for he thus quotes the eighth verse: *Quoniam tres sunt qui testimonium dant in terra, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis.*

After commenting on these words, Bede returns to the seventh; and having quoted it in substance, he thus subjoins his comment upon it: *Tres sunt qui testimonium perhibent veritati. Et tres (inquit) unum sunt individua, namque hæc manent nihil que eorum a sui connectione sejungitur; quare nec sine vera credenda est humanitate divinitas, nec sine vera divinitate humanitas: that is, "There are three who bear testimony to the truth: and the three" (says John) "are one: for these remain indivisible; and none of them is separated from what is connected with itself: wherefore, neither the divine is to be believed in without the real human nature, nor the human nature without the real divine."* Now it must appear, beyond all contradiction, that here is cited the seventh verse, with Bede's own comment upon it. In the seventh verse the Apostle mentions the three witnesses, or those who bear testimony in heaven; in the eighth he mentions the three witnesses on earth. Bede, as I have already noticed, inverts the order, as was often done for the purpose of disguise; and having adverted on the three earthly witnesses, *Tres sunt qui testimonium dant in terra*, he resumes the three heavenly witnesses, and says of them, *Tres sunt qui testimonium perhibent veritati.* Farther, it is observable that Bede has omitted the dangerous clause of the eighth, *ὅτι τρεῖς εἰς ἓν εἰσι*, and

quotes that of the seventh, *καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν εἰσι*. "Et tres unum sunt." Finally, the Apostle, according to the Trinitarians, in the seventh verse bears testimony to the true divinity of Christ; in the eighth, to his true humanity. This was Bede's notion; and hence he says, *Tres sunt qui testimonium perhibent veritati*, that is, to his true nature both as God and man. *Individua namque hæc manent, nihil que eorum a sui connectione sejungitur; quare nec sine vera credenda est humanitate divinitas, nec sine vera divinitate humanitas:* which is as though he had said, "The seventh and eighth verses are inseparably connected, and the former, which asserts the divine nature of Christ, is not to be taken without the eighth, which asserts his real humanity."

Now, reader, reflect on the unqualified declaration of Porson, Griesbach and the Quarterly Reviewer. And what shall we say of them? After this detection, it is scarcely possible for the fondest devotee to give them implicit credence. But I will pursue them through all the mazes of the controversy, will not only defeat, but strip them naked, and leave not a shred of argument to cover them. Such are their arts, their lofty confidence in themselves, and their contemptuous treatment of their adversaries, that they deserve no quarter, and shall have none. As critics and theologians they are guilty of sin against the Holy Ghost, against the hallowed spirit of Truth: and, in return, the violated laws of truth demand that, instead of being forgiven, they should be sacrificed on the public altar, as victims to appease the manes of the murdered text.

BEN DAVID.

SIR,

HAVING in my possession a manuscript which may throw some light on a subject now under discussion in your valuable Repository, i. e. the Proem to John's Gospel, I send a copy of it to you, requesting that it may be inserted in your next number, if you can conveniently find a place for it. It was written about the middle of the last century by a respectable and learned Dissenting minister, who was shortly after called, at an advanced age, to enjoy the reward of his pious and useful labours in a better state of existence.

X. Y. Z.

DEAR SIR,

Having given you some imperfect hints of *my notion of the Word*, I shall now take the liberty to explain myself more fully on that point, whereby you will have a sketch of my Scripture theology, which I have never yet imparted to one single person on earth, but am willing to communicate it to *you*, on account both of your known candour and acute penetration; submitting it to your impartial examination, and expecting from you such remarks as may serve either to confirm or overthrow it; for *that* is quite indifferent to me, as I have no other aim but *truth*. In order to this, I must begin with a paraphrase of St. John's preamble, which is not only the foundation of my system, but I take it to be a summary view of revealed religion, or a history of all God's dispensations from the beginning of the world to the coming of Christ, comparing it with the first and second verses of John's first Epistle, where Christ is called *λογος ζωης*, and *ζωην αιωνιον*, the reasons of which will be seen in the Paraphrase.

Ver. 1. In the *beginning* was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

2. The same was in the beginning with God.

3. All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made.

4. In him was life, and the life was the light of men.

5. And the light shined in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not.

6. There was a man sent from God, whose name was John.

7. The same came for a witness to bear witness of the light, that all men through him might believe.

8. He was not that light, but was sent to bear witness of that light.

9. *That* was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.

10. He was in the world, and the world was made by him, but the world knew him not.

11. And he came unto his own, and his own received him not.

12. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name.

13. Which were born not of blood, nor of the

1. The reason why God did not make the world sooner was not for want of power, for the same Word that made it was from the beginning, and always with God, yea, God himself was that very Word.

2 and 3. But however in the beginning it subsisted within himself till he thought fit to give forth his order, and exerted that all-powerful Word by which the heavens and earth were formed, and without which nothing could ever have existed.

4. Now this Word is to be considered as the grand support of the whole creation, natural and moral; not only the source of all being, motion and life, of all beauty, order and harmony in the one, but the invariable rule of truth, of action and of happiness in the other, the life and the light of men.

5. Though this light for many ages shined in so much darkness, (which is always the character of the Heathen state,) that very few discerned it.

6 and 7. But the time drew on when God intended to make a more clear discovery of the same, and John was the person to introduce it to the world.

8 and 9. Not that he was the Word himself, but sent only to open a way for it, which was not to commence till John had ended his ministry, and was from thenceforth to lighten all men, both Jews and Gentiles, that should hereafter exist in the world.

10. Indeed, as I said before, it had been in the world from the beginning of the creation, which was the workmanship of this Word, and men were inexcusable in shutting their eyes against it.

11. And, therefore, God utterly disregarded them for a season, but, at the same time, to preserve his name and authority in the world, God was pleased to make choice of a particular people as his own, amongst whom the Word was to reside in a peculiar manner, and yet even these, in process of time, rejected him likewise.

12 and 13. Not but that God had a seed amongst them who cheerfully submitted to him, and who thereby secured to themselves the inestimable blessings of his people; I mean of such as were his real children, not by natural descent, nor merely by the rite of circumcision or by proselytism, but by a divine and heavenly birth, or a voluntary choice of God for their Father.

will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.

14. And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.

Ver. 15th was omitted.

16. And of his fulness have we all received, and grace for grace.

17. For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.

14. And thus at last was prepared the way for the most extraordinary manifestation of the Word that ever the world beheld, as a living word, a speaking rule, a standing oracle of truth and life to all ages; appearing in the form of a man, tabernacling among us under the character of the only-begotten of the Father, with full power to impart the will and counsel of God, and all the most valuable fruits of his favour and grace.

16 and 17. *Ελαβμεν* signifies for the most part the time past, and also sometimes a continuance of the same action. I choose to render it thus: And it is from the fulness of authority, of wisdom and power residing in this Word, that all the prophets and divine messengers from the beginning, and myself in particular, have received our commission, and the *χαρις*, some in one kind, and some in another, differing both in the nature of our message and the extent of our commission, according to various times and circumstances, and according to the proportion of the trust and measure of favour God saw fit to bestow upon us; for as *χαρις* is often put for *χαρισμα*, and as *αντι* generally signifies, in proportion, the words may be literally translated thus: Of his fulness we have all received favour, in proportion to the trust committed to us. Thus, ver. 9, the commission of Moses was limited to the giving the law, which, though the highest trust that had been given to any man at that time, yet was nothing in comparison to that important trust that was to be executed by Jesus Christ, the true Word of God, that was to display all the fulness of God's truth and favour to the view of the whole world. All the numerous commentators that I consulted on this place, I found so full of darkness and confusion, or of force and violence, that I a long time utterly despaired of ever understanding it, till one day those words of St. John came accidentally into my mind, Rev. xix. 13, "He shall be called the *Word of God*," whence I immediately concluded that the term *Logos* was nothing but a name that was to be given to Christ on account of the character he was to sustain, and the office he was to discharge as the Messenger and Representative of the Father. And by applying this key, every difficulty vanished; and upon many repeated and careful reviews, the whole passage appears to me so natural and easy, and in all respects so consistent with itself, that I flatter myself it must be the right. But that which has above all other things confirmed me in these sentiments, is, that it not only appears congruous and agreeable to the whole tenor of the Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament, but that it also opens the whole scheme of God's counsels to our view; and enables the mind to apprehend the beauty and harmony of all the Divine dispensations from the beginning of the world to the final consummation of all things, in the clearest light. And this is what I should now proceed to explain and lay before you. But as this will require more time and leisure than I can at present afford, I shall refer it to a future epistle.

The author dying soon after, this promised future epistle was probably never written, as no trace of it could be found by his family amongst the papers he left, which were all carefully examined.

Violation of the Principle of the Bible Society by the Calcutta Bible Association.

[From "The Unitarian Repository and Christian Miscellany," for April, 1824, No. VII.—"Calcutta: printed at the Unitarian Press, price One Rupee."]

WE have seen it remarked somewhere, that a good thing is liable to be abused just in proportion to its goodness; that the more important any truth, it is the more liable to be obscured by error; the purer any system, it is the more likely to be corrupted by foreign admixtures; and the more excellent any institution, the greater is the probability that it will be turned from its original design. What truth, for instance, can be more important than the being of a God? And yet, as Warburton has remarked in his *Divine Legation of Moses*, it has been productive of all the mischiefs of superstition. What system can be purer than that which was taught and established by Christ and his apostles? And yet some of the corruptions to which it has given occasion, almost sink below the very dregs of Heathenism. What institution can be more excellent than the Bible Society? And yet we fear that proofs might be adduced that its primary object has sometimes been lost sight of, and the catholic spirit which it professes, frequently violated.

Our attention has been forcibly drawn to this subject by the perusal of the Second Report of the Calcutta Bible Association just published. This Report has afforded us much pleasure mixed with some pain. We are gratified to observe the growing interest taken by the Christian inhabitants of Calcutta in the object of the Bible Society; but we are grieved to notice those indications of a sectarian spirit in its conductors, of which this Report presents condemning evidence. We are aware that in thus publicly expressing our sentiments on so tender a subject, our motives will probably be misunderstood, and perhaps our object misrepresented: the task we impose on ourselves will certainly be thankless, and must appear ungracious. These considerations, however, will not deter us from performing what we conceive to be our duty to the Christian public by using our ut-

most endeavours to rescue this Society from being made the tool of a party, or to make it stand forth before the public in its true character. Mr. Burke has said, "I like a clamour whenever there is an abuse. The fire-bell at midnight disturbs your sleep, but it keeps you from being burned in your bed. The hue and cry alarms the county, but it preserves all the property of the province." It is not our intention to raise a clamour, to ring the fire-bell, or to send forth a hue and cry; but we do mean most solemnly to protest against the perversion of an Institution which should be as catholic and comprehensive in its spirit, as it is generous and philanthropic in its design.

Before proceeding farther, we will briefly explain what we conceive to be the peculiar excellency of the Bible Society. The primary object of all Bible Societies is no doubt the same as that stated in the Rules and Regulations of the Calcutta Association, viz. "the circulation of the Holy Scriptures, without note or comment."

"The circulation of the Holy Scriptures" is an object which must recommend itself to the heart and understanding of every philanthropist. Even if placed, in point of authority, merely on a level with human compositions, the Scriptures constantly exhibit views so important, so just, and so salutary, of our relations to God and to each other, that they cannot but be considered a powerful means of moral and religious improvement. But when we regard them, as they deserve to be regarded, as the only genuine and authentic records of those successive revelations of his will which God has granted to mankind for their guidance and comfort—to direct their steps on earth and to raise their hopes to heaven—in this case, they acquire so great a value, and must exercise so mighty and beneficial an influence, that it becomes the imperious duty of every sincere Christian to extend the knowledge of them to the utmost of his power.

Bible Societies have not only declared that the circulation of the Holy Scriptures shall be the chief object of their institution, but also that they shall be circulated "without note or comment." The mere circulation of

the Holy Scriptures does not distinguish the Bible Society from other societies. The Bartlett's Building Society, which existed long before the Bible Society was heard of, circulate the Holy Scriptures; but then it is Dr. Mant's Bible which they circulate, containing notes and comments in abundance, and such notes and comments as in their general tendency can be approved only by members of the Church of England, nor even by all of them, but only by such members of the Church as give to the Liturgy and Articles as well as to the Bible an Arminian, and not a Calvinistic, interpretation. Again, the London Unitarian Society for the promotion of Christian Knowledge, which was formed twelve or thirteen years before the Bible Society existed, circulate the Holy Scriptures; but then it is the Improved Version which they circulate, to which, in like manner, are appended numerous notes and comments, principally intended to prove and illustrate the distinguishing tenets of that denomination. It is not, therefore, in the circulation of the Scriptures, but in the circulation of them *without note or comment*, that the peculiar excellency of the Bible Society consists; and in whatever point of view this restriction may be considered, it reflects the highest honour on those by whom it was originally adopted. It was a dictate of the wisest policy, for it secured the co-operation and support of the various sects of Christians, who, however much they may differ in the modes of interpretation they adopt, or the results to which they come, yet all agree in acknowledging the truth of the Scriptures, and in appealing to them as the ultimate authority in questions both of faith and practice. It displayed a truly catholic spirit; for it shewed that the object of the Bible Society was to promote, not the exclusive interests of any particular denomination, but the general interests of Christianity, by multiplying the copies of that book which is the universally acknowledged standard both of its doctrines and its precepts. It was calculated to prove eminently beneficial in its effects; for its manifest tendency was to lead Christians to forget their mutual differences and animosities in the promotion of a

common object as important in itself as it was dear to them all. Other societies are formed to subserve the interests of some particular church or sect or party: the Bible Society acknowledges no church or sect or party more than another, but receives all alike within its wide embrace. The publications of the former will sometimes express sentiments of which only those of the same denomination can approve: those of the latter should contain nothing with which every Christian may not cordially sympathize.

If these views of the Bible Society are correct—and we appeal to the constant and uniform professions of its friends for their correctness—then it follows that doctrinal sentiments do not form the proper bond of union between its members; that to inculcate the doctrinal sentiments of one denomination in opposition to those of another, is no part of its original object; and that to misrepresent the opinions and characters of those who belong to that other denomination, is not only foreign to its purpose, but utterly opposed to it, and calculated to abridge its usefulness by introducing endless divisions among its supporters.

Such, we conceive, is the tendency of some of the statements contained in the Second Report of the Calcutta Bible Association now before us, which we shall endeavour to prove by a few extracts. The first passage to which we would request the attention of our readers is contained in pp. 14, 15:

“The associations into which Christians of all communions, formerly so widely separated from each other, have now entered for promoting unitedly the universal diffusion and study of the Scriptures, seem to be the means by which God intends to unite all believers in the faith and practice of the one divine religion, notwithstanding the multifariousness of communions, which, being formed by men, cannot but be differently formed, as to their outward appearance. At least it has been abundantly proved, by indubitable facts, that the Bible Society forms a principal centre of union, productive of Christian respect and love, (which is infinitely more than cold-hearted, passive toleration,) in which members

of all Christian communions, acknowledging each other as professors of one religion, can meet together in peace as friends, as brethren, as being all of the same mind in every essential point, and engage with one accord to glorify that one God and Saviour revealed in the sacred Scriptures, to know him as the way, the truth, and the life, and to trust in the crucified God-man, as our propitiation and peace with God, both in the course of our life and in the hour of death."

The above is part of an extract from a circular addressed by the Rev. Dr. Leander Van Ess, a Roman Catholic Clergyman in Germany, "to all Bible Societies throughout the world;" and in the present instance, "to all Bible Committees in the East." The whole of the circular, translated from the German, is contained in the Appendix, and the extract from which the above quotation is taken, is introduced into the body of the Report by the Committee, who "hail with delight, as a highly auspicious sign of the times, the public utterance of such truly Christian and Catholic sentiments;" and who "confidently hope that this lovely spirit will increasingly prevail, that true believers of all denominations will more and more approximate to each other, both in a mutual reciprocation of love and affection, and in a co-operation of Christian labours."

We are at a loss what language to adopt in remarking upon these extracts, which contain at once *professions* of the most unbounded liberality, and *proofs* of a narrow party spirit. The writer of this circular, and the authors of this Report, could not be ignorant that all Unitarian Christians, including those in Calcutta, several of whose names we observe in the list of contributors and members, consider the compound phrase, a "God-man," as a solecism in language; the being it is intended to describe as impossible in fact, not less than absurd in idea; and the doctrine which it involves as not only unscriptural and Heathenish in its origin, but as anti-biblical and anti-christian in its tendency. Yet "the crucified God-man" is the phrase employed, in an official communication, by this accredited agent and correspondent of the Parent Society, and a belief in this doctrine is represented

as one of the links of that chain "by which the Bible Societies have united the great family of Christians." Nor is this all. It is these sentiments, containing such a gross and palpable violation of the fundamental principle and comprehensive spirit of the Bible Society, that are pronounced by the Committee of the Calcutta Association to be "truly Christian and Catholic." It is the utterance of these sentiments that is hailed with delight "as a highly auspicious sign of the times." And it is the "lovely spirit" they display which, it is confidently hoped, "will increasingly prevail." We do not at present object to this language, considered in itself, but as being wholly unsuitable to the character and professions of the Institution that adopts it. To meet with it in a Church, or Independent, or Baptist *Missionary* Report would neither surprise nor offend us: but to give place to such language in a *Bible Society* Report is to prostitute to sectarian purposes an Institution which claims, and deserves, and, but for this and similar deviations from its principles, would obtain, the universal suffrages of Christians. We do not, therefore, consider that we are unreasonable in demanding either that the Calcutta Bible Association shall publicly avow that it has been formed for the express purpose of propagating Trinitarian and Calvinistic doctrines; or that in its future proceedings and Reports it shall refrain from the use of language which many Christians, and even some who have liberally contributed to its funds, can regard in no other light than as an attack upon the denomination to which they belong.

It will perhaps be replied that Unitarians are not reckoned among those "true believers of all denominations" who, it is confidently hoped, "will more and more approximate to each other," and that, therefore, no defence is due to their scruples, no compromise is to be made with their errors. It is to be hoped that bigotry and uncharitableness have not gained so firm a footing in Calcutta as such a defence would imply; but if such a defence should be made, it would at once determine the real character of the Calcutta Bible Association. Unitarians, indeed, might urge that, if they chose to imitate a bad example,

they could with as great ease and justice deny the Christian name or character to Trinitarians, as Trinitarians deny it to them. But such recriminations would place them too much on a level with those whose principles and spirit they disapprove, and would lead, only by a more unpleasant course, to a result rendered previously necessary, viz. the entire withdrawal of their subscriptions and support from an Association which has so far lost sight of its proper object as to erect itself into a tribunal of faith and conscience. But we again say that we hope better things, and that although nothing can be advanced to justify the language we have quoted, yet that in future the practice of the Association will more fully come up to its professions.

The next passage worthy of notice is contained in the Appendix, No. II. p. 20 :

“He has a pretty correct idea of the principles of our blessed religion : but there are certain doctrines which he yet stumbles at, such as the Trinity. This, however, should not surprise us, for there are many among us even, to whom it is ‘a rock of offence and a stone of stumbling.’ On the other hand, he invariably admits of the justice of God, and begins to stagger at the idea of a sinner’s being saved merely on the score of mercy.”

The Rev. D. Schmid, one of the Secretaries of the Calcutta Bible Association, addressed a circular to the Missionaries in which they “were requested to communicate any facts respecting the readiness of the natives to receive the Scriptures which might fall under their experience, and any instances wherein the copies distributed appeared productive of spiritual good.” The above is an extract from that one of the only two communications he received in reply, which, as “being of a particularly pleasing nature,” is inserted in the Appendix. The person referred to in it, is described as a respectable Moghul inquirer into the merits of Christianity.

It is evidently quite within the province of a Bible Secretary to inquire of Missionaries “respecting the readiness of the natives to receive the Scriptures,” because “the circulation of the Scriptures” is the express object for which Bible Societies are in-

stituted. But the *interpretation* of the Scriptures is no part of that object : on the contrary, it is in direct terms disavowed, and therefore the Bible Secretary seems to have forgotten both to whom he was writing and in what character he wrote, when he requested to be informed by the Missionaries of “any instances wherein the copies distributed appeared productive of spiritual good.” How could a Missionary reply to such an inquiry without exhibiting his own peculiar views of the *sense* of Scripture? What one Missionary reckons *spiritual* good, another may reckon *spiritual* evil. Of this we have an example in the extract that has been quoted. The writer represents a respectable Moghul inquirer as unhappily objecting to the doctrine of the Trinity, and erroneously seeking to be saved “merely on the score of mercy.” Now, if the Secretary’s circular had been addressed to a Unitarian Missionary, and if he had happened to meet with the same Moghul inquirer, how different the statements his reply would have contained ! He would have expressed to the Bible Secretary the pleasure he had experienced in conversing with a respectable Mussulman who was willing to receive and read the Scriptures, and who had no other objection to Christianity except what was created by the doctrine of the Trinity—an objection which of course was at once removed, by informing him that this was no doctrine of Christianity, but a gross and palpable corruption of one of its fundamental principles. He would also, no doubt, have stated the gratification which he had received from observing his truly Christian state of mind, since he professed to hope for salvation, not through his own merits, or through the merits of any other being, but simply and entirely through the undeserved and unpurchased mercy of God. Would a reply containing these or similar statements have been admitted into the Appendix, and referred to with approbation in the Report? Such a reply would certainly have been of a much more “pleasing nature,” in the estimation of some of the subscribers, than that actually communicated. But no. The Bible Secretary, and Committee, and Association, would, at a single glance, have per-

ceived that all this was exceedingly irrelevant to the object of a Bible Society. Why can they not, with equal clearness, perceive that what is written *in favour* of the Trinity, &c., is just as irrelevant to that object as what is written *against* it?

One more remark on this extract. The writer of the letter affirms, that "there are many among *us* even, to whom it (the Trinity) is 'a rock of offence and a stone of stumbling.'" The language of prophecy here quoted is used by the apostles of Christ in reference to those Jews who rejected Jesus as the Messiah: it would be difficult to say in what sense it is here employed. If it is used by this writer in the same sense in which the apostles used it, and if, therefore, the "many" spoken of are those who reject Christianity altogether, then how serious the responsibility of those who support a doctrine which, not only its enemies contend, is unscriptural and unreasonable, but which even its friends admit is attended with the most fatal consequences in driving "many" into infidelity! But if the language here employed is meant only to describe those *Christians* who reject the Trinity, then, whilst we are glad to learn from such a quarter that there are so "many" of this description, we can consider it in no other light than as holding up this confessedly numerous class of fellow-Christians to public odium, and that too where all party distinctions should be unknown, and all party feelings banished.

The only other passage upon which we will stop to animadvert is an explanatory note by the translator of Dr. Van Ess's circular, already mentioned, found in the Appendix, No. III., p. 22. The Catholic Professor having expressed his hope that those Protestant Christians who differ from each other *in more than external matters* will reunite themselves to the one God and Saviour revealed in the Bible, his translator explains this rather obscure phrase in the following manner:—

"He alludes here to the prevalence of Socinian and Deistical principles in Germany among such as call themselves Protestants."

If this is a just interpretation of the allusion, and we see no reason to

question it, then it is one other proof that the zeal for which this Roman Catholic clergyman has been so much lauded in Bible Society Reports is directed not merely to the dissemination of the Scriptures, the only legitimate object of Bible Societies, but also to the spread of his own peculiar views of the Christian system. We would be the last to do any thing to prevent him from using his utmost endeavours in diffusing what he believes to be divine truth; but we think that these endeavours would be more honourable to himself if they were not made under the covert of the Bible Society's name, and in the character of a Bible Society agent; and that the Bible Society, if it would secure to the Christian world the entire and unalloyed advantages which it is fitted to impart, should discourage in those whom it aids every such aberration from its genuine principles and spirit.

But it is with the Translator of Van Ess's circular, whom we understand to be the Rev. D. Schmid, and with the Association which has incorporated his explanatory note into its Report, that we are at present principally concerned. The language of the circular was sufficiently general to have escaped the notice of most readers, and, therefore, to rescue this hidden allusion from neglect, and to give full point to its sectarian meaning, the Translator, a Bible Society Secretary, must needs append a note which contains as much misrepresentation on the one hand, and concession on the other, as could reasonably be expected in so brief a notice. We happen to know a little more of the state of religion in Germany than can be learned from this note; but let us suppose that we know nothing more than it informs us. What then is the amount of the information we receive? We are told that there is a "prevalence" of certain principles in Germany "among such as call themselves Protestants." It is admitted, then, that those who have embraced the principles referred to are *numerous*, and that they profess to be *Christians*, PROTESTANT *Christians*. These are very plain and important concessions. And in what way is this numerous body of Protestant Christians described? It is in the first place insinuated by the Translator that they call themselves Pro-

testants, but that they are not so in reality. That is, they hold certain sentiments which some other Protestants do not hold, or they reject certain doctrines which some other Protestants believe, and *therefore* they are not Protestants. Admirable reasoning it must be confessed; for on the same principle these self-called Protestants might with equal justice deny the name to those who deny it to them. But if they are not Protestants, what are they? They are Deists, or at least infected with "Deistical principles." Deistical principles are such as lead either first, to a belief in natural religion, or, secondly, to a rejection of revealed religion. In which of these senses this phrase is here used, it is impossible for us to divine. Perhaps in neither of them, but probably in a sense different from both. Every one who does not think and believe and profess with the multitude is a Deist or Atheist, or something worse, if worse can be. We ourselves have undergone various metamorphoses of this kind, without being conscious of them. At the pleasure of our orthodox friends, we have been Atheists and Deists, Mussulmans and Hindoos by turns. Now we are inclined to think that it is in this sense that the self-called Protestants of Germany are stated to be under the influence of "Deistical principles;" and we are confirmed in this interpretation by the epithet which is added. There is not only, it appears, a prevalence of Deistical but also of *Socinian* principles in Germany. In other words, these self-called Protestants are Unitarians; and *honoris causâ* are here styled Socinians and Deists. It would be a breach of truth and charity to allow the claim of Unitarians to be either Protestants or Christians; it is no breach of either the one or the other to impose on them the names of Socinian and Deist, which they uniformly disavow, and which are only fitted to render them the objects of undeserved suspicion and reproach.

We wish we could persuade ourselves that the passages upon which we have remarked are not contained in a Bible Society Report. The inconsistency of the place which they hold in that Report, with the known principles

of such a Society, the more we reflect on the subject, fills us with increased astonishment at the temerity and inconsideration of those who have given insertion to them. We beg, however, earnestly to assure our readers that it is not the Bible Society we oppose, but its abuses; and that it is only the right and duty of self-defence which belongs to every man and to every Christian, that has called us forth now, and will, if necessary, call us forth again, to resist an attack upon Unitarians and Unitarianism, even when made under the auspices of a Society, which, we should rejoice, if we were permitted to regard with feelings of unmingled veneration.

SIR,

Chatham.

I AM anxious, with another of your correspondents, to ascertain the author of "Universal Restitution a Scripture Doctrine." This anonymous work is attributed to Rev. G. Stonehouse, A. M., who was Vicar of Islington; but if this be the fact, I have to observe a complete revolution of sentiment must afterwards have taken place in the writer's mind. In a sermon of his, preached in the above parish, Dec. 10, 1738, the *eternity* of hell torments appears with him a favourite topic, while the diction of the discourse is very different from that of the erudite author of the work first mentioned. In the sermon are the following passages: "Should I, at the peril of so heavy a curse, and at the expense of my Lord's eternal favour, preach soft things to you, why this would be but like the soft words of Satan when he tempted Eve with his 'Yea, eat, ye shall not surely die,' and yet because I tell you the wages of sin is death, you call me an *hell-fire priest, a damnation parson*." P. 15. Again, at p. 18, he says, "When this life of mercy is spent, all is *determined*; and if the end of it finds you in the miseries of a fallen creature, you will then see the whole purpose of your creation blasted, and that you are left in your own hell to endure the horrors and wretchedness of an anxious, darkened, fiery, self-tormented nature for ever."

T. C. A.

REVIEW.

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

ART. I.—*History of the United States, from their First Settlement as Colonies, to the Close of the War with Great Britain, in 1815.* 8vo. pp. 472. John Miller. 1826. 12s.

A BRIDGED histories, fit to put into the hands of youth, and adapted to the mass of readers whose want of time requires knowledge to be set before them in a short compass, are the most useful of all publications, but, if we may judge from the actual state of popular literature, the most difficult of execution. What epitome of the History of England can be named, with which an intelligent father of a family or instructor of the young, is fully satisfied? Here is a blank in our literature, to be filled up, perhaps, by some genius yet unborn, who shall be a patriot and at the same time not a partizan, and a Christian without the feelings of a sectary. The Poet Laureate could perform the desired work, if he would forget his own controversial life, and lay aside his partialities, and rebaptize himself in good humour.

We have a near approach to our conception of what is wanted for a popular history of a country, in the volume before us, which is, we believe, a reprint from a work in circulation in America. The story is neatly told; the style is simple and perspicuous; there is no very predominant prejudice; names are not set above things; the love of liberty is tempered by a regard to law and social order; patriotism is a filial sentiment towards the writer's own country, but not hostile towards any other country; and his reverence of virtue is seen in every page. The web of the history would not however have been less substantial, but much more attractive, if there had been woven into it some few threads of ornament. And the impression upon the reader's understanding and memory would have been stronger, had the historian more frequently paused to sum up matters, and trusted himself, which he might safely, with that generalization which is the philosophy of history.

As Englishmen, we cannot help feeling pleased and even delighted with the kind feeling towards England which is manifested by this and other respectable American authors. The people of the United States are flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone. They have derived from us the seeds of all that is good in their laws and institutions. They and we have language and principles and sentiments in common. They are the children of our forefathers, and if this branch of the family have risen above us in some things, they are willing to confess their inferiority in others, and there is enough in which we are equal and the same to make us feel on both sides of the broad waters the affection of brotherhood.

Mixed as is the blood of the United States with that of every civilized people in Europe, the main stream which animates the heart of the people is English. The best portion of the English people, in their best era, were the progenitors of the inhabitants of the oldest and most populous states; and the foundations of their Union were laid deep by the hands of the Puritans in the love of liberty and the fear of God.

Had we been capable of forming a just opinion at the time, we should certainly have vindicated the American Revolution. But opinions are of little consequence—the great measure is justified by the event. The United States have grown into greatness since their emancipation with an unexampled rapidity, and have become worth more to the parent country as a friendly independent power, than they ever could have been as colonies.

Time works wonders. Some of our readers remember the period when Washington and Franklin were spoken of, and with more contempt than abhorrence, as rebels. Had the Revolution failed, of which they and Adams and Jefferson, with other like-minded men, were the promoters, and their heads been in consequence stuck on Temple Bar, it would have required a century and a half to have effaced

the opprobrium of treason from their names: as it is, their success is their virtue, and they have long been honoured in England nearly as much as in the United States, whose independence is their glorious work.

WASHINGTON is a name dear to the whole civilized world; he is the model both of a generous captain and of an upright statesman. His fame has grown in proportion as the world has seen and examined succeeding heroes and rulers. There was a simplicity in his mind and character which is admired the more it is contemplated, and the retiringness of his manners, which was complained of during his life-time, is now acknowledged to have been the modesty which is one of the signs of true moral greatness. Of this Founder of American liberty the author of the History writes without extravagance, as if properly conscious that his name requires no glittering epithets to make it illustrious. It is a signal blessing to a new country to enrol amongst its Fathers such an example of public virtue; and we venture to predict, that so long as Washington shall be revered in his true character by the Americans, but no longer, will they be free and happy.

The History gives an account of the several Colonies, of the French War of 1756—1763, of the Revolution, of the present Constitution of the States, of the new States incorporated since the Revolution, of the several Administrations under the successive Presidents, and of the late unhappy war with Great Britain; unhappy to both countries, but more particularly to America, which has been dazzled by her successes in various small naval conflicts, and seduced into an admiration of warlike glory, which may blind her to the miseries, dangers and crimes of war. The present sensible and amiable writer is not exempt from the perilous enthusiasm.

The great evils which beset the early settlers in America arose from the treachery and cruelty of the Indians. In another century, the colonists experienced the misery of having the battles of France and England fought on American ground. But these calamities had their use: the neighbourhood of faithless, fierce and restless savages nursed the bravery of

the settlers, kept them compact, and gave a salutary check to their cupidity; and the introduction of European armies initiated them in military tactics, and inured them to the discipline of the camp, and thus prepared them for making effectual resistance to the oppression of England. The riflemen, who have done so much execution in the several American contests, were trained in the back-settlements, where experience had taught them to look for a foe in every bush; and Washington and others of the Revolutionary commanders had learned the art of war under British leaders in the struggles between France and England on their Transatlantic territories. We love not war; we justify only wars of self-defence, which we think are not incapable of being defined; but we admire the ways of Providence, which so restrains and overrules the wrath of man as to make the infelicities of a country subservient to its final greatest good.

In the account of Massachusetts, the author has told the story of the two Judges of Charles I., who fled on the Restoration to New England, which was investigated with true Republican ardour by Dr. Styles, the President of Yale College, who published the result of his researches in a little volume, scarcely known in this country, which was almost the first book for the space of a century and half that contained an avowed vindication of the character and government of the Great Regicide, Oliver Cromwell.

“A short time after, Whalley and Goffe, two of the Judges who had sentenced Charles the First to be beheaded, having fled before the return of his successor, arrived in New England. Their first place of residence was Cambridge; but they often appeared publicly in Boston, particularly on Sundays and other days of religious solemnities. They had sustained high rank in Cromwell's army, were men of uncommon talents, and, by their dignified manners and grave deportment, commanded universal respect.

“As soon as it was known that they were excepted from the general pardon, the governor suggested to the court of assistants the expediency of arresting them. A majority opposed it, and many members of the general court gave them assurances of protection. Considering

themselves, however, unsafe at Cambridge, they removed to New Haven, where they were received with great respect by the clergy and magistrates.

"After a short residence there, enjoying, in private, the society of their friends, the governor of Massachusetts received a mandate to arrest them. A warrant was immediately issued, authorizing two zealous royalists to search for, and seize them, wherever found, in New England. They hastened to the colony of New Haven, exhibited the warrant to the governor, who resided at Guildford, and requested him to furnish authority and assistants to pursue them. Desirous of favouring the exiles, he affected to deliberate until the next morning, and then utterly declined acting officially, without the advice of his council.

"In the mean time, they were apprized of their danger, and retired to a new place of concealment. The pursuers, on arriving at New Haven, searched every suspected house, except the one where the judges were concealed. This they began to search, but were induced, by the address of the mistress of it, to desist. When the pursuers had departed, the judges, retiring into the woods, fixed their abode in a cave.

"Having there heard that their friends were threatened with punishment, for having afforded them protection, they came from their hiding place for the purpose of delivering themselves up: but their friends, actuated by feelings equally noble and generous, persuaded them to relinquish their intention. Soon after, they removed to Milford, where they remained about two years.

"Upon the arrival of other persons, instructed to apprehend them, they repaired privately to Hadley, in Massachusetts, where they resided fifteen or sixteen years, but few persons being acquainted with the place of their concealment. There is, in that neighbourhood, a tradition, that many years afterwards two graves were discovered in the minister's cellar: and in these, it was supposed, they had been interred. At New Haven, two graves are shewn, said to be those of the two judges. It is not improbable that their remains were removed to this place from Hadley.

"A singular incident which occurred at the latter place, in 1675, shews that one of these illustrious exiles had not forgotten the avocations of his youth. The people, at the time of public worship, were alarmed by an attack from the Indians, and thrown into the utmost confusion. Suddenly, a grave, elderly person appeared, differing in his mien

and dress from all around him. He put himself at their head, rallied, encouraged and led them against the enemy, who were repulsed and completely defeated. As suddenly, the deliverer of Hadley disappeared. The people were lost in amazement, and many verily believed that an angel sent from heaven had led them to victory."—Pp. 48—51.

The short history of Rhode Island is in fact the history of Roger Williams, the patriarch of religious liberty in the New World: it will be seen, without surprise, that even under such an apostolic teacher, this favoured State was not able to bear, except by degrees, "the perfect law of liberty."

"RHODE ISLAND.

"ROGER WILLIAMS, who was banished from Massachusetts, for avowing the doctrine, that the civil magistrate is bound to grant equal protection to every denomination of Christians, a doctrine too liberal for the age in which he lived, repaired to Seeconk, where he procured a grant of land from the Indians. Being informed by the governor of Plymouth, that the land was within the limits of that colony, he proceeded to Mooshausic, where, in 1636, with those friends who followed him, he began a plantation.

"He purchased the land of the Indians, and, in grateful acknowledgment of the kindness of heaven, he called the place Providence. Acting in conformity with the wise and liberal principle, for avowing and maintaining which he had suffered banishment, he allowed entire freedom of conscience to all who came within his borders. And to him must be given the glory of having first set a practical example of the equal toleration of all religious sects in the same political community.

"His benevolence was not confined to his civilized brethren. He laboured to enlighten, improve and conciliate the savages. He learned their language, travelled among them, and gained the entire confidence of their chiefs. He had often the happiness, by his influence over them, of saving from injury the colony that had proclaimed him an outlaw and driven him into the wilderness.

"In 1638, William Coddington, and seventeen others, being persecuted for their religious tenets in Massachusetts, followed Williams to Providence. By his advice, they purchased of the Indians the island of Aquetnec, now called Rhode Island, and removed thither. Coddington was chosen their judge, or chief magistrate. The fertility of the soil and the

toleration of all Christian sects, attracted numerous emigrants from the adjacent settlements.

"When the New England colonies, in 1643, formed their memorable confederacy, Rhode Island applied to be admitted a member. Plymouth objected; asserting that the settlements were within her boundaries. The commissioners decided, that Rhode Island might enjoy all the advantages of the confederacy, if she would submit to the jurisdiction of Plymouth. She declined, proudly preferring independence to all the benefits of dependent union.

"In 1644, Williams, having been sent to England as agent for both settlements, obtained of the Plymouth company a patent for the territory, and permission for the inhabitants to institute a government for themselves. In 1647, delegates chosen by the freemen, held a general assembly at Portsmouth, organized a government, and established a code of laws. The executive power was confided to a president and four assistants.

"Upon the applications of the inhabitants, the king, in 1663, granted a charter to Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. The supreme or legislative power, was to be exercised by an assembly, which was to consist of the governor, of ten assistants, and of representatives from the several towns, all to be chosen by the freemen. This assembly granted to all Christian sects, except Roman Catholics, the right of voting. In 1665, they authorized, by law, the seizure of the estates of Quakers, who refused to assist in defending the colony; but this law being generally condemned by the people, was never executed.

"When Andross was made governor of New England, he dissolved the charter government of Rhode Island, and ruled the colony, with the assistance of a council appointed by himself. After he was imprisoned, at Boston, the freemen met at Newport, and voted to resume their charter. All the officers, who three years before had been displaced, were restored.

"The benevolence, justice and pacific policy of Williams, secured to the colony an almost total exemption from Indian hostility. In 1730, the number of inhabitants was 18,000; in 1761, it was 40,000. Brown University was founded at Warren, in 1764, and was removed a few years after to Providence. Its founder was Nicholas Brown, who gave to the institution five thousand dollars."—Pp. 94—97.

Our historian is fully sensible of the stain which negro-slavery fixes on

the history and character of the United States, but he attributes the guilt to England! We forgive him this wrong, for the sake of the undisguised manner, in which he speaks of the foul enormity. He thus concludes the account of Virginia: "The laudable efforts of these representatives to arrest the progress of slavery in the colony, ought not to be passed over in silence. Convinced of its inhumanity, and foreseeing the dreadful evils which it must produce, they often passed laws prohibiting the importation of slaves: but those who were higher in authority, yielding to the wishes of merchants engaged in the abominable traffic, persisted with criminal obstinacy in withholding their assent. England, not America, is responsible for the wretchedness which her kings and her officers were often importuned, but refused, to avert."—P. 31.

To the History is added an interesting Appendix on the principles of the constitution, the statistics, the education and literature, and the religion of the United States. On the last topic, the enlightened writer says, after having enumerated several religious denominations, "Many other sects exist, but reason, less tolerant than the laws, is gradually diminishing the number." This remark suggests a new sense to the sentiment sometimes given at our public meetings, not, we think, without danger of its being mistaken, viz. "No Toleration."

The anonymous historian ends his book with a very natural and not over sanguine calculation of his country's future greatness, which he winds up with admonitions and benedictions, to which every philanthropist will say *Amen*.

"Although now inferior to the principal nations of the old world, yet but a short period will elapse before the United States, should their progress hereafter be the same that it has been, will overtake and pass them. Their great natural advantages will continue to urge them forward. Extensive tracts of fertile land yet remain vacant of inhabitants; the portions already settled are capable of supporting a much more numerous population; new roads and new canals will give greater activity to internal commerce, and open new fields to the un-

firming industry and enterprise of man; and a small part only being required by the government, nearly the whole annual income will be added to the general capital, augmenting it in a compound ratio.

"That these splendid anticipations are not the suggestions of national vanity, the history of the past sufficiently proves. Yet their fulfilment depends in a great degree upon the future conduct of the people themselves; upon their adherence to the principles of their fathers; upon the preservation of free political institutions; of industrious, frugal and moral habits; and, above all, upon the universal diffusion of knowledge.

"This truth should sink deep into the hearts of the old and the young. The citizens of this republic should never forget the awful responsibilities resting upon them. They constitute the oldest nation on this western hemisphere, the first on the list of existing republics. They stand forward, the object of hatred to some, of admiration to many, of wonder to all; and an impressive example to the people of every country. To them is committed an experiment, successful hitherto, the final result of which must have a powerful influence upon the destiny of mankind; if favourable and happy, the whole civilized world will be free; if adverse, despotism and darkness will again overshadow it. May they ever be sensible of the vast importance of their example. May they never betray their sacred trust." —Pp. 466, 467.

ART. II.—*Tracts, Sermons, and Funeral Orations; including an Attempt to account for the Infidelity of Edward Gibbon, Esq. With a Postscript on Lord Byron's Prejudices against Revealed Religion; Letter to Robert Hawker, D. D., in behalf of General Redemption and the Enlarged Spirit of Christianity, &c. &c. published between the Years 1795 and 1825: and Six New Discourses; with Cursory Remarks on the Employments of Heaven.* By John Evans, LL.D., Author of the Sketch and Sequel of the Denominations of the Christian World. 8vo. pp. 784. Eaton, 1825. 14s.

DR. EVANS is entitled [as, we believe, we have before remarked in this department of our work] to the appellation, bestowed by Lord Shaftesbury on Dr. Whichcot, of "the Preacher of Good Nature." By his numerous publications he has

caused his name to be associated with candour; and we rejoice to see the diffusion of works breathing such a catholic spirit towards the several denominations of Christians, and such a benevolent temper towards all the human race.

The greater part of this large volume has been long before the public; several of the tracts, &c., have come under our review; and some of the pieces appeared originally in our Repository. The "Attempt to account for the Infidelity" of Gibbon, obtained the praise of the late Dr. Watson, Bishop of Landaff, who recommended it to the students of the University of Cambridge; and the "Letter to Dr. Hawker," in defence of "General Redemption," was the means, we are told by Dr. Evans, "of rescuing an individual from self-destruction, whose mind had been harassed by the doctrine of Election and Reprobation." "This is true glory," and deserves more than a civic—an Evangelic—crown.

Of the Sermons now published for the first time, the most interesting are a "Charge to the Minister and Sermon to the People at the Ordination of the Rev. Thomas Sadler, Horsham, July 31, 1814," and "a Sermon on the Decease of the Rev. Sampson Kingsford, of Canterbury, preached at Worship Street, Sept. 1821." From the former, we select with pleasure a passage on a "peaceful church:"

"Recollect that a peaceful church, or a church in which a *pacific* spirit is prevalent, is a powerful recommendation of religion to the world.

"Nothing has been more abused than the revelation of Jesus Christ; some proclaiming it to be an unintelligible mystery, whilst others hold it up as a series of raptures and visions carrying them beyond the diurnal sphere of this present world. Individuals who are too prejudiced to examine, or too indolent to make any inquiry, stand aloof from such exhibitions of religion, deeming it the offspring of priestcraft or the instrument of tyranny and domination. This, I am sorry to say, is the opinion entertained of religion by a large portion of mankind. Whereas, if you look into the New Testament, it will be found, that religion is the greatest blessing conferred on the world. It is reasonable in its nature, gentle in its spirit, and pacific in its tendency. It banishes melancholy by in-

spiring cheerfulness. It prevents misery by the regulation of the passions. The health of the human mind (it has been remarked) requires that *futurity* should be gilded with the beams of hope and expectation! And what does this more effectually than true and undefiled religion?—for it secures the happiness of the present by securing and promoting the kind affections, whilst it points to a reversion in the skies, ‘where there are joys at God’s right hand, and pleasures for evermore.’”—Pp. 535, 536.

From the latter, we take an animated passage in exposition and illustration of the final sentence of Christ on his faithful servants:

“Mark the expressions by which the Saviour introduces the reward of the *faithful* servant—‘Well done, thou good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord!’ Dr. Doddridge remarks, that ‘here is an allusion to auditors or spectators of any public exercise to express the highest applause when any part had been excellently performed. *Bravely done!* comes something near it, but is not equally elegant or forcible.’ In this view of the subject the words are replete with animation. They convey a spirit of decision in favour of the *good and faithful servant*, highly flattering to the feelings, and which is easier to be conceived than to describe.

“The eulogy conveys three distinct ideas, that of *approbation*, of *admiration*, and of *triumph*.

“It is the language of *approbation*. As intelligent and moral agents, we form our own judgment respecting conduct. Forming a choice deliberately, we abide by our individual judgment. But still we seek the favourable opinion of others; and when we obtain it, we are invigorated in the path of duty; and the more intelligent and worthy the character, the more valuable the approbation. Indeed, the *joy of his Lord* is a pure and perennial source of satisfaction, because it implies approbation of his views, of his temper, and of his conduct. This imparts a sensation not to be delineated; it is a ‘joy unspeakable and full of glory.’

“It is the language of *admiration*. When we perceive a character surmounting the difficulties of his situation, we commend the resolution and fortitude by which he overcame them. No situation is without its trials; and official situations have trials peculiar to them. Ministers of the gospel are in this respect most critically circumstanced. They have honestly avowed opinions and suffered for it. They have protested against the fashionable vices of the age, and incurred

displeasure. They have reprehended the faults of their flock, and given offence. A minister doing his duty cannot please all. He will have enemies, but they will not deter him from his duty. He has chalked out his path, which will be trodden by him to the end of his journey.

“Our blessed Saviour, who *knew what was in man*, is apprized of these difficulties, and knows the energy required to surmount them. Aware of the weakness of our nature, and of the strength of temptation, he can appreciate the resolution necessary for the triumph to be achieved over them. He is neither a hard nor a severe Master. Making allowance for the imperfections of humanity, he will form no unreasonable expectations concerning his servants. Admiration is excited because, all things considered, the disciple has done well. He has been determined and persevering, however others may have swerved from the straight, undeviating line of rectitude. Hence, having done well, he will *enter into the joy of his Lord!*

“Lastly, it is the language of *triumph*. Indeed, the highest triumph may be indulged on this occasion. No one can be ignorant of the exultation which one party derives from success over an opposite party. It is well known, that in cases of victory, the triumphant army sends forth its acclamations to the ends of the earth. In our triumphs over an enemy with whom we have been contending many a long year, loud and even obstreperous is the exultation. The ringing of bells, the blaze of illumination, and the shouts of the multitude are heard, not in our metropolis only, but throughout the nation.

“But these triumphs, however boisterous, are not comparable to the triumphs of a moral victory. Here is the *good and faithful servant*, whether among *private Christians*, or *ministers* of the gospel of Jesus Christ, contending successfully with a more potent enemy. Among the foes over whom he has achieved the victory, are IGNORANCE and VICE in all their tremendous ramifications. The disciple of Jesus, and much more the minister of Christ, has to war ‘not with flesh and blood’ only, ‘but with principalities and powers, and wickedness in high places.’ The amelioration of his fellow-creatures is the prime object of the Christian ministry. It is God’s own work, and must be accomplished.

“And what a *triumph* arises from a retrospective survey of what has been done in this great business by the faithful minister of Jesus Christ! Many imperfections are discernible; many defects

acknowledged and lamented. But on the whole there has been an honest intention—a wholesome integrity. The recollection of it recreates his thoughts, delights his imagination, and invigorates his heart: and it must be recollected, that this sentence of the Saviour is the *final* sentence; it is the *ultimate* sanction of his Master, delivered at the termination of his course, and in the presence of an assembled world. Its accents vibrate powerfully on his ear,—‘Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.’”—613—616.

With his own compositions, Dr. Evans has united in this volume, those of several other writers, some original. Amongst these we perceive some respectable verses in praise of Education, by Mr. Edward Cox, of Liverpool. But the greatest curiosity of this kind, is a sermon of the late eloquent Mr. Fawcett's, which Dr. Evans read, by request, on a funeral occasion. From the description of it, as “taken in short-hand” by one gentleman, and “altered” by another, we were not prepared to expect a finished specimen of the orator's fascinating style; and we suspect that it was one of the preacher's juvenile performances, and that it is ill-reported into the bargain. There are still visible the sparkles of Fawcett's genius. We lay the introduction before the reader, premising only that the text is 1 John iii. 2, *It doth not yet appear what we shall be.*

“Curiosity is the most universal spring of human actions; by its vivacity dark scenes are often cleared, and the beauty of truth shed abroad. We are most eager to discover what we are forbidden to know. Whatever is secret will awaken curiosity, and set it on the watch; there is a wantonness in the human mind which leads us to wish for what we cannot possess: the same extravagance possesses us in what it does not concern us to know; and it is this which makes us pry into futurity. Hence the veneration the ancients paid to augury, oracles, &c.,—but peace to the *lying* prophets! The scenes of futurity are hidden from us by a darkness no human eye can penetrate; to complain of it were unjust. Our powers were best confined to make us virtuous and happy, that our darkest moments might have hope, and that the gaiety of to-day might not be saddened by prospect of sorrow to-morrow; and that when Providence wrote a dark sentence, humanity might bear it. It is wisely, it is kindly done;

the hand which has concealed futurity has hidden sorrow from us.

“In our views of futurity we feel an anxiety about the length of our days; but the object which strikes us most, and raises all our curiosity, is, **THE UNSEEN WORLD!** The world mysterious is the most sublime idea which can strike our minds, and much of its sublimity is the darkness which hides it from us; all its grandeur is conducted in the most profound silence; reason's clearest glasses have not been able to describe (*descry*) it. Many travellers have been there; but none ever returned: the most lively wit is but dark and vain conjecture. Imagination looks with a strained eye; but not of an object to be seen! When the bell mortality tolls, we follow the mortal to his home! we see the body laid among worms and dust: where is the *spirit* gone? Close shuts the grave, nor tells one single tale. Perhaps there are spirits continually about us; have charge to keep our ways; ward off dangers we do not see. Those intimate companions and familiar friends are perfect strangers to us; profound silence is enjoined them. Perhaps *the spirits* of our **DEPARTED FRIENDS** visit us continually; they used to tell us all their secrets, but now tell us none. Thus benighted, who shall give us information? If any could tell us of scenes beyond the grave, how we should hear them! When we see a *dead body*, how we wish to know where **THE SPIRIT**'s gone! We ask it questions, but it answers not. This profound secrecy of the mysterious state is what makes futurity so very awful. How awful to plunge, at a venture, where we know not! It startles the most hardened, it even shakes the virtuous heart. That this mysterious darkness will ever rest on the world of spirits, is no reflection on the goodness of God.”—Pp. 423—425.

According to his wonted familiar manner with the public, Dr. Evans speaks unreservedly, but always kindly, of the living and the dead. One of these notices may mislead the reader. Having inserted “a List of the Subjects [and Preachers] of the Salters' Hall Wednesday Evening Lecture from 1795 to 1810,” he remarks, in a “Postscript,” that one half of the ministers are deceased, “whilst the truly venerable **THOMAS TAYLER**, in the 92d year of his age, and long deprived of his sight, is *about to take his flight to a better world*,” p. 752. Now, though this was written some months ago, we are able to congratulate Dr. Evans that the respectable gentleman

whom he names, now the Father of the Body of Dissenting Ministers, is not only yet living, but able to take part in the proceedings of the several Dissenting associations, chiefly for charitable purposes, with which he has been so long and so honourably connected.

A correct likeness of the author will increase the interest taken in this collection of his works by his numerous friends.

ART. III.—*The Geography of the Globe, containing a Description of its several Divisions of Land and Water: to which are added, Problems on the Terrestrial and Celestial Globes, and a Series of Questions for Examination: designed for the Use of Schools and Private Families.* By John Olding Butler, Teacher of Writing, Arithmetic and Geography. 12mo. pp. 368. Harvey and Darton. 4s. 6d.

MR. J. O. BUTLER is actively following the example of his late excellent father [see Mon. Repos. XVII. 571—574] in supplying our schools and families with improved elementary books. Labour cannot be more usefully or honourably applied.

This is an instructive and interesting summary of “*The Geography of the Globe*.” it is generally accurate, (as far as we have the means of ascertaining,) and like the late Mr. Butler's works it communicates much useful information, while it guards against the prejudices which are so apt to grow upon young persons with regard to all countries but their own.

The following extracts will shew the plan of the work, and may be taken as average specimens of its execution.

“**COLONY OF THE CAPE OF GOOD HOPE.**”

“**Situation.** The territory of the cape of Good Hope, which lies between the 30th deg. of S. latitude and the southern extremity of Africa, was but of small extent when first formed by the Dutch East India Company. It now extends 500 miles from E. to W. and nearly 300 from N. to S. It belongs to Great Britain. The chief place is Cape Town.

“**CAPE TOWN**, at the head of Table bay, and backed by a magnificent amphitheatre of mountains, is large and populous, and the seat of the British government. The British East Indiamen, and, in times

of peace, the ships of other nations, take in provisions at this place, when outward bound.

“**Bays.** Table and False bays, and that of Saldanha, which has the finest harbour of southern Africa, is capable of holding the largest fleets.

“**Capes.** The cape of Good Hope, and that of Aguillas.

“The southern promontory of Africa is a vast peninsular mass of rocky mountains joined to the main land by a sandy isthmus. Cape Aguillas is the extreme southern point of Africa, being in 34 deg. 58 min. 30 seconds of S. lat. The passage to the East Indies by the cape of Good Hope, was first made in 1497, by Vasco de Gama, a Portuguese. The discovery was one of those events which have most affected the fortunes of nations and individuals: the tide of commerce having been thereby diverted from the southern to the central and more northern countries of Europe.

“**Surface.** The country round the Cape has grand scenery, distinguished by stupendous cliffs, rugged rocks, and spiral-topt mountains. Some of the elevations are named from their configuration, the Table, (3500 feet high,) the Lion, and the Sugar Loaf.

“**Climate.** Though the climate of the Cape is generally salubrious, it approaches to that of the torrid zone; the greatest cold in July and August only producing light snow on the summits of the mountains, and it is rarely sufficient to render fires even comfortable. ‘So great,’ says a modern traveller,* ‘was the heat while passing over the country, that I could not touch without pain part of the waggon which had been exposed to the sun, and the thermometer was then at 100.’

“**Products.** The Cape produces wines, some of which are exported under the name of Cape Madeira. The celebrated Constantia, the produce of two vineyards only, is made at the village bearing its name. The country round the Cape abounds with fragrant and beautiful plants, and the English green-house derives from it much of its exotic beauty. The numerous and elegant families of heaths and geraniums, with ‘their crimson honours,’ and the fragrant and delicate jessamine,† are among the beautiful ornaments which we owe to Southern Africa, whose entire Flora may be fairly estimated at not less than ten thousand.‡

* “Mr. Campbell.”

† “—— her jessamine remote
Caffraia sends.

COWPER's *Task, the Garden*.

‡ “For this information I am indebted to Messrs. Loddiges, who have, in their

"Inhabitants. The name of Hottentot has hitherto been used proverbially to express a want of decent and civilized habits. There is reason, however, to hope that, under the mild and reforming influence of the Christian religion, and of the arts of civilization now extended to them, the Hottentots will cease to be a reproach to our nature. They are of a mild and docile temper—one of the best qualities for the reception of knowledge.

"Animals. No country in the world has a greater variety of animals than those found within the narrow compass of eight degrees of latitude from the Cape. In it exist the largest as well as the minutest in numerous classes of zoology. The ostrich, the largest bird, and the creeper, one of the smallest, known to man; the elephant and the black-streaked mouse, the one weighing 4000 pounds, the other about the fourth part of an ounce; the camelopardalis, the tallest of quadrupeds, and of the astonishing height of 17 feet, and the little elegant zenic, of three inches,—are found here. In this district, which may be called the *ménagerie* of Africa, are the hippopotamus, the rhinoceros, the antelope, the beautifully striped zebra, the lion, the leopard, the panther, the tiger-cat, the wolf, and the hyæna."—Pp. 214—217.

"NEW HOLLAND, which has also the more modern titles of Australia, Notasia, and Terra Australis, is between the Indian and Pacific oceans. It constitutes the largest island in the world, and in size is only a fourth less than the European continent. The eastern coast, which was explored by Captain Cook, is named New South Wales, and has on it some settlements, formed in 1786, for the reception of British convicts whom the law does not condemn to capital punishments, or whose sentence the sovereign has mitigated, and whom it is neither prudent nor humane to keep confined in Great Britain. Sydney town, the capital of New S. Wales, is the seat of government, and the chief places for the convicts are Port Jackson and Paramatta.* The coast of New

delightful garden at Hackney, not less than fourteen hundred species of Cape plants now in cultivation. 'The Botanical Cabinet,' a work published by those skilful horticulturalists, has many beautiful coloured delineations of the exotics of the Cape."

* "Botany bay was at first intended as their chief place of residence, but Port Jackson was found to be a more eligible situation. Botany bay, which is in lat. 34 S. and long. 150 E., was so named from the variety of plants found there. Convicts were sent to the British Ameri-

Holland is barren, but its interior is beautiful and fertile, producing all the species of vegetables known in England, with a variety of excellent fruits. The principal river yet discovered is the Hawkesbury,* which empties itself into the Pacific N. of Port Jackson. The natives of New Holland probably approach nearer the brutal state than any other savages, having neither houses nor clothing. Civilization is, however, extending itself under British influence, and the English settlements are making rapid advances in knowledge and the comforts of life. Schools have been formed, places of worship erected, and Bible Societies instituted for the reformation of those sons and daughters of Britain whom she has been compelled to shake off from her bosom for their crimes.

"VAN DIEMEN'S LAND, an island separated from New Holland by Bass's strait, about 90 miles wide, is diversified by hills and valleys."—Pp. 278, 279.

Since this volume was printed some changes have taken place in the world. The Emperor Alexander of Russia is succeeded by Nicholas,† and Brazil is separated from Portugal, under the Emperor Don Pedro.

John Hunter, to whom Mr. Butler naturally refers (p. 250) for an account of the native American or Indian tribes, is denounced in the American journals as an impostor, after having been shewn in the drawing-rooms and at public meetings in London as the newest curiosity.

Should not "Greece" have been a distinct chapter from Turkey? We hope and trust events will require this alteration in the next edition.

Outline maps would be useful to such a work: they need not be larger than the page. The use of these will

can Colonies before their separation from Great Britain."

* "The Hawkesbury river is named from the present Earl of Liverpool, who, at the time of its discovery, was Lord Hawkesbury."

† By one of those *state-mysteries* which for a time baffle all conjecture, CONSTANTINE, the legitimate successor of ALEXANDER, [Mon. Repos. XX. 757,] has resigned his rights in favour of his younger brother NICHOLAS. Commotions have arisen in consequence, and Russia, even Russia, resounds with the cry of "Down with the Radicals," though the Radicals in this instance are the friends of legitimacy. REV.

be seen by consulting Dr. Aikin's "England Delineated."

Is it true that "Dorsetshire, from its mild air and fertile soil, is called the garden of England"? (P. 49.) Its "spacious downs," and, it might be added, its sands, scarcely answer to this description.

National character is not always easily or safely portrayed. What will our American readers say of the following sentence, part of a description of the "inhabitants" of the United States? "There are good talent, which only wants opportunity for shining, general information, and a desire of knowledge, with classical learning, and a larger share of science." (P. 240.) But they will admit that the "inhabitants" of England are not described with a flattering pencil in these words—"Reluctant in forming new acquaintances, taciturn and reserved, they, notwithstanding, often perform solid acts of friendship." P. 53.

The religious freedom of the United States of America warrants a stronger expression than that "every sect enjoys toleration:" there is no toleration but where there is a predominant sect, which happily is not *tolerated* in the United States.

But these are slight exceptions, if exceptions at all, to the merit of the work, which we have no doubt will obtain a wide circulation and a standing name.

ART. IV.—*The Service at the Settlement of the Rev. Edward Tagart, as Minister of the Octagon Chapel, Norwich, August 10th, 1825.* 8vo. pp. 76. Hunter. 2s.

THIS Service consists of an Introductory Prayer by the Rev. W. P. Scargill; of an Address to the Minister by Mr. Edward Taylor; of the Minister's Reply; of the Charge, by the Rev. W. Turner, of York; and of the Sermon, by the Rev. W. J. Fox. The whole is a virtual answer to the fears of those that regard the ceremony of Ordination as either superstitious or injurious to Christian freedom. If any could complain of the publication, it would be such as think that there should be still some government, and consequently some degrees of power and authority, in the Christian Church. (Mr. E. Taylor says in

his plain and honest Address, "In the church of Christ there can be no degrees of power," &c; but he probably means that there is no spiritual power that is not derived from the people.)

Mr. Turner's excellent "Charge" contains, among many most useful counsels, worthy of the study of all young ministers, the following judicious advice, called for by the temper of the times:

"You will not hesitate on all proper occasions to bring forward openly and candidly the opinions you have adopted upon those points with respect to which Christian sects and parties differ. I have no doubt that on such occasions you will be found ready and able to give a reason, a satisfactory and sufficient reason, for the faith that is in you. But there is a great and important distinction between *doctrinal* preaching and *controversial* preaching. It is one thing to explain and recommend your own views of the doctrine of Scripture, it is another to attack the opinions which you deem erroneous; it is still another to make personal allusions to the character or conduct of those who hold these opinions. The first is frequently necessary, the second occasionally,—the last, in my opinion, never."—Pp. 43, 44.

In the Sermon, from 1 Tim. v. 8, (18,) *The labourer is worthy of his reward*, Mr. Fox reminds the people that their minister should be rewarded by "pecuniary support, social kindness, serious attention and zealous co-operation." These topics are handled with great ability. The first is a delicate one, and, it appears, was suggested to the preacher by some of the congregation: he is, we think, successful in treating it, and we cannot but wish that many of our congregations would consider what he says, were it only in regard to common justice. On the remaining points, he shews himself to be a serious as well as eloquent monitor; and we cannot wish better for both minister and people than that his friendly and Christian exhortations may (as we have no doubt they will) be long practically remembered within the walls of the Octagon at Norwich,—a building consecrated in the mind of every Protestant Dissenter, who is conversant with theological and biblical learning, to pure Evangelical religion and to universal religious liberty.

ART. V.—*The Grievances of Ireland, their Causes and their Remedies: in a Letter to Sir Francis Burdett, Bart., M. P.* By William Sturch, Esq. 8vo. pp. 64. Hunter. 1826.

THE name of the author will be sufficient pledge to a wide circle of readers, that this pamphlet abounds with correct knowledge, manly sense, comprehensive and enlightened views of society, benevolent Christian sentiments, and the true principles of civil and religious liberty. No one can peruse it without feeling a strong conviction, both that the sole object of the writer is to do good to the unhappy country to which it relates, and that he has stated the real “causes” of the miseries of Ireland, and that his proposed “remedies” would in time work a favourable change. Mr. Sturch does not take up the state of the sister island upon report; he has again and again witnessed the actual condition of its wretched population; and he has been naturally led to inquire what means would better that condition, by the important and responsible station which he occupies as one of the oldest and most active members of one of the London Companies, (the Fishmongers’,) which possesses very considerable estates in Ulster.

In this Letter to the true-hearted English Baronet, Sir Francis Burdett, Mr. Sturch asserts the importance of the connexion between Great Britain and Ireland, and the necessity of their union being cemented by their mutual interests; and traces the melancholy history of English misrule in Ireland from the time of Henry II. downwards. To this long series of bad government he attributes the evils, too obvious to be overlooked, in the character and condition of the Irish people.

“—the sum of all is, that IRELAND, blest with a soil and climate well suited to the production of all the necessaries of life, and many of its luxuries; with noble rivers, magnificent lakes, spacious and commodious harbours, above all, with A PEOPLE NOT INFERIOR IN CORPOREAL OR MENTAL ABILITY TO ANY IN EUROPE; numbering amongst her sons many illustrious characters whose names adorn the pages of history in successive ages, and having been connected with Great Britain more than *six hundred years*, is yet, to this day, so far as regards the great mass of her inhabitants,

POOR AND IGNORANT, OPPRESSED AND UNHAPPY.”—P. 19.

The causes of all this misery Mr. Sturch considers to be the four following—the removal of which, of course, constitutes the remedies which he proposes:

1. “By far the most powerful and universally operating cause of the wretched state of a great part of the population of Ireland, appears to me to be one which, although its origin and its long continuance may possibly be traced to the want of a good general government, yet it is now beyond the power of any government on earth to remove; and with which, indeed, the state has no right whatever directly to interfere. I mean, the too generally prevalent custom of letting lands, or as it is usually called in Ireland, and indeed in some parts of England, *setting*, or permitting them to be underlet, in very small holdings,—at very high rents,—to needy persons,—and upon long leases.”
2. “The second great point to which I would solicit attention, is intimately connected with the first. I mean, the universal instruction of the children of the poor, without distinction of sects, in the necessary arts of reading, writing, and the first rules of arithmetic, in the simple principles of moral obligation, and in decent and regular demeanour. I would add, as a matter of no trifling moment, in the English language.”
3. “The third point of importance in considering the state of Ireland, is that which is commonly called Catholic Emancipation; and which has lately so entirely occupied the public mind.”
4. “The fourth essential consideration for the welfare of both countries, and the last that I shall advert to, is the entire consolidation of the Executive branch of the Constitution with that of England; the complete reform of the revenue laws; the revision of the system of interior government, and the removal of the oppressions which arise out of it; and the establishment of perfect freedom of trade between the two islands.”

We have not room to explain in what way Mr. Sturch would apply all his remedies, but must refer the reader to the “Letter” itself, which will amply reward the perusal. We may briefly observe, that his scheme of “Catholic Emancipation” is, that the Church-lands in Ireland should be vested in Commissioners, who should let them to the best advantage, and divide the net proceeds according

to a prescribed scale amongst the resident and working clergy, and that tithes and other church-claims should be wholly abolished. This is rational and equitable enough, though we fear the clergy will meet the proposal with the cry of sacrilege! With tithes, Mr. Sturch would sweep away the *Regium Donum*, (as it is improperly called—being in reality an annual grant of Parliament,) constituting the national endowment of Presbyterian places of worship. For this he suggests no substitute: will not therefore the several Presbyteries cry out as loudly as the clergy against such a reform?

On the general subject of Emancipation we are tempted to extract one admirable passage, and we are sorry that we cannot extract more:

“That six parts out of seven in any country should be absolutely shut out from all chance of the occupation of the higher offices in the state, and should continue, during two centuries, to be excluded from being eligible to represent any part of the community in Parliament, besides being subject to a variety of other inconveniences and disabilities, for no other reason than their differing in some of their religious opinions from the seventh part, which seventh part, be it remembered, are infinitely divided in opinion amongst themselves, is, surely, a state of things which would excite the utmost astonishment if related for the first time to any persons accustomed to the use of reason. But that these insulting, degrading, and discouraging disabilities should be suffered to continue in force against so vast a majority of the inhabitants of that country, and should be obstinately defended as just and necessary, after their *‘peaceable and loyal demeanour’* had been publicly acknowledged by the legislature, and stated as a reason why *‘it is fit that those many restraints and disabilities to which other subjects of the realm are not liable, shall be discontinued,’* and after they had given, and professed themselves *‘still ready to give every pledge that can be devised for their peaceable demeanour and unconditional submission to the laws,’* is an enormity that would exceed all belief, if it were not perfectly notorious and indisputable.

“That any people so unjustly and ignominiously treated should be perfectly contented, is impossible. That the whole of so large a body should, under these circumstances, continue to be uniformly peaceable and loyal, is not to be expect-

ed. Dangerous insurrections have accordingly arisen, and it is greatly to be feared, that if justice shall continue to be pertinaciously denied, rebellions of a more alarming character will succeed, accompanied with all those horrors at which I have slightly hinted in the beginning of this letter.

“But I feel ashamed of attempting to terrify my countrymen into an act of justice. I would much rather appeal to the nobler feelings of their hearts. I would call their attention to the right that every man possesses by Nature, a right uncontrollable by human laws, to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience; and the injustice of interfering with the exercise of that right, by civil disabilities and privations. I would remind them that the human mind ought to be free as air in the investigation of truth, in the acquisition of every kind of knowledge, and in the application of it, by every individual, to his own use and benefit, and in the diffusion of it, for the benefit of others. In a word, I would urge my fellow-subjects to the practical assertion of religious liberty in its most perfect form.

“For I wish it to be clearly understood, that it is upon this ground alone, and not from any partiality to the Romish faith, that I advocate the cause of Catholic Emancipation. If the question were about religious truth, I should certainly lift up my voice against the religion of Rome, as a corruption of the best and purest religion that the world have ever known. I find it difficult to believe that Newspaper report, in which you, Sir, are made to say, in the House of Commons, that ‘all religions are good;’ but if you did say so, you probably meant, that in every form of religion there is *something* good, and in that sense the assertion may perhaps be true; for it would certainly require great ingenuity to teach religion, and above all the Christian religion, in any form, so as entirely to leave out that which is the great end, the sum and substance of all religions, the moral precepts; and whatever of these are retained *must* be good. But no religion can be said to be good, the very ground and leading principle of which is bad. The religion of the worshipers of Juggernaut, which teaches its unhappy votaries to *destroy* their bodies for the salvation of their souls, cannot be good. And the religion of Rome, which lays it down as a first principle, that all men must be in communion with its bishop, and must believe all its doctrines, without presuming to inquire whether they are true or false, on pain of eternal damnation to all who shall dissent, can-

not be good, because it directly tends to reduce the human mind to the most abject, disgraceful, and pernicious thralldom. It is, therefore, 'of the highest importance, that all the real friends of mankind should unite in resisting and opposing it; *not by force*, but by REASON; not by penal statutes, but by every generous and Christian endeavour to assist the diffusion of light, and to facilitate the progress of MORAL AND RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE.'—Pp. 44—48.

ART. VI — *England Enslaved by her own Slave Colonies. An Address to the Electors and People of the United Kingdom.* By James Stephen, Esq. 2nd edition. 8vo. pp. 68. 1826.

ART. VII — *Third Report of the Committee of the Society for the Mitigation and Gradual Abolition of Slavery throughout the British Dominions. Read at a Special Meeting of the Members and Friends of the Society, held (on the 21st of December, 1825) for the purpose of petitioning Parliament on the Subject of Slavery. With Notes and an Appendix.* 8vo. pp. 36. Printed for the Society. Hatchard and Son. 1826.

WE should sicken as we survey the miseries under which human nature groans, if we did not also behold the mighty mass of intellect which is at work for man's redemption. Negro-slavery is the darkest stain upon the character of modern times; but this is relieved in the eye of Christian philanthropy by the noble efforts that have been and are made, from motives of pure humanity, for wiping away the opprobrium from the face of civilized nations. These efforts may be ascribed to the Society named in the second of these articles, which is less known than it deserves to be, and is far from adequately supported in a pecuniary way by the professed friends of negro-emancipation.

The abolition of the Slave-trade was a signal triumph of humanity, achieved by the short-lived administration under the ever-to-be honoured Charles James Fox. It is melancholy to reflect how little has been done since that period for bettering the condition of the Blacks.

"No less than eighteen years have elapsed since Parliament, in voting the Slave-trade to be contrary to justice and humanity, virtually recorded the moral title of those oppressed and degraded human beings to their freedom; for it is plain, that a bondage iniquitously imposed cannot be rightfully prolonged. Necessity alone could justify the delaying for an hour the full restitution that was due to them; and such a necessity was accordingly alleged. It was asserted that a sudden enfranchisement was dangerous, and that therefore progressive means must be employed.

"But how did we follow up those views? Sixteen times had the sun run his annual course, and still beheld all these victims of injustice toiling like brutes under the drivers, in all the moral filth of slavery, and all the darkness of pagan ignorance; tortured at discretion with the tremendous lash of the cart-whip, sold like cattle in a market, and condemned at the owner's will to a perpetual exile from their native homes, their wives, their husbands, their parents, and their children. A hundred thousand at least of hapless infants had in the mean time been born of the enslaved females in our colonies; and how had they been treated? Exempted from that state which it was held so hard and dangerous to alter? Educated in Christian principles? Prepared for exercising when adults the rights and duties of free men?—No: but left to learn idolatry from their parents, and their duties from the driver's whip; and to hand down the vices and the miseries of slavery, with the alleged difficulties and dangers of correcting them to other generations." *England Enslaved*, p. 4.

In 1823, in consequence of the exertions of the Anti-Slavery Society, the case of the Negroes was brought before the Parliament, when His Majesty's Ministers moved Resolutions, which were unanimously carried, pledging the country to measures of amelioration. But, alas! it was foreseen that the resolutions would be nugatory, since the plan of the government was merely to recommend the improvements that were contemplated to the Colonial Assemblies.

"The experienced friends of the Slaves must have lost their memories or their understandings, if they had entertained a hope that such a course would produce any good effect. They saw in it, if not frustration and positive mischief, at least certain disappointment and delay. Recommendation to the Assemblies!! Why,

the experiment had been tried repeatedly, during a period of twenty-six years, as well before as after the abolition of the Slave-trade; and had uniformly and totally failed. The Crown, the Parliament, and that far more influential body, the West-India Committee of this country, with Mr. Ellis at the head of it, had all recommended, supplicated, and even menaced, in vain. Not a single Assembly had deigned to relax one cord of their rigorous bondage; or to adopt a single measure that had been proposed to them for the temporal or spiritual benefit of the Slaves, except in a way manifestly evasive, and plainly intended, as well as proved by experience, to be useless; while some of those inexorable bodies had even met the solicitations of their Sovereign, and the resolutions of the supreme legislature, with express rejection and contempt. Recommendation to the *Assemblies!!!* to the authors of every wrong to be redressed! of every oppression to be mitigated! to Slave-masters, the representatives of Slave-masters, hardened by familiarity with the odious system in which they have been long personally engaged, and surrounded with crowds of indigent and vulgar Whites, to whom slavery yields a sordid subsistence, and the degradation of the Blacks is privilege and respect! You might as well recommend toleration to Spanish Inquisitors, or Grecian liberty to the Turkish Divan." *England Enslaved*, p. 5.

In Jamaica, as we learn from the speech of the Governor, just brought over, not a single step has been taken in compliance with the instructions of Government; and the same remark may be made with regard to all the other colonial legislatures, without an exception. (*Report*, p. 6.) The Assemblies defy the Government and the people of England, and without some further interference the cause of the Negroes is hopeless.

The only spot in which the measures of ministers are attempted to be carried into effect is Trinidad, which, happily for this end, has no legislative assembly. Here, too, all is done by compulsion, and by unwilling agents, who are actuated, it is to be feared, more by the spirit of the other islands than by that of the authorities at home.

Since the last discussion in Parliament, many new facts have come to light with respect to the state of the negroes. The proceedings of the Fiscal of Berbice, for instance, have been

published, and a truly notable illustration they are of the privileges which the planters sometimes boast that they have conceded to the slaves. One of these is, that such as are aggrieved may complain to a magistrate: but mark the humanity of the law! If the magistrate, himself a planter and slave-holder, shall judge the complaint unfounded, he is empowered at his discretion to punish the complainant, by sending him to the whip. *Report*, p. 10.

We refer the reader for a full understanding of this melancholy subject to the pamphlets before us, and especially to Mr. Stephen's "Address," which is one of the ablest and most effective expositions of a political subject which ever came before the public. It is admirable as a specimen of composition; more admirable as an effusion of humanity and Christian benevolence. The Master in Chancery feels that in his argument he stands upon high ground; and from the eminence to which he is raised by the growing strength of the cause, by the support of government and the co-operation of the people, he hurls down weapon after weapon, of reason and of irony, drawn from political expediency and from Christian duty, which the supporters of unqualified slavery will find it impossible to repel or even to parry. As far as reasoning extends, the day is won.

Mr. Stephen calls upon all classes of his countrymen to come forward and strengthen the hands of Government in this righteous cause, by their declarations and petitions. What pious man can resist the following appeal?

"Servants of God, of every description, my last and surest appeal is made to you. Of whatever faith you are, Churchmen, Dissenters, Catholics, Theists of every kind; if you believe that there is a God, the common Parent of the human race, who delights in justice and mercy, behold a cause that demands your strenuous support. The Slave-masters would craftily divide you. They would avail themselves of your theological differences; and especially would persuade you, if they could, that those who earnestly maintain this cause of God and man, are all fanatics and enthusiasts. But what creed will be found to countenance a system like theirs, when its true nature is developed? Even the Mahometan faith proscribes it, though

in a much milder form, except as a scourge for unbelievers.

“What then! is it pushing religious zeal too far to say that innocent fellow-creatures ought not to be left in a perpetual hereditary Slavery? that unoffending men, women, and children, ought not to be deprived of all civil and human rights, and condemned to toil for life, like cattle, under the whips of the drivers? Is it enthusiasm, to hold that a Slavery so rigorous as to have destroyed thousands and tens of thousands of its victims in our Sugar Colonies, and which is still so fatal that the most prolific of the human race cannot maintain their numbers in it, ought to be lenified by law? Is it fanaticism, to regard a bondage imposed by acknowledged crime, as one that cannot be rightfully protracted, and fastened on the progeny for ever? Then let religion and wrong, religion and cruelty, religion and murder, shake hands.

“To such of you as are deeply impressed with the truth and importance of the doctrines peculiar to Christianity, and zealous for their propagation, and to such of you as are accustomed to observe and recognize the hand of Divine Providence in the government of the world, there is much more that I could wish to say. I might appeal to the principles you hold most sacred, for the duty of lending your aid to reform an impious system which shuts out the light of the Gospel, and violates in the grossest manner all its precepts; which keeps in a cruel thralldom the minds, as well as bodies, of its unfortunate victims; and adds to its other enormities anti-christian persecution. I might shew the inconsistency of the charitable efforts you are making to convert your fellow-creatures in the most distant and uncivilized regions of the globe, while you suffer your fellow-subjects to be kept in pagan darkness, and the vilest moral degradation, not by choice, but by compulsion, through a domestic tyranny which your own power, within your own territories, impiously upholds. I might prove to your entire conviction how hopeless it is that the poor Slaves in general should be made Christians, in more than name, by any means that have been adopted, or can be used, without raising their temporal condition.

“Many of you also, I doubt not, might be strongly impressed by a clear and comprehensive view of that wonderful chain of events, which indicates, as plainly as events unexplained by Revelation can indicate, to human eyes, the hand of Divine Providence avenging the wrongs of the poor enslaved Africans, and favouring, I trust, our feeble efforts for their deliverance. The ‘signs of the times’ are

in this respect well worthy of the careful observation of every pious mind; and it is no presumption to deduce from them, not a new rule of conduct, but confirmation and encouragement in a purpose prescribed to us by the clearest principles of Christian duty.

“But I think it best to abstain at present from these important and interesting topics. To do any justice to them here, would be to extend too far the length of this address. My views on some of them are already, though partially, before the public; and I hope ere long to present to the religious friends of our cause, in a separate publication, a defence of the Bible against the foul charge of its countenancing Colonial Slavery; to which I propose to add a summary of those very extraordinary facts and coincidences that indicate, to my firm conviction, a purpose of Divine Providence to avenge, and I trust also to deliver, the long-oppressed African race.”—*England Enslaved*, pp. 65—67.

Already the call has been heard and obeyed. Hundreds of petitions in favour of the negroes have been poured, and are still pouring, into the Houses of Parliament; many from large towns, some from corporations, and a few from counties. Many more will, we doubt not, attest to the legislature and the world the inextinguishable hatred of slavery which is native to the hearts of Englishmen.

The Dissenting Ministers of the Three Denominations have presented unanimous petitions in concurrence with the general feeling. The Deputies from the Dissenting congregations have at least talked of petitioning. The Committee of the more active “Protestant Society” have resolved on petitions, and published their resolutions; they have also recommended to congregations, in connexion with them, to send up separate petitions, of the expediency of which we have some doubts. The question is, how the greatest sum of influence is to be obtained. And we cannot but think that the proper answer is, “Go to the legislature in large masses, or with the authority of recognized bodies. This is not a measure that belongs to Churchmen or Dissenters, or Catholics; it belongs to ALL. Unite in the pursuit of it, for this very union will be strength.”

Some of the petitions may, and probably will, be unwise; so we, at least, should denominate any which may pray for immediate emancipation, or overlook the claims of the planters to

compensation. All that we contemplate is such steps in favour of the Negroes as shall civilize and christianize them, and prepare them eventually for freedom, and that not in opposition to their masters, but in promotion of their ultimate interests; so that in the event the proprietor and the slave, the colony and the mother-country, may be

benefited, and that, with the concurrence and co-operation and satisfaction of all parties, human nature may be vindicated, Christianity may gain a triumph in the recovery of nearly a million of human beings to happiness, and the English name may be restored to its due honours in the eyes of the whole world.

POETRY.

LINES TO THE FIRST PRIMROSE OF THE YEAR.

CHILD of the early year,
Thy stormy lullaby
Sweeps o'er my ear
In the rude wind's wintry sigh.

Thou look'st in beauty forth,
To tell the tale of spring,
Ere yet the North
Has unfurled his cloudy wing—

In other zones to reign,
Through polar pines to roar,
And lash the main
On the sullen arctic shore.

The winds thy cradle rock,
To their stern melody,
As if to mock
At thy pale fragility.

Yet there thou bloomest on,
Like worth by sorrow tried,
Rearing its crown
'Mid the storms of time and tide.

And looking to the sky,
Where all *such* flowers shall wave
(No more to die)
In the winds beyond the grave.

Crediton, Feb. 20, 1826.

STANZAS.

ALL that live must taste of sorrow—
The golden clouds of to-day,
Ere the sun shall arise to-morrow,
Will be passed, like a dream, away;
And the hopes which from time we borrow,
Are wrought of a frail world's clay.

Ah, vainly the heart reposes
On the visions of life's young morn!
Many hearts, ere its evening closes,
Will be left to bleed forlorn:
The tear is the dew of its roses,
And the rose is the bride of the thorn.

But grief is the fire of trial,
The gold of the soul to prove ;
And over this frail life's dial
Many shadows of pain must move,
Ere the heart be a crystal vial
For the waters of life above.

Alas, for the chains that bind us,
For the souls that are earthly still !
Alas, that the days behind us
Should the thoughts of immortals fill—
That the tears of this world should blind us
To the light of the paradise-rill !

Crediton.

THE SONG OF MOSES.

Exod. xv. 1—21.

THE horse and the rider are thrown in the sea,
And Israel, escaped from her bondage, is free—
Jehovah has conquer'd—to Him I will raise
The song that bursts forth from my heart in His praise.

The arm of our God was our safety alone,
That arm has the hosts that pursued us o'erthrown ;
The God of our fathers has fought on our side,
And Pharaoh struck down in the pomp of his pride,
His chariots and horsemen, o'erwhelmed by the waves,
Have sunk in the deep ocean's fathomless graves !

Thy hand, O *Jehovah*, is glorious in fight,
And none can resist its omnipotent might ;
The foe that rose up in his pride against Thee
Thou hast scatter'd, and drown'd in the depths of the sea.
As stubble dispers'd by the wind, so the breath
Of Thy wrath in a moment has swept them to death ;
The monarch himself, his chief captains and hosts,
Lie entomb'd in the Red Sea that washes their coasts.

The blast of Thy power divided the flood,
And the billows, ascending on either side, stood
Like mountains of water, unscalably steep,
High walls of defence in the midst of the deep.
Exulting in triumph the enemy cried,
“ I will follow—o’ertake—all the spoil will divide ;
My lust in their ruin shall riot its fill,
The sword I unsheathe—the slaves I will kill !”

The breath of Thy spirit blew strong on the waves,
They cover'd that host in their fathomless graves ;
Like lead they sank down in the depth of the sea,
And Israel, redeem'd from her bondage, is free.

O *Jehovah*, our God, who with Thee can compare,
’Midst the gods of the earth, or the gods of the air ?
Whose glory or greatness is equal to Thine ?
Whose deeds are so glorious, whose power so divine ?
Thou stretch'd out Thy hand from the gloom of the cloud—
The earth deep engulph'd them—the sea was their shroud.

The nations shall hear, and with trembling shall own,
Almighty the Power which our foes has o'erthrown :
The arm of the valiant unnerv'd shall decline,
And hosts stand in motionless dread, Lord, of Thine.

The princes of Edom in terror shall quake,
 The knees of thy mighty men, Moab, shall shake,
 Thy sons, Palestina, droop hopeless in woe,
 And Canaan melt from His presence as snow.

Thou hast rescued Thy people from slavery's yoke,
 Thy mercy the chain of their vassalage broke ;
 Thou wilt lead them triumphant thro' deserts and seas,
 To the land fix'd as theirs in Thy changeless decrees—
 The land of long promise, where, placing thy throne,
 Thou reignest Almighty, and reignest alone !

The horse and the rider are cast in the sea,
 And Israel, escaped from her bondage, is free—
Jehovah has conquer'd—to Him I will raise
 The song that bursts forth from my heart in His praise.

J. B.

Rotherham, February 3, 1826.

VERSES

To a Daughter on the completion of her Eighteenth Year.

THIS morn, dear EMMA ! swiftly too, I ween,
 Advance the promis'd hours of gay nineteen,
 And soon—may Heav'n indulge a parent's prayer—
 Shall woman's honour'd duties be thy care.
 Full many a sun has pour'd the morning ray,
 Since last my verse would hail thy natal day :
 And now, or ere life's ev'ning shades prevail,
 Ere memory sleep, and thought and language fail,
 Fain would I ask, once more, the rhymer's art,
 A father's favourite wishes to impart,
 That woman, matron, friend, each dear relation,
 To thee be, Heav'n-endow'd, a blest vocation,
 Till Time present thee, virtuous, kind, and sage,
 The guide, the exemplar of another age.

J. T. R.

OBITUARY.

SAMUEL PARKES, ESQ. [Mon. Repos. XX. 752.]

Mr. SAMUEL PARKES was the eldest son of Samuel and Hannah Parkes, of Stourbridge, in Worcestershire, and was born there on the 26th of May, 1761. At the age of five years he was sent to a preparatory school in the town, and during the time of his daily attendance at this infant seminary, Mr. Kemble's company of itinerant performers were at Stourbridge, and played in a capacious barn to a large auditory; the success of the company being great, they staid in the town several months, and Mr. Kemble sent his daughter to the same school. This child was afterwards the celebrated Mrs. Siddons. At the age of ten, he was sent to a school kept by the Rev. Stephen Addington, at Market Harbo-

rough, in the county of Leicester. For this gentleman Mr. Parkes always expressed strong feelings of respect and obligation for the instructions he had received from him, but how long he remained with him does not appear; but when removed from school, he returned home and was in his father's business, that of a grocer, till he settled for himself. In 1790, while living at Stourbridge, Mr. Parkes was active in establishing a public library in the town, and was the president for some years; about the same time he was engaged in the management of the erection of a chapel for Unitarian worship; indeed he always felt a lively interest for the welfare of his native place. About the year 1793, Mr. Parkes went to reside at Stoke upon Trent, where he began business as a

soap boiler, and from this time he dated his commencement of chemical pursuits. In 1794 he married Miss Twamley, of Dudley. During the time he lived at Stoke, in consequence of there being no place for Unitarian worship, Mr. Parkes had a private service in his own house every Sunday, which was attended by many of his friends from the neighbourhood. In 1803 Mr. Parkes came to settle in London as a manufacturing chemist. In 1805 he published the first edition of the Chemical Catechism [M. Repos. II. 30]; in 1809, the first edition of the Rudiments of Chemistry. In 1810 he was active in forming the Christian Tract Society. In 1813 Mrs. Parkes died quite suddenly, while Mr. P. was on a journey in the North, and a memoir of her written by himself will be found in the Mon. Repos. [IX. 68, 114]. In 1815, Mr. Parkes published his first edition of the Chemical Essays, in five volumes, 12mo. [M. Repos. X. 586.] In 1817, the Highland Society of Scotland voted Mr. Parkes a piece of plate for his Essay on Kelp and Barilla, which was printed in the transactions of the Society. This year Mr. Parkes was very active, in conjunction with the late Sir Thomas Bernard, in endeavouring to obtain a repeal of the Salt duties, and published a small work entitled "Thoughts on the Salt Laws," and soon after published "A Letter to Farmers on the Use of Salt in Agriculture." He also received a piece of plate from the Horticultural Society of Scotland, for a paper sent to them on the uses of salt in gardening. After so many years of assiduous labour, he had the satisfaction, in 1825, of seeing his endeavours to benefit his country crowned with success by the entire repeal of this tax, to accomplish which he began to write twenty years before, and he received with no small degree of pleasure letters from different parts of the country thanking him for his exertions in this useful cause. In 1820, Mr. Parkes published a second edition of the Rudiments of Chemistry, and in this year was actively engaged in the trial of Severn and Co., in which were examined almost the whole of the leading chemists of the country. In January 1822, the tenth edition of the Chemical Catechism was published, and in 1823, a new edition of the Chemical Essays, in 2 vols. 8vo., and about the same time an improved edition of the Rudiments. It was very gratifying to Mr. Parkes to know that his different works had been translated into the German, French, Spanish and Russian languages, besides many editions published in America. In Spain and Germany the Chemical Catechism is the standard chemical work in the public schools. He was constantly engaged in correcting his

works, and at the time of his death had three new editions preparing for the press. In June 1825, Mr. Parkes went to Edinburgh and was there taken ill and attended by the first medical practitioners of that city: his illness, however, became so severe and alarming that his son-in-law, Mr. Hodgetts, hastened to him, and, as soon as it was considered prudent, he removed him to London by easy stages. The disease had become too deeply seated by this time to be eradicated, and his family had the pain of watching him fast sinking away from his sphere of usefulness. He was attended by Dr. Babington, Dr. Farr, Dr. Bright and Sir Astley Cooper, but medical skill was useless and unable to alleviate his acute and severe sufferings, sufferings which none but those who witnessed could imagine; but throughout the whole of his illness he was never heard to repine, and expressed the most lively pleasure at receiving the visits of his numerous friends: indeed, the *last* sentence he uttered only a few hours before his death, was to thank a friend standing by him for his kindness in coming to see him, and he was constantly talking of the attentions he received. But, alas! his friends only alleviated for a time his pain; his valuable life was not at their disposal; and after a severe struggle of eight and forty hours this affectionate parent, valued friend and useful member of society, closed his active life on the 23rd of December, 1825.

H.

[Mr. Parkes contributed several papers to this work: on the Indestructibility of Matter, IV. 20 and 711, and V. 175; an extended Obituary account of his father, VI. 431; an interesting description of a "Visit to Birstal, Dr. Priestley's Native Place," XI. 274, &c., &c. ED.]

1825. Dec. 28, at *Moretonhampstead*, in the 70th year of his age, Mr. JOHN TRELEAVEN. There were many qualities in the character of this excellent man which entitled him to peculiar respect, and rendered his death the occasion of no common sorrow. The natural strength of his mind, the soundness of his judgment, and the strict inflexible integrity which marked his whole conduct, gave him an influence seldom possessed by persons who move in a much higher sphere, and little capable of being understood by those who had not the privilege of witnessing it. In no instance, perhaps, has the superiority of moral distinctions to all that rank and greatness and wealth can bestow, been more unequivocally proved. Believing that those enlarged views of religion, of its

doctrines and its duties, which recommended themselves to his serious and discerning mind, were supremely important, he took care that his heart should bear witness to their calm and steady and habitual efficacy. He knew how to contend earnestly for the principles which he had embraced, without being unmindful of his own weakness and fallibility; and he rejoiced to behold in every class of Christians bright and beautiful examples of Christian virtue. The spirit of unostentatious, cheerful piety which distinguished him in the earlier days, and amidst the more active scenes of his life, did not forsake him when his head was silvered with the honours of age, and it strikingly displayed itself through the period of his decline. His failing strength announced that the time of his departure was at hand; and he could lay him down in peace; for he was not afraid to die. Death entered his chamber, and was welcomed by him as a messenger from the throne of mercy, sent to tell him that the season of his trial and labour was over, and that his reward was ready. In that house of prayer which so long saw him a humble and devout worshiper, bowing down before the Majesty of Heaven, within those walls which so often resounded to his heartfelt and animating notes of praise, his removal has left a void that cannot easily be filled up. May the affectionate mourner who grieves for the loss of her stay, her counsellor, her friend, find comfort in the sure promises of the widow's God! And, while his children muse over the memory of a father, by whose presence their home was enlivened and endeared, may they redouble their grateful, considerate attentions to her who bare them, and dwell together in uninterrupted harmony and love, helping and serving one another! To the individual who traces this feeble record of departed worth, Mr. Treleaven was "the friend of many years," and he hopes never to forget his virtues, never to lose the impression of his kindness. "We took sweet counsel together, and walked unto the house of God in company."

J. H. B.

1826. Jan. 5, aged 54, after an illness of long continuance, Mr. JOHN WOOD, of Shore Place, Hackney. The following affectionate tribute to his memory has been put into our hands: "The name of an individual, who took so lively an interest in a work which now records his decease, must not be passed unnoticed. The study of theology had of late years become the favourite occupation of his leisure hours, and a few days previous to

his death, he said to one of his family, 'That were his life prolonged, and he could devote his time exclusively to literature, it would be his chief pleasure to write for and read the Repository.' The distinctive and essential characteristic of the deceased was *benevolence*. It was this which led him, in days of activity, to promote the interests of all who called upon him for assistance; in hours of conversation it prompted him to admire and advocate whatever tended to universal peace; and in moments of reflection induced him to cherish and pursue those tenets which exhibit the Creator in the most merciful points of view to his erring creatures. He continually referred to the folly and bigotry of the supposition that Unitarianism was merely a religion for the hour of health and prosperity, for he had found that it enabled him to look forward to his death with calmness and with hope. He always spoke favourably of human nature generally, and in his individual experience, the grateful and the good had always preponderated over the unthankful and the evil. May he receive that mercy that he hoped would be the portion of all those who worship the Father in spirit and in truth!"——Mr. Aspland paid a justly-deserved tribute of respect to this excellent man, in a funeral sermon, Jan. 15, at the Gravel-Pit Meeting, of which Mr. Wood had long been an active and universally-respected member.

Jan. 21, SOPHIA ELIZABETH, aged 36, wife of the Rev. E. BRISTOW, of Birmingham. During a long period of depression and sickness the supports and consolations of religion were powerfully felt. While her mind on most subjects partook of the infirmity of her body, and frequently inclined her to despondency, her views of religious truth were ever of the most cheerful and comprehensive kind. Though anxious by every means to prolong her life, she still contemplated death without dismay, and looked forward to futurity with devout hope; and the closing scene of her earthly existence at once displayed her mild and unostentatious yet fervent piety, and evinced the beneficial tendency of correct views concerning the scriptural character of the great Supreme. Fully aware of her approaching dissolution, and retaining her faculties to the last, she requested to bid adieu to her child, and then calmly resigned her spirit into the hands of her Creator. Agreeably to her own request, she was interred at the Old Meeting-house, in Birmingham; and the funeral service, which was most impressively performed by the Rev. J. Kerish, toge-

ther with the devotional exercises and the sermon of the ensuing Lord's-day morning, evidently affected the hearts of those who assembled to pay the last tribute of respect to her memory.

Jan. 26, at *Portsea*, Mr. JAMES BRENT, a Burgess of the Corporation of Portsmouth. Having attended public worship on the Lord's-day and read the hymns with more than usual animation, at the close of the afternoon service he complained of indisposition, but spoke cheerfully, and, taking an affectionate leave of his brothers and friends, walked home. On joining his family he said, "I am very ill;" and, when seated, remarked, he thought the spasms which afflicted him would eventually occasion his death. A stimulant having been promptly prepared, he just tasted it, the glass fell from his hand, and, supported by his wife and daughters, he expired in their arms, without a struggle, groan or sigh, and without a feature or muscle of his countenance being distorted. Medical aid was instantly called in, but proved ineffectual. His family were involved in the deepest sorrow by the momentary nature of the shock and the awful separation it had produced. On the Friday morning after his decease he was interred in the General Baptist Chapel, St. Thomas's Street, Portsmouth, when the Rev. RUSSELL SCOTT performed the funeral service, and on the following Sunday morning kindly improved the mournful event in an appropriate and pathetic address to a numerous, attentive and sympathizing audience, from *Zachariah i. 5, Your fathers, where are they?*—The subject of this memoir possessed a sound understanding and a mind well stored with useful knowledge. He was an attentive and judicious observer of the passing events, and held deception in abhorrence when practised by those placed either in high or low stations of political trust. As a subject of the British Government he felt it his duty to defend strenuously the principles of constitutional liberty established at the memorable era of 1688, and from this honourable line of conduct nothing could induce him to deviate. The chicanery of priests and the cant of hypocrites were his soul's aversion: integrity and uprightness marked his own character. He was serious, pious and extensively benevolent, and his heart often bled over the follies, misfortunes and suffering of others, which he had not the power to counteract or the ability to relieve. Instructed in early life by pious and respectable parents in the first principles of natural and revealed religion, on personal conviction of its being a Christian rite, he was baptized,

and joined the Church meeting in the chapel before named, of which the Rev. JOHN MILLS was then pastor. [See *Monthly Repository*, VIII. 743.] Not long after becoming a member of the society, he was appointed to the office of deacon, which he filled nearly forty years with credit to himself. If he ever was a believer in the Trinity, it must have been in early life, as from the time of his first making a public profession of religion, one God, the Father only, was the object of his faith and worship. To this, in his estimation, essential branch of Christian faith and practice, he gave the most uniform support through life—as also to those great moral truths, the accountability of man, and the love of God to the whole human race! Indeed, amidst the trials of this evanescent state, his best consolations were derived from a lively hope of the final happiness of all men, through the unpurchased mercy of God in Jesus Christ. These religious principles were not embraced as an amusing theory, but as motives to virtuous obedience. Hence he was the tender husband, kind and provident father, affectionate brother, peaceable neighbour, and actively benevolent friend. The CHRISTIAN SOCIETY to which he belonged will remember with lasting respect his unwearied, solicitous regard for its welfare, particularly his laudable exertions in frequently, during the two years' illness of its pastor, keeping the chapel open when it would otherwise have been shut for want of a supply. On these occasions he conducted the devotional services, and read sermons selected with judgment for the edification of the congregation. *Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord: HE rests from his labour, and his work will follow him.*

Jan. 30, at his residence in *Thornhaugh Street*, the Rev. JOHN HYATT, one of the ministers of Tottenham-Court Chapel and the Tabernacle, Moorfields. He was highly esteemed in his connexion, that of the Calvinistic Methodists, and was the author of a volume of Sermons [see *Mon. Repos.* XI. 611—614] and many other religious publications.

Feb. 7, at *Bermondsey*, in the 69th year of his age, the Rev. JOHN TOWNSEND, Pastor of the Independent congregation in that place. He was a sensible, prudent and excellent man, whose piety and benevolence were most exemplary. He was one of the Founders of the Asylum for the Deaf and Dumb, and one of Mr. Coward's Trustees. He was also an active member of several Dissenting Societies for charitable objects.

Feb. 16, at *Norwich*, whither he had removed in December in the hope that change and the anxious attentions of a widowed mother might restore his health, WILLIAM HENRY TAGART, in the 23rd year of his age. If ever a deep conviction of the wisdom, rectitude and benevolence of the Divine government be necessary to repress the murmur of complaint, and the hopes of religion needful to soothe the anguish of regret, surely it must be when the fond parent and attached family are called to resign at once a son and brother, with whose life, situation and character have been connected all the most encouraging prospects and sacred endearments of this world. For the decay of age we are prepared by nature. Is a career of vice suddenly checked?—it accords with our notions of wise, providential interference.—But when a young man, rejoicing in his strength, full of promise and of hope, already the protector of the fatherless and the confidence of the widow, is cut off in the morning of his days, the dispensation is awfully mysterious. This tries the strength of Christian faith and resignation. In vain do we probe our natural understanding for an argument to justify this act of Providence; and happy is it that we can summon to our aid the apostle's exhortation "to sorrow not as those who are without hope," and with implicit trust can rely upon the Divine promises of his and our great Author and Finisher of faith. The youth whose rapid and fatal decline has suggested these reflections, was distinguished by the firmness of his religious principles, by the blamelessness of his life, by the gentleness of his manners, and by a most truly amiable and excellent disposition. Having lost his father at the age of fourteen, and being the oldest of a large surviving family, he entered early upon his brief career of laborious and useful exertion; and from that time became the best and almost only assistant of the widow, and acted as a father to the fatherless. Though sent forth thus early to open a way for himself and those he loved to an honourable station in the world, and exposed to all the evils attendant upon removal from the salutary restraints of the parental roof, it is no little consolation to his mourning friends to reflect, that not a single instance can be traced of his departure from the path of rectitude. Far be it from a surviving relative, in the weakness of partial affection, to exaggerate the value of his loss; but surely he was a youth of no common character, who, without the encouragement of immediate example, or impulse gained from a thoroughly completed virtuous education, held on a quiet course of innocence and purity, integrity and uprightness, with persevering

and steady application to his duties; who was not only beloved as an associate, but respected as an example by his companions; who neglected no opportunity which the confinement of his situation admitted for religious instruction and intellectual improvement; who was known by few, perhaps by none, without acquiring their esteem and their attachment. As a son and as a brother he was invaluable; and the recollection of him in the minds of those who knew and loved him, will be embalmed by all those little nameless acts of beautiful and affectionate attention to their wants and wishes, which, "by the world unseen or scorn'd," constitute the happiness and endearment of private and domestic life. There was indeed that religious purity and integrity felt in his presence and seen in his actions which often mark the victim of an early death. He is gone where the heart will be judged. Let then the trumpet of fame call the attention of the world to those whose glory and reward it is that they are seen and heard of men; but let the pious and humble Christian take comfort in the thought, that in the breast of one who lives and dies almost unknown, there may exist a benevolence as pure, a virtuous energy as great, a hope as high, as in the more distinguished of the earth; and that our heavenly Father marks and approves the secrets of the heart. This is the consolation for all the bereavements which friendship and affection are called to endure, and this the motive for continued perseverance in every path of quiet and unostentatious, though hard and oftentimes oppressive duty. E. T.

Feb. 16, at *Southampton*, ANNE COBB MAURICE, third daughter of the Rev. M. Maurice, formerly of *Frenchay*. Patience, meekness and resignation were united in her to brotherly kindness and charity, and by a pious and diligent perusal of the Scriptures she aimed to form her faith and to direct her conduct.

Feb. 17, aged 21, after an illness of three months' duration, JAMES, the youngest son of Mr. WILLIAM CLARK, of *Much Park Street, Coventry*. In this amiable and excellent young man were united those qualities, both of the head and heart, which never fail to ensure to their possessor the respect and esteem of all the truly wise and good. Destined from his fifteenth year to become a practitioner of medicine, he was sent to the University of *Glasgow* to prosecute his studies for that purpose, and during three sessions which he passed at this seat of learning, his orderly and regular attendance in the different classes in which he

was enrolled, and the success which attended his well-directed researches after knowledge, were such as procured for him the friendly notice and encouragement of the several Professors under whom he studied, as well as the esteem and good-will of all his classmates. He subsequently removed to Birmingham, and entered upon his professional career as a pupil and assistant of Mr. I. M. Baynham, of Portugal House, in which capacity he

soon acquired the confidence and friendship of that gentleman by his unwearied attention to the duties of the surgery, and by the kindness and urbanity of his manners towards the patients whom he occasionally visited. His loss will be long and deeply felt by his afflicted father, and an extensive circle of mourning relatives and friends.

THOMAS CLARK, Jun.
Birmingham, Feb. 19, 1826.

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC.

RELIGIOUS.

Report of the Committee of Deputies appointed to protect the Civil Rights of Dissenters, to the General Meeting, 16th December, 1825.

THE Committee have again the satisfaction of reporting to the General Meeting, that their occupation the last year, as to any of the common objects of their attention, has not been burthensome. A few cases relative to property, and disputes respecting trusts, have occurred, which they have attended to with various success; but none of importance sufficient to merit particular detail. The Dissenters' Registry, they have endeavoured to arrange so as to answer its purposes, as well as can be accomplished without Parliamentary authority, for which they have not thought it desirable to press,—as, when the question relating to their Marriages shall be again brought forward, it may be found practicable to introduce the other subject without much additional expense or trouble as part of the Public Bill; and, in the mean time, if the Redcross-Street Registries are (in common with all others except the Parochial ones) inadmissible as legal evidence in a Court of Justice, they are, nevertheless, highly advantageous as records of fact, and as indexes, by which complete legal evidence of the dates of Births (not merely of Baptisms) may be obtained.

On the most important of the matters committed to their care, the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, they have only to report, that by the advice and with the entire concurrence of all whom they have consulted as best informed on that head, and most interested in the issue, they resolved to take no step during the last Session of Parliament;—and considering its delicacy, the variety and complication of the interests concerned, and the feverish state of the country at the present crisis on every thing relating thereto, they submit to the Meeting the expediency of refraining from entering

into any discussion of details in this Report. The Committee, however, beg to assure the Meeting, that though, as a body, dissolved, they continue individually, as firmly as ever, attached to the principles on which their dissent is founded, and as desirous of employing their most vigorous efforts to procure the repeal of every restraint on Religious Liberty, whenever an opportunity shall appear of exerting themselves with reasonable probability of advantage. One, they cannot but hope, may be anticipated at no very distant period, from the increasing liberality of the times;—of which, they are happy to be able to furnish the following recent proof and example. In the note, p. 201, of the 12mo edition of the Proceedings of the Committee, it is said, “Dissenters are also disabled, on the ground of scrupling the Sacramental Test, to be called to the Bar, by the Honourable Society of Gray's Inn; that Society having an order or bye-law, which requires a candidate for that degree to produce a Certificate of having taken the Sacrament. The other Inns of Court have no such law.” This blot the Society had overlooked too long. To its honour be it now recorded, that this most exceptionable bye-law was abrogated by an order spontaneously issued by the Benchers on the 16th of November last, which has placed the admission to the Bar of the Students of this Inn on the same impartial footing on which, in the other Inns of Court, it has long stood.

Removals of Ministers.

THE Rev. Mr. BAKEWELL, of *Chester*, has accepted an invitation to be Minister of the Unitarian Congregation, *Edinburgh*, vacant by the resignation of the Rev. Mr. *Squier*.

The Rev. Mr. ELLIOT, of *Rochdale*, is chosen Minister of *Prescot*, in the room of the Rev. *W. T. Procter*, deceased.

We understand that congregations are without ministers at *Alnwick* (see advertisement on Wrapper for January), *Loughborough* and *Ipswich*.

The Rev. JAMES YATES, one of the ministers of the New Meeting, Birmingham, has, we are sorry to hear, resigned on account of ill health.

The Rev. J. B. BRISTOWE has declined the invitation to settle at *Warminster*, [see M. Repos. XX. 570,] in consequence of the urgent wishes of his friends at *Ringwood* to continue his labours among them.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Political Economy.—Mr. Macculloch states in his discourse on this subject lately published, an 8vo pamphlet, that the late Emperor of Russia (Alexander) gave considerable encouragement to this study. At his request, M. Henri Storch composed a course of Lectures for the Grand Dukes Nicholas (the present Emperor) and Michael, which were published in 1815, under the title of *Cours d'Economie Politique*. This work Mr. Macculloch places at the head of all the works on Political Economy "ever imported from the continent into England." Chairs for lectures on this new science were established at Naples and Milan, but these have been suppressed by the timid and jealous rulers of Naples and Austria. The Reviewer of Mr. Macculloch's Discourse in the *Edinburgh Review* for November 1825, says, that a professorship of this science has been founded by the munificence of a private individual (Mr. H. Drummond) in the University of Oxford, the endowment having been received with the most grateful alacrity by that ancient and dignified body.

[Mr. Drummond is announced in the *Times Newspaper* (Feb. 4) as the author of a pamphlet on the Corn Laws, entitled "Cheap Corn best for the Farmers," of which the editor says, "We never perused any similar publication with more pleasure, nor met with any one calculated to do more extensive good. It is written with all the simplicity of *Poor Richard's* Proverbs, and reduces several of the truths of the important question on which it treats, to propositions equally convincing. The author throughout evinces the possession, without the pedantry, of knowledge, and brings forward the results of just reasoning without any of that ostentation of formal argument which is usually charged on political economists. His little work may in fact be entitled, 'The Evils of the Corn Laws made easy to the meanest capacity.' The extracts given with these remarks fully justify the high tone of praise in which the *Times* speaks of this publication, which we hope to see extensively read.]

The Reviewer adds, "A proposition was recently made by certain respectable individuals in this place (Edinburgh) to endow a separate professorship for this science in our University (Edinburgh) under the

royal patronage. But the scheme, though supported by many persons of great local authority, and among others by most of the distinguished teachers in the University, was not fortunate enough to obtain the approbation of that learned body in its corporate capacity, and was rejected for the time, chiefly, as we have understood, on the ground of the subject being supposed to fall within the province of the Professor of Moral Philosophy, and of the learned person who now fills that chair (Wilson) being likely in a short time to deliver a course of lectures on it himself." The Reviewer is sore upon this subject; and it would appear that the rejected proposal was designed to provide an academical chair for Mr. Macculloch. The writer consoles himself with saying of this gentleman, "We do not think it unlikely, indeed, that he is destined for still higher things, (Quere, the London University?) and that he would not thank us for the provincial preferment to which we are so selfishly recommending him!" Should this sentence fall under the eye of W. Cobbett, it will throw him into a rage, and, to use a favourite adjective of this political grammarian, a "beastly" rage.

Manumission of Slaves.—By a cause which has come before the Vice-Chancellor, (*Thorley v. Byrne*) it appears that the late Earl of LINDSAY, who died Feb. 1825, directed by his will (dated June 1816), that all his negro slaves on certain lands in Antigua should be emancipated in the year 1833, being first instructed in the Holy Scriptures and taught different trades, and that on their liberation the sum of £10,000 should be shared amongst them. The bequest was resisted by the heir at law, on the ground of its being invalid by the laws of Antigua. On the part of the executor it was stated, that the negroes had as yet been kept in ignorance of the bequest, it being feared that the knowledge of it would occasion their insurrection. His Honour was clearly of opinion that this must be considered as a charitable bequest to the negroes, and directed it to be referred to the Master to take the usual accounts of the testator's real and personal estates, and of the amount of the legacies bequeathed by him; as also to inquire what slaves the testator was in possession of at the time of his death, how many had been born since, what was their state and condition; as also whether by the laws of Antigua this was a valid legacy. We earnestly hope that the Christian design of the philanthropic Earl of Lindsay will not be defeated by any quirk of colonial law. If, as the slave-holders contend, negroes be the real property of their masters, surely an owner may manumit them at his pleasure, either at once or by degrees, in his

lifetime or by testament. Should the slaves in question be held in bondage a day longer than the period specified for their deliverance by their late truly noble master, there will rest somewhere very heavy guilt; and in that case what man having a British heart, but must justify the wronged Blacks should they rise and "break their chains over the heads of their oppressors"?

Society in Scotland for buying up Church Patronage.

ONE of the grounds of Dissent from the Churches of both England and Scotland is the legal right, growing out of custom, of landed or tithe or advowson proprietors to present clergymen to livings without respect to the opinions, wishes or feelings of the parishioners. The "Evangelical" party in the Church of England have, as individuals, if not in societies, been long intent upon the purchase of benefices with a view to secure an "Evangelical" or orthodox ministry. They have, however, done little or nothing for securing their object in regard to posterity, since the heirs or successors of the present proprietors and patrons may be any thing but Evangelical. The Scottish Church Reformers go better to work. They have formed an institution, to be supported by subscriptions, for buying up patronage and throwing the close church boroughs open to the people. The Society has existed twelve months, and the account of the first annual meeting is just published. Mr. Hume, the Member for Aberdeen, took part in the proceedings of this meeting. The success of the Society will depend upon its funds, though we perceive that the managers contemplate the case of heirs-at-law "disposing a patronage to the Society." Is not the existence of such a Society a strong argument against an Established or Territorial and Political Church? And are not its members compelled to resort to the ecclesiastical crime of simony, in order to restore to the long-abused people their suffrage in the appointment of their pastor? We mean not to reproach them, much less to declare any dislike of their general object; but as Protestant Dissenters we do congratulate ourselves on standing upon principles which conscientious Churchmen shew that they would most gladly return to, if they could, by any means short of separating from the churches to which their education and habits bind them.

MR. FELLOWS has presented Professor Leslie, of Edinburgh, with £200 to extend the Physical Cabinet belonging to his class; and £75 to be distributed as

prizes for the two best Essays on Comets, open to all students who have attended the University during the last ten years.

NOTICES.

Somerset and Dorset Unitarian Association.—The Half-yearly Meeting will be held at Bridport, on Friday, usually called *Good Friday*, March 24. The Rev. Mr. Lewis, of Dorchester, is engaged to preach on the occasion; and it is expected that the Chapel will be open in the evening for divine worship. It may be added, that there is a regular service on Thursday evenings.

Ilminster.

E. W.

The Annual General Meeting of the *Devon and Cornwall Unitarian Missionary Society* will be held at Exeter, on Good Friday, March 24th.

The next Half-yearly General Meeting of the *Somerset, Gloucester and Wilts Unitarian Missionary Association*, will be held at Frenchay, near Bristol, on Friday, March 24th, (Good Friday,) when the Rev. Matthew Harding is expected to preach. Morning service to commence at eleven o'clock.

Society for the Relief of Aged and Infirm Ministers.—It will be seen by the Wrapper that the Annual Sermon on behalf of this charitable and truly Christian institution will be preached on Wednesday, March 15, by the Rev. JOSEPH HUGHES, M. A.

Manchester College, York.—The Annual Meeting of the Trustees will be held at the Cross-Street Chapel Rooms, Manchester, on Thursday, March 23. (See Wrapper.)

The Annual Sermon for the Society for the Relief of the Necessitous Widows and Children of Protestant Dissenting Ministers, will be preached on Wednesday, the 5th of April next, at the Old Jewry Chapel, in Jewin Street, by the Rev. F. A. Cox, LL.D., of Hackney; service to begin at twelve o'clock at noon precisely.

THE Select Preacher at St. Mary's Church for the present month is the Norrisian Professor of Divinity [Dr. Hollingworth, elected 1824].

PARLIAMENTARY.

The Parliament has met under evil omens. The tide of prosperity has rolled back, and the public confidence is at its lowest ebb. The King's Speech, which was delivered by commission, is in a doleful strain; and the debates in both Houses

have turned upon the prevalent commercial distress, its causes and its alleviations, for instant cure is allowed on all sides to be out of the question. Ministers set out with a vigorous resolution to put down the small paper currency, in order to bring the precious metals into circulation; but they have since relented, and exposed themselves to the charge of vacillation and inconsistency, a charge the more galling, because it cannot be rebutted. They still profess to adhere to the principle of free-trade; but it is uncertain whether the growing weight of public distress will not compel them to give way on this point also. Most of the staple manufactures of the country are at a stand; commerce is without confidence; and in trade, through all its gradations, every man's object is to do as little, instead of as much, as possible. Nothing is clear in the political horizon, but the melancholy truth that the country is in deep trouble. Out of the evil would arise some certain good, if Ministers were disposed to reduce taxation nearer to a level with the capacities of the people; but of this they do not appear to think for a moment. To-day less, to-morrow more, of Bank paper, is the only expedient for meeting the exigencies of what they themselves call "an awful crisis."

There has been little in the parliamentary proceedings (we use the reports in the *Times Newspaper*) that properly falls under the object of this work. A circumstance or two may be worth notice. Half-pay officers in holy orders—champions of the Church-militant—have been again talked of in the House of Commons. Mr. HUME, the faithful watchman of the public purse, who first started this subject, has put it up again; and it appears that Government at first (in consequence probably of this gentleman's questions) required all these double-character persons to dispose of their military

or naval commissions; but that afterwards (in consequence, it is to be presumed, of some interference—could it be episcopal?)—they revoked their own order, with the exception of all but officers in the marines. These are not thought fit to appear at the altar in a war-like character. Why are any permitted to exhibit this shameful inconsistency? Is the Church so poor that she cannot feed her ministers, but must quarter them upon the public? Let these active spirits content themselves with fighting one sort of battle, whether ghostly or bodily: at any rate, let them not, in the name of decency, expect to receive pay with both hands, with one for wearing the sword, and with the other for thumbing the Book of Common Prayer.

On the 2nd reading of the South American Treaties' Bill, Sir ROBERT INGLIS complained that there was no reciprocity in the treaty with Colombia, with regard to religious toleration. It was provided that Colombian citizens should exercise their religion as they pleased in England, whereas Englishmen in Colombia were allowed only to perform their worship in private. As there were four other South American States to be treated with, he hoped more care would be taken of establishing a perfect equality in this respect. Mr. ROBINSON, the *Chancellor of the Exchequer*, answered, that these were commercial treaties, and that it might not be possible to do away at once with the religious prejudices of the mass of the South Americans, but that he should be happy if the spirit of toleration alluded to by Sir R. Inglis, should procure greater religious privileges than were provided by the treaties. He hoped, however, (referring, we suppose, to the Catholic Question) that the honourable gentleman would extend his views with regard to toleration, to Protestant as well as Catholic countries.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from W. Parkinson; S. H.; R. B. A.; S. P.; A Nonconformist; A Layman; and A Protestant Dissenter.

A *Well-wisher*, &c., must be aware that unless he give his real name, his opinion can have little weight. We suspect that we have investigated the matter in question more closely than himself, and that we have had much better means of forming a true judgment.

H. R.'s contribution of 1*l.* to the Chapel at Battle was duly received.

On looking over the newspaper with which our correspondent R. B. has kindly favoured us, containing the proceedings at the Low Bailiff's Dinner, at Birmingham, in October last, we perceive that we have already extracted all that is essential, in respect of the memory of Dr. Priestley. (See our Number for December last, XX. 752.) But to diffuse the knowledge of this pleasing instance of liberality, the speeches will be given at length in the next Number of the *Christian Reformer*.

We are requested to acknowledge, in compliance with the wish of the Contributor, the receipt of the MS. entitled *Visits to Ruth's Cottage*, and to state that it has been referred, for consideration, to the Sub-committee of the Christian Tract Society.
