

THE
MONTHLY REPOSITORY

OF

Theology and General Literature.

No. LX.

FEBRUARY.

[Vol. V.]

BIOGRAPHY.

MEMOIR OF SAMUEL CRELLIUS; COMMUNICATED BY DR. TOULMIN.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

Birmingham, 27 Dec. 1810.

Sir,

In the Eclectic Review for April last, p. 338, occurs the following paragraph in a note.

“SAMUEL CRELLIUS was a Socinian and a leader of that party. He is still quoted as one of their strongest advocates: but the endless mercy of our Lord was also manifest in him. He not only rejoiced to see his daughters bow their knees to the crucified: but he himself turned to the Lord, called upon him as his Lord and his God, and found at the end of his life no consolation but in the atonement by the blood of Jesus, and wished that all his books could die with him. This has been testified, not only by his daughters, but by all who were with him before his end.”

A note by the late Rev. B. Latrobe to Crantz's History of the Moravian Brethren.

It is easy to perceive with what view the writer, in the Eclectic Review, has given the public the above quotation. But in order to its carrying any weight with it, the fact must be established. As the character of Samuel Crellius was eminent, I am induced to offer to the public some documents concerning him

and his death, from which it may be judged with what propriety he is called a Socinian; and with what correctness and truth the circumstances of his death are stated in the above paragraph. The statement of Latrobe, adopted by Crantz, and re-published by the Eclectic Review, appears to have its origin in a misapprehension of Samuel Crellius's sentiments.

The learned Mosheim says, that “Crellius, though he was a professor of theology amongst the Socinians, yet differed in his opinions, about many points of doctrine, from the sentiments of Socinus and the Racovian Catechism, and would not be called a Socinian but an *Artemonite*, from Artemon, who lived under the reign of the emperor Severus, and denied the pre-existence of Jesus Christ*.”

I will only add, that Bock, from whom the following narrative is translated, is a Trinitarian. If any of your readers receive information or entertainment from it, they will not regret that the representation given of the subject of it in the Eclectic has appeared; and will, perhaps, feel some small degree of obligation to your and their friend and servant,
JOSHUA TOULMIN.

* Ecclesiastical History, translated by Maclaine. b. v. p. 58, note (u) and p. 99. 8vo. 1768.

A Memoir of SAMUEL CRELLIUS:
A translation from Fred. Samuel Bock's "Historia Antitrinitariorum;" Tom. I. Pars 1. Printed at Leipsic, 1784.

The very learned and ingenious Samuel Crellius, grandson of the celebrated John Crellius*, was born in March, 1660. He pursued the studies of his youth in the academy of the Arminians at Amsterdam. In 1680, he went to Berlin, and after having spent some time there, proceeded to Prussia. From this country he removed to Koenigswald, near Frankfort on the Oder; where he lived many years, discharging the functions of the Christian ministry, among the Unitarians, after the death of Preusius, to whom he was a son-in-law, and indeed in his life time, after he was laid aside. In 1687, at the synod of Selchovia, held in the march of Brandenburg, he was chosen into the number of the elders of the synod. From this place of residence he made frequent journeys to Frankfort and Berlin. In 1697, he went to Holland, and from Holland passed over into England, and published at London in reply to Bull's Defence of the Nicene Faith, his View of the Faith of the Primitive Christians proved from Barnabas, Hermas, and Clemens Romanus. During his stay in England he was favoured with the patronage of the Earl of Shaftesbury. From hence, it is likely, he returned to Holland, and printed his piece entitled a Compendium of New Thoughts concerning

the First and Second Adam: in which he advanced several singular, whimsical and unsupported speculations. He then went back to Germany, and visited again Berlin, and was courteously received by Ancillonius, to whom he carried introductory letters of recommendation from Reinierus Leers the bookseller. He afterwards took up a second residence of some years at Koenigswald, sustaining the office of a minister to the Antitrinitarians of the March and of Silesia: making frequent visits to Berlin, where he contracted a friendship with some learned men, particularly with La Croze; to whom he addressed many letters between the years 1710 and 1725; which were published in the correspondence of that scholar. When he applied to be admitted into the number of the fellows of the academy at Hall, of which Stryckius was then rector, he was denied the privilege.

About the end of the year 1725 he took another journey to England, where he published his Remarks on the Introduction of John's Gospel: and, in April, 1727, he returned to Holland. He wrote thus 17th of July, 1727, from Amsterdam to La Croze: "Now I am, for cogent reasons, fixed here; though I reluctantly leave Germany and am very unwilling to lose your obliging and learned conversation."

During his stay in England and Holland, he enjoyed the friendship of some eminent characters besides that of the earl of Shaftesbury; as that of the fa-

* See Memoirs of the Life, &c. of Faustus Socinus.

mous Reinierius Leers and Bayle. In the epistolary correspondence of the latter, there is extant a letter to Crellius; which, as it is a proof of his great regard for him and explains some circumstances of his history, we judge proper to insert here.

“Illustrious Sir,

“I must acknowledge myself unequal to express the great obligations, which I owe to you, for the luminous and copious observations and collections about* ——— with which you have enriched me. I will avail myself of them to illustrate this topic of history in the Supplement to my dictionary, which I know not when we shall begin to print; nor can I decline those excellent additions you propose; and which, not for the sake of flattery, but with real truth, I say, shew the man of judgment and of penetrating genius. It was most grateful to me to receive, from a gentleman of your distinguished character, such a mark of your diligence and friendship; and I am ashamed and grieved to think that I have no means of testifying my gratitude; should any offer, I shall cheerfully embrace it.

“I hear, that your brother, Paul Crellius, who does honour to his name, is at Cambridge, and applies very closely to the study of the best arts. That excellent nobleman, my lord Shaftesbury, who is his patron, will from his own love of antient literature, afford him great assistance.

“Our friend Leers begs his respects and wishes of all prosperity to you. Accept the same fervent wishes from me; and continue, eminent sir, to favour with your attachment,

Rotterdam, your very affectionate,
June 21, 1706. Bayle.”

Crellius, whilst he lived in England, was acquainted with the learned Grabe, with whom he had frequent conversations, and who applauded his courteous and virtuous manners and bore a strong testimony to his assiduous investi-

gation of antiquity. The learned Hudson, having heard from others what religious party Crellius joined, prohibited his access to the Bodleian library, fearing lest, after the example of Sandius, he should make extracts from the MSS. and books, which he thought would illustrate and set off what Dr. Hudson deemed a most pestilent cause. Crellius had also an interview with Sir Isaac Newton, who favoured him with a long conversation, and made him on his going away, an handsome present. His affability of manners and great learning procured him patrons and friends: for from his earliest years he applied himself to sacred and profane learning, and particularly to sacred antiquities and ecclesiastical history.

In Germany, he was highly esteemed by La Croze, who, however, never failed to express in his letters his difference from him in sentiment, and his grief on account of Crellius's opinions. Thus he expressed himself in a letter written in April, 1727. “I do not at all wonder that Artemonius does not agree with me, now I know the inward thoughts of his mind, which I earnestly pray may not affect his eternal salvation. For I love the man, and most highly estimate his excellent endowments. We will talk more on this subject, when you return here, for I cannot think that you will always continue to live in Holland, though you seem to say it.” In another letter of the 10th of June, 1729, he says: “I have taken care that

*The word here is *Rocos*, the meaning of which the translator has no means of ascertaining.

your defence should be deposited in the royal library : my own opinion of it I will not obtrude here : for what weight will it have with you ? I wish to spend the remainder of life in peace, but I greatly pity you, who lay out your good abilities and uncommon learning in derogating from the dignity of our Saviour. The matter I know appears in another light to you. But I wish you to reflect, that in studies of this nature, your eternal salvation is at stake, the loss of which I think is the most dreadful of all evils. In my own orthodox opinion, I will be fixed and constant unto death : yet I will neither quarrel with others nor engage in disputation. I am so certain of the truth of my religious views, that no sophistical objection, nor change of the sacred text can pluck the persuasion out of my mind." In a third letter, he writes : " I have always loved you, and it is with great reluctance that I differ in opinion, on the most important points, from so moderate and good a man. I wish that such a man as you are, were on our side. It will, perhaps, be so in the end ; which I fervently pray to God may be very soon. This will be a spring of joy in heaven, and with all your friends, amongst whom I may, with reason, claim almost the first place." In a letter to Mosheim, dated the 6th of the nones of October, 1718, La Croze speaks of Crellius, " as a man, than whom, if you except his incurable heresy, there is no one better, or more serious:" adding that he sometimes came from his retreat to Berlin and visited him.

It seems probable, that Crelli-

us's chief support arose from the copy monies, which he honourably received from the booksellers, for his writings, which gained him a great name, and procured him the rank of a professor among the Socinians. All the works he published, are entitled, by the learning and literary application they display, to great praise. He died at Amsterdam, 1747, on the 12th of May, in the 87th year of his age. In a publication, on literary intelligence, at Hamburg, in 1747, it is said, that about the close of life he repented of his errors, and gave plain proofs of the sincerity of this repentance. In the same literary intelligencer, in 1748, Paul Burger, archdeacon of Herspruck, expressed his thoughts of the probability of the truth of this, because when he lived at Amsterdam, in 1731, he declared to him that in some conversations with the celebrated Schaaffius, at Lyons, he was led to doubt on some points, and that he was still unsettled in his judgment on them. But in the same public prints, of 1749, we are with more certainty, informed that Crellius continued an Unitarian to his last breath ; which his brother Paul told me before many persons. It was in vain, therefore, that Aletophilus Tacitus, who is the same with Richter, the physician, endeavoured to claim Crellius, as one of the sect of Herrenhuthans : though we can readily admit that, for eleven years, as the same Richter reports, he was acquainted with, and conversed with the Herrenhuthans, and for the last two years of his life outwardly joined their assembly and heard their public sermons. Stoschius in his history of the eighteenth century,

says, "I remember, that Crellius, whom I visited at Amsterdam in 1742, and had much conversation with him on many heads of the Christian doctrine, declared with some emotion, that he did not follow the opinions of Socinus, but cordially believed in the doctrine of the satisfaction of Christ, as it was taught by the Remonstrants, and was persuaded that all men would be finally saved by Jesus Christ, and delivered from the punishments of hell." He adds, that he was certain, that there were very few, if any, in the proper sense, Socinians, then in being.

Crellius had two sons, Samuel Stephen, and Joseph, who were both married, but had no male issue; and emigrated to the New World, and settled in Georgia, a colony formed under the patronage of the king of Great Britain; and are, perhaps, still living: [i. e. 1774.] Stephen was a justice of the peace in that country. Joseph was engaged in agriculture. Crellius had also two daughters, the eldest, Theophila, was married to J. A. Leddius, a physician; the second, Dorothy, lived single. Paul Crellius told me, that they were both present at their father's death.

Crellius himself hath explained in an epistle to a friend, which we meet with in the correspondence of La Croze, what a review of his works will more fully shew, the difference of his sentiments from those of the Socinians, and the points of agreement between them.

He begins thus: "You will not be displeased, I think, with my addressing you as a brother;

for even the Rev. Abbadie, that spirited antagonist of the Unitarians, than whom no one has attacked Socinus with more warmth, does not hesitate, in the introduction to his Treatise concerning the 'Deity of Christ,' to call the followers of Socinus 'erring brethren.' You know that I avowedly leave Socinus on those points in which he held different sentiments from other Christians. In the doctrine of the Unity of God I firmly adhere to him. As to other points held in common, by the different parties of the orthodox, I think with them, or approach nearly to their views. Not I only, but all who most closely agree with Socinus, equally hold in abhorrence the doctrine of Mahomet. Nor do I see how they who believe that Christ is not only a prophet superior to all others, but the lord of heaven and earth, in the closest possible union with the Father, and actually a partaker in his government, can be in danger of embracing Mahometanism. I confess, that those monsters of Unitarians, who deny the invocation of Christ, or look on him only as a prophet, who will reign a thousand years, may most easily fall into that mad scheme; as Neuser, the father of that impious doctrine, is said to have done: the father, I say, for Francis David, when in conjunction with George Blandrata, he refuted George Major, professor at Wittenberg, asserted, as may be shewn from several passages in that work, that the Lord Jesus was to be invoked. Whereas Neuser evidently ascribes to himself the first broaching of this

doctrine, and so seems to have seduced Francis. But on the other hand the orthodox frequently, and the Jews sometimes, go directly over to the Turkish camp, and have no need to lodge first in that of Socinus. Whereas it is not clear, as I know, from any one instance, that any adherent to Socinus in the doctrine of the invocation of Christ, ever joined the Mahometans; not even when they were driven out of Poland by the Turks, in the years 1658 and 1660. Besides, how can they easily revolt to the Mahometans, who, as it appears from their books of devotion, and discourses published at different times, both publicly and privately, pray to the Lord Jesus that he would speedily destroy the abominable doctrine of the impure Mahomet. I doubt whether to send my son to Hall, for unless he can be admitted to the commons of the students, my scanty finances, considering my large family, will not be equal to his support there. But so many sons of families in succession to one another are gaping for that bread, that there is scarcely any hope that the whelps will be permitted to eat it."

In another letter to La Croze he writes, "I have in reality no new thoughts on that subject. I have corrected the doctrine of Socinus on the person and character of Christ, from Unitarian ecclesiastical antiquity; and, if I am not deceived, have rendered it at once more sublime and more agreeable to the orthodox; and have endeavoured to bring back Christian theology to that state

in which it appears to me to have been when Justin Martyr introduced his innovations. I wish that our divines, wearied out with so many abstruse conceptions and disquisitions on the doctrine of the Trinity, would return to the same point. Let the modes of expression invented by men be discarded. Let us dismiss the terms hypostasis, (in the metaphysical sense,) three persons, generation, eternal procession, communication of attributes, personal union, &c. Let us not, in the next place, urge and obtrude points which we ourselves do not understand, and do not appear to be laid down in the Scriptures, and there will remain to us a theology level to the capacity of the unlearned rustic; namely, God the Father, and the man Christ Jesus, intimately and inseparably united to God the Father, and the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son, that is, immediately receiving from them instructions and commands; whom the Father and Son send.

"Let, I say, such terms as the Holy Spirit has not used, be discarded, and let us not obtrude our doctrines on others, and there will be Christian charity, like a grain of mustard seed. How easy then will be ecclesiastical toleration, and an union of Athanasius with Socinus, reformed and corrected by my ideas. But let the Platonic logos, and the Arian pre-existent spirit, created before the world, and united with the Son of Man, without a human soul, by a divine destiny, and contrary to the course of nature,

in the womb of the Virgin, be sent back to the Utopia from whence it came."

Crellius on all occasions waved taking his denomination from Socinus, as he did not think with him in all points. Although, because he adopted and defended Unitarianism, he may be classed in general with the Socinians: yet, strictly speaking, he embraced the principles of the Artermonites, which he thought would, in length of time, be acknowledged by the whole world. He appears to have burnt with an earnest desire of conviction on the orthodox faith. Hence, when on a time, he was at Hall in Saxony, and sought a conference with a reverend gentleman of the theological faculty, such was the

effect of his discussion of the meaning of the first chapter of John's Gospel, that all who were present were confirmed in their notions concerning the essential deity of Christ. We have read, that he declared with many tears, that it was the greatest grief to him, that he could not relinquish the opinion he had formed concerning the person of Christ. Among the singular opinions held by him was that concerning the bodies of those who are said to have risen from the dead with Christ: viz. that it was not a complete resurrection, but that the bodies only of some saints came out of the grave and went into Jerusalem, from whence they soon returned to the tombs; but that their souls were translated to heaven.

ORIGINAL LETTERS OF DR. HARTLEY'S.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR,

The following letters, written by the great Dr. Hartley, the former when he was seventeen and the latter when he was thirty years of age, were printed, "through the kindness of the ingenious and excellent Dr. Percival of Manchester," in a work, which I believe is little known, entitled "A Supplement to the Anecdotes of some distinguished Persons, chiefly of the present and two preceding centuries*." They are so much in Dr. Hartley's style and spirit as to authenticate themselves. I hope you will give them a place in the Monthly Repository. They

cannot fail to interest many of your readers.

Your's respectfully
S. S. Y.

LETTER I.

Bradford, Sunday, Oct. 8, 1721.

"Dear Sister,

"I take this opportunity to send you Bp. Beveridge's Private Thoughts, with that other book which I found accidentally, at Mr. John Wilkinson's. I wish I could say I was perfectly well; but however I am much better, and follow my school business very diligently. Pray be not at all discouraged, I am in very good hands; my master and Mr. Kennet (our vicar) will do all they can for me, I am assured. Pray take my word, as from one experienced, (though younger than yourself,) to behave yourself cheerfully and briskly at all times. We hear of several persons (and I am

sure my aunt can give you some instances) that have been preferred on account of some very trifling actions, in which they have shown their activity and care. I would have you spend all the time you can reasonably spare from your business, in reading. I speak not only of religious books, (though I would have them to be your chief care) but of such as will innocently divert, or fit you for company. You are young yet, and I hope nothing of ill is so rooted in you but may easily be wore out. Take care you harbour nothing of envy, hatred, malice, covetousness, revenge, detraction. The world is so full of the last, that I am sure, sister, you and I and every one ought to be on our guard: be sure you never pollute your mouth with any such thing: rather turn off the discourse, or excuse your neighbour as charitably as truth will allow. I believe it will be neither an useless nor false observation, that whatever a young person applies himself to at first is commonly his delight afterwards*: what I argue from hence is, that if you and I perform our duty to God, our neighbour, and ourselves, as well as human infirmity will admit, and at all other times be discreet, active, and cheerful, we shall receive more satisfaction than the most voluptuous and delicate person, and it will be infinitely to our advantage in this world and the ensuing eternity. I beg of you not to neglect the sacrament; for assure yourself, no pretence will excuse you before Christ at the last day. But in this and your spiritual exercises, dont think God requires the time, but the heart. If you forgive all men and be in charity, be thankful and humble to God, and such like, your short prayers and fasting, where they are inconvenient to you†, will be accepted; and without these, the longest will not. Pray give my duty to my aunt and uncle; I beg her pardon for not behaving to her as I ought, and return her thanks for all her care and kindness. Dear sister, accept of my best advice and love: you may observe I recommend cheerfulness and

qui kness to you, as what I fear, both you are defective in.

I am,

Your's, &c.

D. HARTLEY.

I am turned preacher, as agreeable to the day, in this letter; but if you will send me an answer, the next shall be more entertaining. I am in good hopes to get fifteen or sixteen pounds a year in the university, and am fitting myself for that honourable society. Pray pardon haste."

LETTER II.

"Bury, March 2, 1734—5.

"Dear Sister,

"I received your's some time ago, and wrote the next post to my sister Sarah, and directed it for her at Mr. Dearden's, near Halifax; but as I had a letter a post or two ago from my brother John, which mentions nothing of her, I am afraid my letter to her has miscarried. Pray inquire about it, and let me hear how she does. I am glad to hear you go on better this time than you did the last. I wish you a happy minute with all my heart. Don't you want a god-father? Pray make use of me, and let me know by Mr. Gibson what you have given for me. My little boy is very well. Mr. Walton and I manage our house tolerably well: we are both of us very abstemious, and drink neither ale nor wine, which besides the advantage it is of to my health and spirits, keeps me from a great deal of troublesome company, and saves a considerable expence. I study much harder than ever I did, and am much more cheerful and happy. I have lately gained the knowledge of some things in physic, which have been of very great use to me; but my chief studies are upon religious subjects and especially upon the true meaning of the bible. I cannot express to you what inward peace and satisfaction these contemplations afford me: you remember how much I was overcome with superstitious fears when I was very young; I thank God that he has at last brought me to a lively sense

* Hence we see how early in life Dr. Hartley's attention was directed to the principle which forms the basis of his inestimable work. His "Observations on Man," are but a beautiful illustration of this maxim. S. S. Y.

† According to copy, but surely incorrect. Ed.

of his infinite goodness and mercy to all his creatures, and that I see it both in all his works and in every page of his word. This has made me much more indifferent to this world than ever, at the same time that I enjoy it more; has taught me to love every man, and to rejoice in the happiness which our heavenly Father intends for all his children; and has quite dispersed all the gloomy and melancholy thoughts which arise from the apprehensions of eternal misery for myself or friends. How long or how much God will punish wicked men he has nowhere said, and therefore I cannot at all tell; but this I am sure of, that in judgment he will remember mercy; that he will not be extreme to mark what is done amiss; that he chastens only because he loves; that he will not return to destroy, because he is God and not man, i. e. has none of our foolish passions and resentments; that his tender mercies are over all his works, and that he is even love itself. I could almost transcribe the whole bible: and the conclusion I draw from all is this: First, that no man can ever be happy till he is holy, till his affections be taken off from this vain world and set upon a better, and till he loves God above all things, and his neighbour as himself. Secondly, that

all the evils and miseries which God sends upon us, are for no other purpose but to bring us to himself, to the knowledge and practice of our duty, and that as soon as that is done they will have an end. Many men are so foolish as to fight against God all their lives, and to die full of obstinacy and perverseness. However, God's method of dealing with them in another world is still full of mercy at the same time that it is severe: he will force them at last to comply, and make them happy whether they will or no. In the mean time those who are of a humble and contrite heart have nothing to fear even here. God will conduct them through all the afflictions which he thinks fit to lay upon them for their good, with infinite tenderness and compassion. I wish these thoughts may be as serviceable to you as they have been to me: they are not proper to be communicated to every one, perhaps, but you and well-disposed people will make no other than a good use of them, and be more excited hereby to the true love of him who is loving to every man whether they know it or not.

My best respects,

Your's

D. HARTLEY.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

ON THE DECLINE OF PRESBYTERIAN CONGREGATIONS.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

London, January 9, 1810.

SIR,

As the "Monthly Repository" is announced to be "the only periodical publication which is open to free and impartial theological inquiry and discussion," I shall put this principle to the test, and take advantage of that large share of liberality to which you lay claim. In some late numbers of your journal, several pages have

VOL. V.

been devoted to an inquiry into the causes of the decline of Presbyterian congregations, and many are the reasons assigned; but it appears to me that the principal causes have as yet been overlooked, those which are stated being only of minor importance, and, in general, affecting equally other denominations. Now, Sir, I will not pretend to any larger share of sagacity than your correspon-

I

dents, nor will I decide with an air of dogmatism upon points that have been disputed by wise and good men; but as I have paid some attention to the subject, I trust it will be no arrogance if I also shew my opinion, which I will endeavour to do with meekness and candour. If any of the following observations should be at variance with the judgment of your readers, I hope they will give me credit for impartiality in my inquiries, and indulge me with the same right of private judgment which they claim so plentifully for themselves.

On the impropriety of the term Presbyterian, as applied to English dissenters, I fully agree with your correspondents. It is a name descriptive of a system of church-government not practised in South-Britain, and applied to churches that are strictly independent. The origin of the application is, I doubt not, known to most of your readers. A majority of those divines who were cast out of their livings upon the restoration of Charles II. were proper Presbyterians, and contended for that form of church-government which they themselves practised during the commonwealth. In consequence of the re-establishment of episcopacy, the societies which they formed became disjointed, and had no other bond of union than what arose from the friendly correspondence of their ministers: In their church discipline, however, they retained as much of the spirit of Presbytery as could be introduced into a single congregation. Still, the points upon which they differed from their Independent brethren were of that minor importance, that both de-

nominations agreed to unite; and articles of union were drawn up by the great Mr. John Howe. At that time, the Presbyterians were to a man, decided Trinitarians and Calvinists. The enemy of souls, whose peculiar character is that of a *destroyer*, envying their peace, soon found means to disturb it. The first source of contention was the *Neonomian* controversy, which occasioned the division in the Pinners' Hall lecture, and the establishment of a new one at Salters' Hall, in 1694. Henceforward, the denominations again became two: suspicions and jealousies were kept up on both sides; and each party, afraid of falling into the alleged error of the other, actually verged further from that system of orthodoxy which both had formerly approved. Hence, many of the Presbyterians became Baxterians or low Calvinists. Several years afterwards a new ground of dispute arose, which separated the denominations still wider. I allude to the Salters' Hall controversy in 1719. The bulk of the Presbyterians, it is well known, joined the non-subscribers; the majority of them, I doubt not, from conscientious motives, and a real desire to uphold the right of private judgment. But this was not the case with all. Mr. Benjamin Robinson, a learned and respectable Presbyterian minister, and one of the subscribers, declared openly, as a known fact, that some of the non-subscribers had a secret design to answer, and made a zeal for religious liberty only a covert for error, and a bait to draw in the rest; the consequence of which, he verily believed, would be the utter ruin of

the Presbyterian interest. How far his prediction has been verified I will leave it to others to determine; but thus much may be fairly said, that the conduct pursued afterwards by some of the non-subscribing ministers certainly did not tend to uphold the dissenting interest. Two or three of them left the ministry entirely, several went over to Arianism, and not a few conformed to the established church. This is a curious fact, and shows how easily some gentlemen, who could not conscientiously digest one article, made up their minds all at once to swallow thirty-nine. This circumstance seems to afford some colour for Mr. Robinson's observation, that something else besides a zeal for religious liberty, was at the bottom of the proceedings in that assembly. Let not the reader imagine that I am friendly to creeds and confessions of faith. I detest them when made necessary to Christian communion, or as a passport to civil office; nor do I think that the magistrate has a right to impose subscription even to the bible itself. From the period of the Salters' Hall controversy, we may properly date the decline of the Presbyterian interest; for though many of their congregations continued to flourish long after that period, yet the seeds of dissolution then sown, have been advancing in a progressive state towards maturity. The fruit of this declension has been the total extinction of many once flourishing societies; and those which still survive will, I doubt not, ere long, arrive at the same conclusion.

As the bulk of non-conformists

a century ago were Presbyterians, so their churches were more numerous than those of the other denominations. At the time of the ejection many persons of quality and of considerable influence in the country, were of this profession. These having attached themselves to the ejected ministers when in prosperity, did not forsake them in a time of trouble. Considerations of policy, combined with a superficial acquaintance with their principles, induced some, indeed, to forsake the religion of their forefathers. But in the room of these there arose others who proved generous friends of the oppressed, thereby evincing the folly and madness of persecution. The countenance of these persons gave confidence to the ejected ministers, and the respectability which most of them had acquired for learning, piety and diligence in their profession, procured them large and wealthy congregations. This was pretty much the state of things during the lives of the first race of ministers. In the next generation, however, affairs put on a different aspect. Death had thinned the ranks of those noble personages who patronized the cause of non-conformity; and their successors discovered that it was not the road to emolument and honour. A state of persecution is in many respects favourable to the cause of the sufferers. It excites inquiry, and draws forth the commiseration of many persons who would otherwise be strangers to their principles. But in a time of peace the same feelings are not so easily roused, nor are the circumstances of that conspicuous nature as to excite attention. This, Mr. Edi-

tor, is one way in which I account for the decline of our Presbyterian congregations in the generation immediately succeeding to that of the ejected ministers.

The successors of these worthies were most of them men of the same stamp. Trained up under their immediate instruction, they imbibed much of their spirit, and proved able and useful ministers of the New Testament. Their congregations also were many of them large and respectable; though, upon the whole, it is certain that the Presbyterian interest was not so prosperous as in the times of their predecessors. The cessation of this second race of ministers produced a new era in the history of Presbyterian societies. Their successors were not equally successful in keeping up large congregations; but during the last half century, which has produced a new order of things, the declension has been more visibly awful. The cause of this remains to be stated, and I am afraid that the blame here will ascend from the hearers to their teachers. In what I am about to advance, I know that I shall be treading upon tender ground; but as I speak in the confidence of truth, and to persons who are not very ceremonious in their treatment of those who differ from them, I do not know that much apology will be necessary. When I speak of Calvinism, I attach no importance to it any farther than as it corresponds with the oracles of divine truth; but that there are certain doctrines which form the peculiar glory of the evangelical dispensation, and are the very life and soul of a gospel ministry, the voice of scripture and

of experience fully demonstrates. To defend these doctrines is not the design of the present paper. But whether they be true or not, and should it turn out that man is not a guilty creature, and stands in no need of a mediator, my argument will remain just the same. To lay no stress upon the points in dispute between Calvin and Arminius, it is a fact beyond contradiction, that those doctrines which relate to the ruin of man by sin and his recovery by Jesus Christ, formed prominent features in the preaching of the founders and earlier ministers of our Presbyterian churches. It is also a fact equally certain, that when these doctrines were kept back from the people, and in their room were substituted dry, critical discourses, and harangues on the nature and beauty of virtue, the audience gradually declined. What Mr. Job Orton observed respecting Mr. Cardale, a learned Socinian preacher, may be applied with equal effect in a hundred other instances. After preaching about forty years at Evesham, "at the last (says Mr. Orton) he had about twenty people to hear him, having ruined a fine congregation by his very learned, dry, and critical discourses, an extreme heaviness in the pulpit, and an almost total neglect of pastoral visits and private instruction." What has been the consequence of this state of things is well known. Scores of meeting-houses have been shut up, and either gone to decay or fallen into the hands of upstart and self-created preachers, who throw no real weight into the dissenting scale. An inspection of the few remaining Presbyterian

congregations in the metropolis, fully warrant the foregoing observations, and lead to the conclusion that they will ere long share a similar fate.

When men cease to be interested in what they hear from the pulpit, their motives for an attendance upon public worship will relax. A transition from the meeting-house to the parish church, will fully prove that the powers of moral suasion are not sufficient to keep alive the attention, nor to attract a large number of people upon motives that are truly religious. The reason is obvious. The relative duties between man and man arise so evidently out of the nature of society, and are so secured by the laws of the community, that they may be easily known and appreciated by every person who makes a proper use of his reasoning faculties, independently of revelation; and where there is a constitutional bias to a vicious habit, it will never be corrected by the most elegant harangues on the beauty of virtue, how much soever we may admire the reasoning, and admit its validity. To convert man from a state of profligacy, or, which is equally odious in the sight of the Divine Being, from a self-complacency in his own righteousness, is the leading design of the doctrines of the gospel. Where these are explained and practically enforced, conviction will seize the mind, the understanding becomes informed, and the affections receive a tone that is consistent with the dictates of reason and sound morality. Now, to apply these remarks to the present subject. I have attended occasionally, at most, if not all,

the meeting-houses called Presbyterian, about London; and I must aver, that as to the most of them, the strain of the discourses would lead a stranger to conclude that the preacher had never read his Bible, and that the sum of his faith was contained in Seneca's *Morals*, or in Wollaston's celebrated book on "The Religion of Nature." I protest, Mr. Editor, that this is not a strained picture; and notwithstanding their apparent difference and known enmity, I can find no difference in this particular between Arians and Socinians. At present I can recollect but a single exception, and that is at Essex Street, where the preacher certainly quotes much of the New Testament, if it is only to confute it. This is ingenuous; and I have no doubt but the open avowal of his principles is the reason of his having a larger congregation than most of his brethren. In my argument with respect to the tendency of merely moral preaching, I am borne out by one or more of your correspondents.

The main design of public worship being to acquire a knowledge of God, and of the way in which we may serve him most acceptably, and as revelation gives us the most accurate information upon those points, it is natural that they should form leading topics in our public sermons. But as there is a considerable difference of opinion with regard to those subjects, the safest way is to keep close to Scripture. *We preach Christ crucified*, was the emphatic language of the great apostle to the Gentiles, and in this he gloried; but in which of our Presbyterian meeting-houses, so called, does

the preaching bear any affinity to that of the apostle? Is it any wonder then that they are deserted, and that the indifference of the people keeps pace with that of the preacher. It being an avowed maxim of the latter, that faith is of no importance, the people have no inducement for inquiry, and consequently become wholly destitute of religious principles. The consequence of this, is an indifference to the forms of worship, and to the sanctification of the sabbath. The censure passed upon our ancestors by your Liverpool correspondent, on account of the strictness with which they observed that day, confirms my opinion more strongly upon the tendency of Socinian principles. Considering that portion of time as set apart peculiarly for religious improvement, it is no wonder that they preferred serious books, and serious conversation to subjects which, however innocent in themselves, were not so well calculated to cherish religious dispositions, nor to improve the sacred hours of the sabbath. Religious duties to them were not "intolerably tedious;" nor will they be so to us when we are equally concerned in preparing for a future existence. It is this growing indifference to religion, that occasions those other evils complained of by your correspondents; such as late hours of rising and meals; frivolity of dress; and luxuriousness of manners. The only way, as it strikes me, to remedy these evils, and to revive the expiring cause of Presbyterianism, is to revert back to the principles of our forefathers; to imitate their method of preaching; and to imbibe more of that

spirit of seriousness which distinguished the whole of their conversation. Then, indeed, will this denomination flourish, and realize a measure of that prosperity, which distinguished the days of a Baxter, a Vincent, and a Doolittle.

One word more upon the subject of free inquiry, the abuse of which is stated by your correspondents to be one cause of the alleged evil. In this I fully concur; and am strengthened in my ideas by every Socinian publication that I meet with. It is customary for authors of that stamp to monopolize free inquiry to themselves; and your correspondents invariably restrict it to the Presbyterians. Is this liberal? Will any man in his senses believe that all besides Socinians take up their religion upon trust; or that they do not use equal freedom and diligence in their inquiries? Is a rejection of the Trinity, the Atonement, Divine Influence, and other doctrines conceived by some christians to be revealed in the New Testament, the criterion of free inquiry? Alas, Mr. Editor, I am afraid this boasted liberality is mere sound; or rather that it is something worse—the essence of bigotry! Though no Socinian, I am nevertheless as warm an advocate for the right of private judgment, and of free inquiry upon all subjects, whether civil or religious, as any of your correspondents. This disposition I do not shew by appropriating any exclusive terms of liberality or rationality to those who think with myself; nor by setting down a man for a fool or a bigot because he happens to differ from me. Without any dereliction of

my own principles, I can give credit to a Calvinist or to a Socinian, for the utmost freedom as well as honesty in his inquiries. Of the nature of Socinian candour, your own publication will furnish some striking specimens. One of your correspondents, who signs C. C. (IV. 670) speaking of the Socinian Academy at York, of which the late Mr. Wood was principal tutor, mentions it as "the only one, now in this kingdom, in which a succession of valuable young men can be educated to the gospel ministry, on the scriptural principles of candid examination and free inquiry." This is in perfect unison with the compliment paid, in a former number of the "REPOSITORY," to Mr. Evans's seminary, at Islington. But the flattery is too gross, and the assertion, in both instances, too devoid of truth to impose upon any one who is not absorbed in bigotry. Was I to make the same assertions with respect to the academies at Hoxton, at Homerton, or at Wymondly, what would be thought of my candour? Yet, I am not aware that the tutors in either of those seminaries lay any embargo upon "candid examination and free inquiry." If it should be said that their lectures have a tendency to predispose the minds of their pupils in favour of Calvinism; I would ask, of what nature are the lectures given at York, and at Islington? Have they not a Socinian complexion? And do not their tutors instruct their pupils to hate Calvinism? How then are they better than others? Another instance of Socinian candour shall be taken from your Review (pp. 684 and 690), where you allow yourself

in the same fault which you condemn in others. The Barrister's "Hints" must not be called *profane*, nor the "Edinburgh Review," *atheistical*, because those words are to be found in the vocabulary of persecution. Yet, you can resort, upon occasion, to the same vocabulary, and dignify Calvin as "the murderer of Servetus." This is not the dialect of candour. To associate the illustrious reformer with assassins is a shock to the understanding; in such company I am persuaded he will not be found another day. Whatever hand Calvin had in that unhappy affair, you know very well that his conduct is not justified by modern Calvinists, who are as inimical to persecution as Socinians may be. With equal propriety might I term the founder of your sect "a murderer;" for it is well known that the conduct of Socinus and Blandrata towards Francis David was not a whit better than that of Calvin. The apology, if it may be so called, must in both cases be the same. The rights of conscience were not at that time properly understood; and the reformers, by setting up their own opinions as the standard of divine truth, had assumed that claim to infallibility which they so justly condemned in the Church of Rome. The examples here adduced, afford a fair specimen of the nature of Socinian liberality, and lead to the unavoidable conclusion that it is circumscribed within the limits of a party. The general strain adopted by Socinian writers fully proves that their modesty stands allied to their liberality. Of this we have a remarkable instance in the complacency with which they

arrogate to themselves the exclusive appellation of rational. What, are no rational christians to be found but Socinians; and are other christians to be considered as devoid of the chief dignity of their nature! But to argue the point seriously would be putting an affront upon common sense. I was going to observe further upon the improper application of the term *Unitarian*, which Socinians restrict to themselves, but is equally applicable to all other

christians who maintain the Unity of the Divine Being. Having, however, exceeded greatly the limits I first proposed to myself, it is necessary that I should forbear; and shut up these remarks with my earnest wishes for the revival of those principles that added lustre to the Presbyterians of former days, and are best calculated to establish their interest upon a solid basis.

W. W.

ON THE DECLINE OF PRESBYTERIAN CONGREGATIONS.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

“To teach is to inform and to impress. To inform the understanding, by opening and explaining the Holy Scriptures, is one chief branch of instruction. The other is to impress and set home information upon the heart, that it may abide there, and bring forth the fruit of a holy life.”

ROBERT ROBINSON.

Birmingham, Jan. 6,
1810.

SIR,

The decline of what are called Presbyterian Congregations has lately become the subject of inquiry among some of your correspondents. That it is a fact, all seem to allow, and the “Rational Dissenter of the old school” deeply laments it. But in my humble opinion, he has not at all found the cause of the decay he deplures, which in order to ascertain, it will be necessary to examine of what materials those congregations are composed, and what line of conduct their public instructors have pursued; for it is certain that the cause of this decline must be sought either in the preacher or the hearers, or both. As far as my experience goes, the congregations in ques-

tion are made up of very motley materials. Some attend because their parents attended, some because there happens to be a favourite preacher, some because it is decent and decorous to attend at some place of public worship, some because no particular doctrines are preached, some for what they can give, and some for what they can get, some because they don't like the church, and yet wish to go to the genteel-est meeting in the place, some because they are disgusted with the jargon of Calvinism, and are therefore glad to go any where to escape it, and some, doubtless, with the “Rational Dissenter,” for their own practical improvement. Such are the materials which have composed the Presbyterian congregations that I have

known.* Now what has been the conduct of their instructors? *Ex pede Herculem.* The instance cited by *Sabrinus* shews it at once. A minister of the gospel had preached to a congregation nearly half a century, without ever informing them what were his ideas of the foundation of that gospel; he had never thought it necessary to declare to his people whether he believed Christ to be God or man. He certainly thought it a matter of no importance; it was certainly one of those "learned discussions," those "unedifying speculations," which the gentleman "of the *old school*" seems so much to fear. This, sir, I blush to say, is not a solitary instance; it is not the exception, but the rule. With what propriety then could such ministers as these adopt the words of Paul, "that he had kept *nothing* back, but had shewn them *all* the counsel of God." It is wonderful to observe how careful these christians are, that the name which they assume should not possibly betray to the world either what they believe or what they deny. They assume titles to which no mortal man can possibly affix any just and proper meaning. Ashamed to say what they are, they resort to the despicable expedient of calling themselves what they are not. Ask any one of them to give you a reason for calling himself a Presbyterian. Only ask him, and see what answer he will give you.

But this title, I suppose, was not explicit and clear enough for your correspondent, so he dubs himself a Rational Dissenter, (all other dissenters are irrational); but this is not enough, he is "of the *old school*;" and pray let me ask him, as there is an "*old school*," what is the *new school*, who were its founders, and what are its opinions? Really it does not look well to see men sheltering themselves under titles of such studied ambiguity and want of meaning,—they are either ignorant of their principles, or they are ashamed of them.

Now, sir, if such are Presbyterian Congregations, and such Presbyterian Ministers, I appeal to their own common sense, whether they have not the seeds of decay and dissolution in them. It is in vain to shuffle or to shift the question; it is in vain to lay the fault upon the depravity and luxury of the age; it is in vain to whine and lament over the alteration of the dinner hour from one to four o'clock, or to deplore the change in the female dress:—the plain fact is this; *where people do not well understand their religious principles, they will soon cease to attend at all.* This is the real cause of the decline of Presbyterian Congregations, and it is a cause so abundantly clear to me, that I am astonished that any man "with his eyes open can seek for any other."

The "Rational Christian" deprecates any discussions of a doc-

* Let it be remembered that some congregations which formerly were called Presbyterian, have now assumed a more consistent and definite title; such, I mean, as that of the New Chapel in this place; the congregation at Hackney and that at Exeter. Thanks to the labours of such men as Priestley, Kenrick, Toulmin, Kentish, Belsham, Aspland, and Carpenter, these societies exhibit no symptoms of decay or dissolution.

trinal kind in the pulpit; any refutation of Trinitarianism; but I would just remind him that the apostles, in their public labours, were not so scrupulous in attacking the erroneous opinions of their hearers. Peter explained his ideas of the nature and character of Christ more pointedly and plainly, in his first address to the Jews, than a Presbyterian minister would in forty years; he scrupled not to assert the simple humanity of his master; and Paul exhorted Timothy to preach the great doctrine, that "there was one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." I don't know what "eminent men" are referred to, by the "Rational Christian," but there are very few of eminence among the dissenters who have not been controversial writers. Lardner, Priestley, Lindsey, Price, Taylor, Farmer, Wakefield, Kenrick, and many others, whose names will suggest themselves to your correspondent, were all controversialists, and it argues no very extraordinary degree of respect for the labours of these great men, to give them no higher title than "party squabbles and unedifying speculations." While attacking the errors of orthodoxy, and dispelling the mists of ignorance and bigotry, *they* imagined they were promoting the cause of their great master, and displaying to the world the unclouded glory and peerless excellence of his kingdom. But I am afraid they would not be accounted worthy disciples of the "old school." I should be glad to be informed what the disciple of this "old school" means by those curious points, "learned discussions" and "unedifying speculations," which he holds in such contempt, and which, he says, "make some few of the Socinian Congregations better attended than those where practical religion is almost the only point attended to." I suppose he regards the doctrines of the Trinity, transubstantiation, the eternity of hell torments, original sin, satisfaction, and other of those corruptions of christianity which have, for centuries, been promulgated by the majority of the christian world, as the doctrines of the Gospel; these, I suppose, he regards as "curious speculations," and any attempt to strip the religion of Jesus of these disguises and deformities, he would designate by the appellation of a "learned discussion;" doubtless, therefore, if his advice could be followed, christian teachers and hearers would trouble themselves no further about them. But, sir, we have reason to thank God that the apostles of old, and the venerable host of Reformers and Confessors of later times, were of a different opinion; they did not regard error and truth as of equal importance; they laboured with unceasing diligence in spreading the pure doctrine of the gospel, far and wide; where they found error they attacked it; where they saw ignorance they informed it; where they discovered hypocrisy they exposed it; and their labours were blessed in being effective to the pulling down the strong holds of ignorance, bigotry and prejudice. No doctrine which degrades the majesty of the Deity, which has a tendency to make him appear either unjust, cruel, or tyrannical, can be harmless. Truth of all kinds is important; but religious truth of infinitely the greatest importance:

error of every kind is fatal; but religious error the most fatal. Shall that minister then who endeavours to give his hearers right ideas of God and his government, and a just estimate of the nature, design, and office of Jesus Christ, shall he be told that he is leading his people into "curious speculations and learned discussions?" No, sir, he will rejoice in the contemplation that he has "kept nothing back which was profitable to them;" that he has "not hesitated to declare unto them the whole of the gospel of Jesus Christ." I take the public duty of a preacher to be two-fold, and one branch of it ought on no account to supersede or displace the other. In the words of Robinson, "he has to inform the understanding, by opening and explaining the Holy Scriptures," and this, he emphatically adds, "is one chief branch of instruction." But how is this to be done without adverting to those errors which have so long deluded the world? Are his people, if possible, to be kept in ignorance, that the doctrines of men have ever superseded the commandments of God; that the decrees of councils, synods, and assemblies, that the creed of Athanasius and the dogmas of John Calvin have long been substituted for the doctrines of Jesus Christ. If this were possible, I should be glad to know what useful end it would answer, or what good purpose it would effect. No, rather let us adopt the advice of Paul, and let "every one be able to give a reason for the hope that is in him." But while the preacher is careful to "inform the understanding," let him on no account neglect to "impress the heart." This part

of his duty is not at all less binding upon him than the other. Let the great moral duties of the gospel be inculcated and enforced with all the earnestness and solicitude which they so eminently demand, and let all possible practical improvement be drawn from so abundant a fountain of living water. Let the importance of feeling the influence of christianity on the heart, of entertaining those views and hopes with which it enriches and elevates the believing mind, and of practising those labours of love which it enjoins, form frequent subjects of public exhortation. Let the sinner be warned of his danger with faithfulness and a tender, affectionate concern, to save his soul from death. Let those who are seeking the Lord be directed to find him. Let the trembling and disconsolate be guided to those sources of divine consolation and peace which the gospel affords, and let the afflicted christian be comforted with those divine truths and promises which are calculated to sooth his heart in the day of trial and calamity, and to strengthen his faith, patience, and confidence in God.

Such, in my humble opinion, are the duties of a minister of the gospel; so far from being incompatible or discordant, they are essential to the support and the existence of each other. When Presbyterian Congregations have discovered this, they will flourish; but until they do, they will most assuredly decline; they will dwindle into insignificance; and they will finally fall, as some of them have already done, equally unnoticed and un lamented.

AN UNITARIAN.

● ON THE DECLINE OF PRESBYTERIAN CONGREGATIONS.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

Nottingham, Dec. 10th,
SIR, 1809.

After the interesting discussion of the cause of the decline of Presbyterian congregations, by Sabrinus, W. H. and C. C. any additional interference may be thought superfluous and presumptuous. I trust, however, that a fourth person may be allowed to express a wish, that a clear definition may be given of the term Presbyterian. If by Presbyterian congregations be meant those societies which agreed in no common point, but in church government and a disbelief of the Trinity, some of whose members were high Arians, others low Arians, and others Unitarians, the decline of such congregations may, I imagine, be ascribed principally to that spirit of inquiry which has recently been excited in the nation.

But if by Presbyterian congregations be meant Unitarian congregations, is it a fact that they are on the decline? Are they not greatly increasing? Have not the

non-descript Presbyterian societies assumed a tangible form, and been metamorphosed into Unitarian congregations? And is not the number of Unitarians now nearly equal to the number of quondam Presbyterians? Not to mention Essex-street, how does the case stand at the Gravel pit, and at all the principal towns and cities in the kingdom, as Bristol, Liverpool, Birmingham, &c.? Are not the exertions of the Unitarian missionaries crowned with abundant success? In many parts of the kingdom where, till recently, Unitarianism was totally unknown, is it not rearing its head, and making a perceptible and not very slow progress? If this be the case, why should erroneous statements be sent abroad to the world, which give those, who do not wish well to the cause, an occasion to triumph, and tend to chill the energies of its friends?

I am, Sir,

Your well-wisher,
G. Y.

ON THE DECLINE OF PRESBYTERIAN CONGREGATIONS: AN ANECDOTE.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

Trowbridge, Feb. 1st. 1810.

SIR,

I would have sent you the following anecdote long ago, had I not observed (which I am by no means sorry for) that your valuable Miscellany is like a stage-coach, crowded inside and outside, and that there is always a greater demand for places than

you can comply with; perhaps, now, you cannot reserve a place, but I presume that the mere bulk of the passenger will not be objected to. My application is for an anecdote, to shew that the want of plain English preaching has been one great cause of decay in Presbyterian, and other reputedly heterodox congregations.

A worthy friend of mine was lately travelling from Sarum to Warminster, in a light caravan, where, among other passengers, there was a young woman, who gave him to understand that she had been for some years a servant to a dissenting minister, of the Arian persuasion, not far from Sarum. My friend then took the liberty of asking her several questions, relative to her former master and his congregation; when she made the following reply: "My master was universally re-

spected as a good sort of a gentleman, and I liked him very much as a master; but I confess I never scarcely went to hear him, because he always preached *in Latin!!* Since his death, the people have had another minister, who has a great many more hearers, because he preaches *in English* to them!!" The anecdote requires no comment. May the hint which it conveys prove useful!

Your's, &c.
D. J.

QUERIES ON THE PRE-EXISTENCE OF CHRIST.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

Jan. 6, 1810.

SIR,

Anxious to come to a fixed and settled opinion respecting that grand point of controversy, the pre-existence of our Lord and Master Jesus Christ, I request of you, or from Mr. Marsom, through you, clear and distinct answers to the following queries.

1st. What rank amidst the creatures of God, do those who believe the pre-existence imagine, that Jesus Christ held before he appeared on earth?

2d. Do the pre-existarians be-

lieve that he came on earth in the same nature as he possessed before, or that he underwent a change, and became at his conception no higher or better than a man?

3d. Do they suppose that at his ascension he resumed his former rank, or was advanced to a higher one?

4th. What passages of Scripture do they build their sentiments upon?

I remain,

Your's, &c.

Παυλοσκωτος.

OBJECTIONS TO MR. FARMER'S HYPOTHESIS OF THE TEMPTATION OF CHRIST. LETTER II.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR,

In my former letter I endeavoured to shew, that the language, employed by the evangelists in their narratives of Christ's temptation in the wilderness, discountenances rather than favours, the late Rev. and learned H. Far-

mer's hypothesis respecting that extraordinary occurrence; and that, in consequence of the difficulty he felt about the time and place proper to be assigned for the commencement of the vision, in which he conceived the piety and virtue of our Lord to have

been put to a severe trial, he probably fell into the inconsistency I noticed, in the accounts he gives of those circumstances in different passages of his *Inquiry*. Beside those grounds for being dissatisfied with his scheme, I have now to state another, which I believe had a principal share in making me abandon an hypothesis, which he displayed so much ingenuity in his attempt to support and establish.

This additional ground for my dissatisfaction is, that, upon principles and positions laid down by himself, and from which he reasons, it may be made to appear to those who admit them (in some of which, however, I do not agree with him) that the temptation could not be a *present* trial, though that he considered it as such must be evident to every one who has perused his work with tolerable attention. Such of those positions as I may want I proceed to set down in numbered paragraphs, referring to the pages where they may be found. My edition of the *Inquiry* is the third, and I believe the last.

1 par. p. 7, note. If the devil had disguised himself, the temptations would have been trials rather of the *understanding*, than of the *heart*, or of our Lord's piety and virtue; the former of which is very different from the scripture idea of temptations.

2 par. p. 11. The largest offer is the offer of nothing, if he who makes it be unable to make it good; and if he be known to be so, by the person to whom it is made, the offer will be deemed an *insult*, rather than a *temptation*.

3 par. pp. 156, 157. The

meanest slave of vice would turn from the offer of the world, &c. by the devil in person with scorn.

4 par. p. 7, note. Christ knew the proper character of the devil in the very first temptation, as well as in every succeeding one.

5 par. p. 22, note. Christ's knowing who the tempter was at once disarmed his temptations of *all* their power.

6 par. p. 37. A lively exhibition of certain images before the mind produces the same effect with the sight of their corresponding objects; and transactions upon the stage of fancy answer the same end as a real performance.

7 par. p. 38. The real performance of the things said to have been done by the devil could answer no valuable purpose.

8 par. p. 86. The devil's seeming to say and do all that is ascribed to him in the history was, *in effect*, the same thing with regard to Christ, as if this had been the very case.

9 par. p. 95. In a vision the inspired person was awake, and had the regular exercise of his understanding and judgment.

10 par. p. 96—98. Vision gives as clear a view of what it represents, as if it were the very thing itself, and the notice of it were conveyed by the senses. What is imaginary no way differs in appearance from that which is real, *and has the same effect upon the prophet*, who does not at the time distinguish between the images of a vision and outward objects. The mind may enjoy an equal liberty in both, and be as capable of a rational determination and choice, with re-

spect to the representations of a vision, as with respect to the objects of sense. And consequently, the one may serve for the trial, display, and improvement of virtue, no less than the other.

11 par. p. 6, note. The history represents the tempter as appearing and acting under his proper character; and consequently, without affecting any disguise.

12 par. p. 36. The prophet cannot distinguish a vision from outward objects which are seen with the bodily eye; and is affected by the former in the same manner as he would have been by the latter.

13 par. p. 4. By a personal and undisguised appearance the devil can never hope to prevail over the feeblest virtue.

If I do not labour under a great mistake, this list of positions will furnish means of convincing such of your readers, as with Mr. F. hold them to be just, that he has failed in his attempt to prove that the temptation in the wilderness was a *present* trial. That he had been thought to have failed in this point, appears from the first appendix of his third edition, where he endeavours to remove objections which had been brought against his hypothesis. In examining his reasoning for that purpose, I shall refer to the foregoing positions, which, for the sake of easier reference, and to avoid as much as I can tedious repetitions, I have arranged in separate and numbered paragraphs.

Mr. F. informs us, (p. 172) that, "it is alledged, that the same considerations which diminish or destroy the force of Christ's temptation upon the common hypo-

thesis, equally affect its force upon mine;" and immediately observes, "if this allegation be just, neither of those hypotheses can be true; since it serves equally for the confutation of both. We hope, however, to shew, that the allegation has no sufficient foundation to support it." He then enters upon what I cannot as yet help regarding as an unaccomplished, and indeed hopeless undertaking, with reminding his readers, "that the *Inquiry*, (p. 101) asserts this vision to be directly, and properly intended, as a prediction and symbol of Christ's future temptations.—So that even were we to grant, that this vision was not *probationary*, this would not affect its proper use and intention as *prophetical and premonitory*." Hitherto we do not meet with any thing which goes directly to invalidate the allegation.

Mr. F. proceeds to observe, (p. 173) "it is evident, that this vision bore the *form* of a present trial;" and in the next sentence illustrates what he meant by *form*, where he says, "to the view and apprehension of Christ at the time, it contained certain alluring proposals made to him by the devil, in order to solicit him to evil." Whatever these proposals were in themselves, and abstractedly considered, they could have nothing in them alluring to Christ in the circumstances in which they were made, Mr. F. himself being judge, and consequently could not be *present* trials of his virtue and piety. Let us see whether this must not follow from some positions in the foregoing list.

Mr. F. grants in No. 11, that the devil is represented in the history as appearing and acting un-

der his proper character, and consequently, without affecting any disguise;—in No. 4, that Christ knew the proper character of the devil in the very first temptation, as well as in every succeeding one, (so that through the whole of the attack made upon him he was apprized what sort of assailant he had to resist;)—in No. 5, that Christ's knowing who his tempter was at once disarmed his temptations of all their power, (with respect to him, therefore, they could be no temptations, being confessedly incapable of making any impression upon his mind;)—in No. 3, that the meanest slave of vice would turn from the offer of the world, &c. by the devil in person with scorn. From these concessions, when we add to them Nos. 8 and 9, (in which Mr. F. allows, that the *visionary representation* of the devil was the same thing to Christ as his *personal presence*, and his *seeming* to say and to do things the same as his *actually* and *in person* saying and doing them,) the unavoidable inference seems to be, that according to Mr. F.'s ideas, the virtue and piety of our Lord underwent no trial at all in the desert. And he appears *virtually* to acknowledge as much, where he represents the vision "as not possible to be intended to seduce him into sin, because the several scenes of it were so framed, as to guard or warn a good mind from yielding to any of the proposals it contained. To appearance these proposals were made by the devil in person; which was designed to awaken an immediate resistance, and was a proper *motivation* against compliance, p. 173, 174." Here it should be recol-

lected, that our author makes *appearance* in this case to have been the same with regard to Christ, as the *reality* would have been, (No. 8,) and what the effect of the reality would have been, he tells us (in No. 3,) where he describes it as amounting to nothing, even with respect to the meanest slave of vice.

Though what I have already written might be deemed sufficient to prove, that on Mr. F.'s hypothesis Christ could not have been tempted, yet, as he gives it as his ultimate conviction, that the vision might answer the end of a *present* trial, that is, that it might serve to manifest how Christ was disposed to act, or to *discover* and *display* his virtue, which, he says, is a very common meaning of the word temptation, or trial, in scripture, and is the sense in which he uses it, when he calls Christ's vision a present trial, (p. 174.) respect for the opinion of so able and learned an author requires, that nothing of consequence advanced by him should be overlooked, or passed by unnoticed. Accordingly I would ask, with reference to the passage just quoted, what opportunity Christ could possibly have for displaying his virtue, when, according to No. 12, it was out of his power to distinguish the vision from reality,—when, according to No. 6, transactions on the stage of his fancy answered the same end as a *real performance*,—and when, according to No. 7, *the real performance* of the things said to have been done by the devil could answer *no valuable purpose*, and consequently could not serve to put his virtue to any test at all.

Mr. F. however, having more to say in order to set aside the foregoing allegation, and to show how the temptation might be a present trial, it is no more than what is due to the reputation he has long enjoyed in the literary world, to accompany him, through the remaining observations brought forward in his piece for that purpose. He observes then, (p. 174.) “the proposals (made by the devil) were in *themselves* so enticing, that nothing but the considering them as *sinful*, or as *temptations of Satan*, could dispose the most consummate virtue to resist them.” I answer, they were considered, and agreeably to the *intention* of the framer of the vision, *unavoidably* considered in that light, (*ibid.*) and therefore could not be calculated to excite the desires and passions, to which they were in themselves adapted, and which, in other circumstances they might have tended to awaken, and put into action: compare Nos. 8, 6, 7, in the order in which they are here placed. With a view to the same object, Mr. F. proceeds to observe (p. 175) that, “When the vision was ended, he (Christ) would naturally regard it as an emblem of his future conflicts;” and adds, “In this view also it served to try the steadfastness of his piety and virtue.”—What intimation does the history afford us, that Christ regarded the vision in that light, either during its continuance, or immediately upon its being ended? Does Peter appear to have understood the prophetic design of the vision of the sheet before it was explained by subsequent events? He was evidently in doubt for some time, at least, after the vision was over,

what it should mean, and perhaps till he arrived at the house of Cornelius: See Acts, x. 17—34. Is there any better evidence, that, when the supposed vision in the wilderness, was ended, Christ at once saw the design of the author of it? How often soever visionary representations were intended to be predictions, and how soon soever after they were past, the persons favoured with them discovered the purposes they were employed to answer, is it any where hinted in the accounts of Peter's undoubted, or of Christ's supposed, vision, that either of them, *as soon as ever* the vision he had seen was withdrawn, had adverted to its design? But had this been the fact, how could an idea, which by supposition did *not* present itself to the thoughts of Christ, while he remained in the trance, affect the impression made by it upon his mind? Can any thing operate before it begins to exist?

In the part of the appendix we have been attending to, Mr. F's object was to prove the temptation to have been a *present* trial; but from that point he seems to have started off to a different one, which is to show, that the vision was prophetic of *future* trials. Here I would desire the reader to notice Mr. F's concession, p. 177, where he says, “It is acknowledged, that both his (the devil's) apprehended and his real presence would create upon a good mind a *prejudice* against his proposals,” (he should have said as elsewhere, *would disarm them of all their power*, Nos. 3, 4, 5.) “And for this reason, it would have been impolitic in *Satan* to have made his appearance before

Christ either in person or in vision; if he meant thereby to recommend his proposals." (Must not Mr. F. then make the author of the vision represent the devil as acting out of character, contrary to what he elsewhere supposes? See No. 11.) "But what would have been absurd in this malignant spirit, whose business it is to seduce, was a wise conduct in the Deity, (the author of this vision,) because his intention was to forewarn Christ of his danger, and to arm him against it." And Mr. F. as if he had thought this to have been the whole of the divine intention, adds, "It was on purpose to lead Christ to regard the present proposals, (which were afterwards to occur in real life,) as highly criminal in their nature; that the vision represented them as made to him by the devil, as the temptations of that great enemy of God, whom it is always virtue to resist." But the premonition of approaching trials, is a different thing from a present trial, which latter it was his business here to show the temptation to have been, according to positions laid down by himself, but which it will be evident to the reader it could not have been, if he will look back to Nos. 4 and 5, and attend to what is said at the top of p. 177. Accordingly, Mr. F's next sentence is quite irrelevant to the subject immediately before him, which was, not to prove that the appearance of the devil in vision was proper,

the vision being considered as prophetic of future trials, but that it was consistent with the vision's being a present trial; which the places just referred to show it not to have been, as truly on his hypothesis as on the common one. The sentence is. "Thus the very same circumstance, the appearance of the devil, which was proper in the vision, suitable to both its divine author, and benevolent intention, would have been absurd upon the common hypothesis." Presuming that it must now be sufficiently manifest, that Mr. F. has been unsuccessful in proving the supposed vision to have been a present trial,

I proceed to examine his reply to an objection, which it seems, had been made to his hypothesis,—viz.—"That the apprehended presence of Satan in vision would produce the same general effect, as his real presence at any other time." p. 176. Unless I very much mistake the meaning of our author in some of his positions already quoted, the objection asserts no more than he had himself allowed and advanced. However, as he must have entertained a different idea of the import of those positions, it is but fair to give his own statement of the objection, and to let the reader see how he endeavours to parry it. "It is farther urged, (he says, p. 177,) that the reasonings employed to abate* the force of the second temptation, upon the com-

* He should have used a stronger word than *abate*. For where he is considering this temptation on the common hypothesis, he asks, "What inducement could Christ have for a compliance with the proposal suggested? Would he be disposed to gratify Satan, by doing an act at his mere motion? It is absurd to suppose it." (p. 10.) According to this remark, the force of the second temptation would not only have been abated, but entirely destroyed upon the common hypothesis the proposal having nothing in it, which could operate on the mind of Christ in the way of inducement. Neither could it have any force on Mr. F's, as must be manifest from Nos. 4, and 5.

mon hypothesis, do equally affect that advanced in the *inquiry*." He then proceeds, "The reasonings here referred to are levelled against the supposition, so commonly made by the advocates of the literal interpretation, that the devil having assumed a human form, and transported Christ through the air to the top of the temple—Christ could not but easily discern, that a compliance with his proposal of throwing himself down thence might issue in his dishonour, and thus destroy the credit of the miracle, by which he was to have established his divine mission; since the devil, who had in a miraculous manner placed him there, might do the same thing without receiving an injury. (p. 179) From what follows, Mr. F. seems to think, that as he had not asserted in the *Inquiry* that the representative figure of the apostate angel was a *human form*, his reasoning to prove that the second temptation was none upon the common hypothesis could not be turned against his, but for no other reason, that I can perceive, than that Christ might not easily discern, that the devil under a different form, or under the form in which he was exhibited in the vision, could not have thrown himself down from the temple (I suppose he meant *visibly* to the people, or else the remark could be nothing to his purpose) so as to have destroyed the credit of our Lord's miracle by performing an equal one himself. But it matters not under *what* form the devil was presented to his imagination, provided it was one which was visible to him, as Mr. F. every where evidently supposes; since in *that*

form he must have admitted, that our Lord could not but easily discern, that, had the devil descended with, or immediately after him, he would have been as visible to the people below as he was to himself, and that the consequence would have been the same as it would have been, had the form been human. Thus, whatever might be the form, under which the devil was exhibited to the imagination of Christ, as it must have been a visible one, he could not but have conceived at the time, that it was equally visible to others, (unless he had been expressly assured to the contrary,) and so have seen reason for apprehending, that the object of his own descent might have been frustrated, and therefore have felt no more inducement to comply with the proposal in the second temptation on Mr. F's. hypothesis than on the common one—that is, none at all.

With reference to the third temptation Mr. F. observes, that the offer of all the kingdoms of the world to Christ by the devil *in person* could be no temptation, since he knew the devil to be incapable of making the offer good. With reference to the same temptation, and by way of objection to Mr. F's. hypothesis, it had been asked, "What difference with regard to Christ, could it make, whether he had a *real sight* of the devil, or a *visionary representation* of him when he made this offer?" p. 181.

To set aside this objection, Mr. F. argues in the following manner: "those who rely on this objection, seem to me not to attend to the wide difference, which there is between judging

the images or appearances of a vision to be real objects, and their having exact external archetypes." p. 181. Whether those images or appearances have exact external archetypes or not, they are equally judged by the prophet to be real objects, (*ibid*); so that Christ could have no doubt of his being presented with a sight of all the kingdoms of the world, or of the power of the devil to bestow them upon him; he could not alter his views and persuasions concerning the objects of his vision, the impression being made by a hand too strong to be resisted; yet in rejecting the devil's offer he could exercise his understanding, and so evince the pious disposition of his mind. Such seems to be the amount of our author's reasoning in reply to the foregoing objection.

Now the only circumstance, as far as I perceive at present, which could deprive this reply of Mr. F. to the objection here brought against *his* hypothesis of any part of its force, if made to the objection which he has urged against the *common* one, is, that if the devil had *in person* promised Christ all the kingdoms of the world on his complying with a certain condition, his knowledge of the tempter's inability to accomplish his promise would have immediately convinced him, that it was the promise of nothing, and so have rendered his offer an *insult* instead of a temptation; but that, if he were represented in a *divine vision*, as making such an offer, and as having power to make that offer good, Christ must have supposed that he had such power, notwithstanding any know-

ledge of the contrary, which he had derived from any other sources of information. But could Mr. F. or can any advocate for his hypothesis imagine, that our Lord's knowledge of the devil's want of power would, in the one case, not have deserted him for a moment, or have been instantly recollected, and induced him to reject the offer with contempt and to bid the offerer with abhorrence depart from him,—but, in the other, have forsaken him altogether, escaped his recollection, or have been totally destroyed and obliterated by another and opposite conviction, the effect of an impression irresistibly made on his mind by the representations of the vision? Mr. F. allows and insists that our Lord knew who his tempter was, and founds his proof, that the third temptation was none, according to the common hypothesis, upon that circumstance, evidently supposing so close an association to have existed in our Lord's mind between the ideas he entertained of the devil's character and his knowledge of the devil's want of the power he claimed that his *personal appearance* would have made him instantaneously advert to the latter. To have been consistent with himself, Mr. F. must have granted, that the association between these two things was equally close on *his* hypothesis, and that in consequence of this association, which, according to a general law in our mental constitution, must have been the same on both hypotheses, the force of the third temptation would have been equally destroyed on either of them, unless some momentary doubt,

whether the devil did, or did not enjoy the power he arrogated to himself, arose in our Lord's mind, occasioned by the opposition between his former knowledge however acquired, and his present conviction produced by the representations made to him in the vision. But of the existence of such a doubt I cannot discover the slightest trace in the evangelical narratives of the temptation, which on the contrary seem evidently to lead to the conclusion, that our Lord was as prompt in deciding and acting, as he could have been, had his ideas or apprehensions concerning his adversary's character and extent of power, been at all times *unvariably* the same. Unless, therefore, it can be shewn, either that the devil's *known* want of power to make good his promise was not recollected and opposed to the conviction of his enjoying such power produced (as Mr. F. conceived) by some representation in the vision, which surely cannot be shown but from the gospel narratives of the temptation, or by proving that the universally experienced operation of the law of the association of ideas in causing recollection was in our Lord's particular case suspended for a time—or, that if such opposition actually took place, and was of course noticed by Christ at the time, it occasioned no disturbance in the exercise of his understanding or passions* ;—unless I say it can be satisfactorily made out, that one or both of these things happened, (for neither of

which have I ever met with any evidence whatsoever) I must conclude for myself, that Mr. F's. hypothesis has no advantage over the common one in proving the third temptation to have been a *present* trial of our Lord's virtue and piety.

Other objections (and in my humble opinion of some weight) to the scheme of the *Inquiry* have occurred to my mind, which, to avoid wearing out the patience of your readers, I shall not bring forward, at least for the present. I now lay down my pen, intending, (if capacity and opportunity of doing it be afforded me) to resume it for the purpose of obviating objections to the hypothesis I have long adopted, which in its great outline differs scarcely by a shade from those of Mr. Dixon and Mr. Newcome Cappe. In the mean time I shall be glad to see any objections to their hypotheses, which some among your numerous readers may have to start, as they may equally lie against mine, and merit particular attention, which I shall be disposed to pay to them, especially if they should materially differ from those, which several years ago occurred to my own mind, or were suggested by a very learned and ingenious friend deceased, all of which I then examined with all the impartiality and care I was master of. I remain, with the best wishes for the growing reputation and success of your useful miscellany,

Yours, &c.
GERON.

* It appears, (says Mr. F.) from instances before cited, that vision did not disturb the understanding or passions of the prophet ; p. 135, note II.

EARLE'S POEMS.

In a small volume of "Verses upon several Occasions, by J. Earle, Chaplain to his Grace the Duke of Douglas," 2nd edit. London, printed, 1724, there is a reference to Mr. Billingsley, probably the same excellent person of whom Dr. Toulmin has given some account, vol. iv. 249.

The author in an Epistle Dedicatory to Mrs. Susanna Langford, thus deprecates severe criticism:—

"As poetry is not my profession, I shall be very little solicitous about the censures of those who possess a skill in these matters, and shall flatter myself with no other hope than this modest one,—That this collection may fall into the hands of some who can relish the subject, and are not critics enough to be disgusted at the manner, or however are devout enough to sacrifice their critical skill to their spiritual delight.—'A truly spiritual taste will keep well disposed minds so intent to the weight and seriousness of the matter as not to leave them at leisure for little impertinent criticisms,' as *good* MR. BILLINGSLEY expresses himself, in his preface to the metrical composures of Mr. Daniel Burgess, a man who had a much greater share of learning, good sense, and wit too, than very many of those who have affected to be witty upon his public performances. To such as Mr. Billingsley describes, the following lines are offered," &c.

Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Earle had a greater talent for humorous than serious poetry. The "Verses" in this volume are mostly on solemn subjects, and have little pathos, harmony, or dignity; but the author's turn for epigram now and then appears. The following poem contains a pretty thought.

THE REPRISAL.

Since in despite of all my care,
A wand'ring heart to fix,
Worldly impertinencies will
With my devotions mix:

My business and diversions too
Shall interrupted be,
With many a sweet and pious thought,
My dearest Lord, of thee.

To such readers as were pleased with Dr. Earle's "Extempore" on receiving a Diploma, given in the "Say Papers," No. viii. vol. iv. p. 65, it is presumed this communication will not be unacceptable; and it may possibly add something to the scanty biography of Mr. Billingsley, the patron of Dr. Foster and Mr. Stogdon.

E.

ON THE CONSISTENCY OF THE QUAKERS.

To the Editors of the Monthly Repository.

SIR,

The insertion of my reply to the principal part of Philo's paper "on the Inconsistencies of the Quakers," (p. 11) induces me to request room also for the following observations on some other subjects noticed therein.

After describing in very pleasing terms, an amiable family of Quakers, with whom Philo, though not of that persuasion himself, is intimately acquainted, he adds: "One of this esteemed family married a worthy young lady of a different profession; I have of-

ten the pleasure of witnessing their mutual happiness, and the Quaker was disowned."

These facts are, I doubt not, correctly stated by Philo; but he is in error when he speaks of disownment "for marrying out of the connexion," as merely a "modern custom," the rules of the Society having, for much more than a century, subjected parties so marrying to disownment. The propriety and wisdom of the regulation is another question, equally open to examination as when it was first made; a period much more remarkable for sectarian distinctions and mutual acrimony, than for a just estimate of those great principles of christian truth, on which the contending parties were agreed. The object it aimed at, was however undoubtedly good; that is, to discourage the union of its members with those who were, from the influence of education, or otherwise, of discordant sentiments.

I imagine Philo will grant that a general accordance, between a man and his wife, on the most important points of religious faith and practice, is highly desirable, not only for the promotion of their own comfort through life, but still more eminently for the religious welfare of their offspring. At the same time, it is obvious that no regulation of this nature, can secure any person from the consequences of such diversity of sentiment in a husband or wife, as is to be found among the members of the same religious society. And accordingly the Quakers very properly leave all inquiry into the religious sentiments of their members, who intend to

marry each other, to the parties themselves, their parents or guardians.

The most salutary mode in which a religious Society can influence its members, respecting marriage is, I should think, by giving them, as an important part of their education, just ideas on the subject, generally before they have formed such engagements, and thereby enable them to chuse wisely for themselves. Instead of which, as far as my observation has extended, the zeal and exertions of the Society have hitherto been principally directed towards admonishing the parties not to marry contrary to the rules of the Society, when it was too late, their honour and affections being both engaged; and in excluding them from religious fellowship for being married to persons of another persuasion. Yet there may often be in such unions, a much nearer approximation of religious sentiments between the parties, and even with the society disowning them, than is frequently to be found between those who are married according to its rules, and still continue members of the society.

From Philo's sketch of the character and mutual happiness of his worthy friends, subsequent to their marriage, it is probable their union affords one instance of the justice of the above observation.

To persons of such mental attainments as I imagine Philo's friend possesses, exclusion for such a cause from the society may not be esteemed any great hardship. But I have known persons disowned for a similar cause, whose general attachment to the doctrines and discipline of

the Quakers was very strong, and whose happiness, although persons of great moral worth, was materially impaired by being thus severed from their brethren.

Persons are also frequently disowned for other causes not of an immoral nature, such as the payment of tithes, &c. in mere obedience to the law of the land; who are strongly attached to the general and more important doctrines of the society, and are far from approving the system of tithes as a christian institution.

If such persons must still be disowned, I cannot understand why they might not, on requesting leave, be allowed the privilege of being married in the society; the only other legal form of marriage in this country, for professed christians, being that of the established church, to a compliance with which, it is highly probable they may have a conscientious objection.

The refusal of the Quakers to permit the marriage of persons amongst them, one of whom has been disowned, has occasioned the parties to live single for many years, and even for life, when their affections were mutually engaged to each other, and no other impediment to their union existed, except their repugnance to the adoption of the ceremony of the church of England.

Such have been, and may be, the consequences of continuing and enforcing the present rules of the society respecting marriage and the payment of tithes. On one branch of the latter subject, impropriate tithes, there is an interesting letter by Mr. Clarkson, the author of the *Portrature of Quakerism*, in your 3d. vol. p.

476; highly deserving of the serious attention of such zealous disciplinarians as are advocates for disowning their brethren for such causes as these. This writer has fully established, in my apprehension, the impropriety and inconsistency of disowning those who pay or receive impropriate tithes. And although he laments that the society "should not have made, long ago, a proper distinction between ecclesiastical and impropriate tithes," I see no reason to conclude he would approve disowning "a virtuous man and a good christian" for the payment of either. The letter, on the contrary, shews how strongly his mind was impressed with the "*many evils*" which may arise from unnecessary disownment.

"Members," says he, "may occasionally be turned out of such a society, who may be men of a more amiable spirit than others who may remain in it. The hearts of the upright may also be grieved. And there may be laid inevitably in the constitution of such a society, the seeds of its own dissolution."

An extension of the privilege of being married in the form prescribed by the Quakers, to those who are from education or otherwise of the same persuasion, or to those who may have been disowned, and yet profess a conscientious objection to complying with the marriage ceremony of the church of England, would be only treating such persons with the same kind of liberality as magistrates usually extend towards them, by the acceptance of their affirmation instead of an oath.

Whether the society, in its collective capacity, could very soon be induced to make some such alterations in the rules respecting marriages and tithes, as I have ventured to suggest, is not for me to determine. But I have no such apprehensions of the effect of premature discussion as Mr. Clarkson seems to have entertained. And I feel confident that, at no very distant period, propositions to the Yearly Meeting, on behalf of such amendment in the rules, would be favourably received and ultimately adopted.

By the ancient constitution of the society, this annual assembly forms its legislative body, and one important part of its duty is to consider and decide upon propositions for the repeal or alterations of existing rules, or the formation of new ones, as the circumstances and views of the

society may from time to time require.

Propositions may originate with any individual member ; but the concurrence of the monthly and quarterly meetings to which he belongs must be obtained, before they are presented to the Yearly Meeting. Such a constitution as this is well calculated to prevent the perpetuation of error, merely because it has been long established, and affords a regular and efficient means of adopting real improvements, without incurring the dangers of an intemperate zeal for innovation, and I trust naturally tends, although its progress may be slow, towards the formation of a "system which requires only" such requisites as Philo deems necessary, "that is, a rational assent and reasonable service."

Yours, &c.

PACIFICATUS.

ONE OF THE EDITORS OF THE "IMPROVED VERSION," ON THE REVIEW OF IT IN THE MONTHLY REPOSITORY.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

February 1, 1810.

SIR,

The editors of the Improved Version, in common with your other readers, are obliged to your industrious critic for the pains which he has taken to mark every minute deviation of the text of the Improved Version from the received text, and from the text of Griesbach's second edition, in which he has performed an acceptable service to those who have taste and leisure for such nice investigations. But that it may not be inferred from the numerous instances of these petty variations, that the editors of the

Improved Version have been culpably negligent in performing the office which they undertook, it may be proper to state that it was never in the contemplation of these editors to exhibit an exact copy of all the minute various readings of the Griesbach text.

Without meaning to detract from the value of a text verbally and literally correct, or from the obligations which the Christian world is under to the Mills, the Wetsteins, the Bengels, and the Griesbachs, to whose acute and laborious researches we owe the great improvements which have been made upon the text of Ste-

phens and Elzevir, the main object of the editors of the Improved Version was to communicate intellectual rather than verbal information; and it was more to their purpose to ascertain the meaning of a sentence or a phrase in holy writ, than to correct the spelling of a word, or the position of a crotchet. With them therefore the object of prime consideration was to exhibit the best authenticated reading, and the correctest translation of those obscure passages, which, having been corrupted or mistranslated, have been most frequently misunderstood, and appealed to in support of popular errors. And to these texts they have subjoined notes, to confirm the reading or the translation, and to propose what in their consciences they believed to be the true meaning of the sacred writers. Their design unfortunately does not meet with the approbation of your reviewer. This difference of judgment they regret, but cannot help. That gentleman has *his* opinion, and the editors have *theirs*. The explanatory and doctrinal notes, which he disapproves, they consider as the most useful part of their undertaking; and it was their duty to adopt those means which in their judgment most directly led to the attainment of their end.

It cannot be doubted that a new version of the New Testament by a competent hand, from Griesbach's text, minutely noting all the variations from the received text, and stating the grounds and authorities for those variations, is a desideratum in sacred literature, and would be a very acceptable present to the public. But this would have been quite

inconsistent with the plan of the Improved Version, as the critical notes must in this case have superseded the exegetical ones, or would have swelled the volume to an inconvenient size.

It was indeed their desire, as far as it was practicable, to combine the advantages of critical correctness with theological instruction. With this view they selected the version of archbishop Newcome as the basis of their own, and, amongst other reasons, because it was taken from the text of Griesbach's first edition. Into this text they introduced those variations only which affected the sense, and which are inserted in the interior margin of Griesbach's second edition. These, as the learned collator himself allows, are comparatively few. But some of them are of considerable importance: for example, Eph. iii. 9. the words, "Jesus Christ," which are inserted after the words "who created all things," in Griesbach's first edition, are omitted in the second.

The variations which the editors were most solicitous to mark, were those of the Improved Version from the primate's text, that they might not be chargeable with imputing to the learned prelate renderings or sentiments which were not his own. Here they were aware that they stood upon tender ground. And it is satisfactory to find that the sharp-sighted coadjutor of your reviewer has been able to detect so few errors of this class, which have escaped the vigilance of the editors, and these shall be carefully corrected in subsequent editions. To satisfy bigots of any description the editors neither expect nor

desire. But they flatter themselves that this scrupulous attention to mark the difference between the primate's version and their own, and in all cases to introduce into the notes the very words which were omitted or altered in the text, will allay that laudable anxiety which has been expressed upon the subject by those truly eminent and respectable persons and dignitaries of the established church, who being the nearest relations of the deceased prelate, are the natural guardians of his theological and literary reputation; and they trust that it will appear in the event that the publication of the Improved Version, so far from being injurious to the primate's memory, will be the means of giving greater publicity to, and of creating an increasing demand for, his own liberal, learned, and judicious work.

It was incorrect in the editors to state, that in *every* instance in which either the primate's version or their own differs from the received text, they had placed the words of the received text at the bottom of the page. They could only mean the most material instances, and those by which the sense was affected; for as it was

their chief design to enable the English reader to peruse the New Testament with understanding and edification, they never thought of descending to the extreme minutiae of verbal collation. Upon the whole, the Improved Version may boast without hazard of contradiction, that its text is by far the most correct of any which have yet appeared in the English language; and it may safely appeal to the candid and discerning, that in all points in which the sense is materially, if at all, affected, the text is as correct as the present improved state of sacred criticism will admit. That it has not pursued the Griesbach text into all its minutiae of words, letters and points, is sufficiently obvious; but neither was it the intention of the editors, as it could not have been done properly and completely without the sacrifice of what appeared to them an object of far higher importance, and a primary regard to which was their chief inducement to embark in this important undertaking.

I am, Sir,

Your humble Servant,

ONE OF THE EDITORS
OF THE IMPROVED
VERSION.

REVIEW.

“ STILL PLEAS'D TO PRAISE, YET NOT AFRAID TO BLAME.”

POPE.

ART. I. *National Gratitude. A Sermon delivered October 25, 1809, &c. before the Congregational Church assembling at Peckham, in Surry.* By W. B. Collyer, D. D. 8vo. pp. 36. Williams and Smith, 1809.

“In every possible point of view,” says the preacher, “public worship appears to me, on this particular day, a singular duty and a distinguished privilege.” (p. 3.) “It is an occasion,” he tells his hearers, with more moral than grammatical propriety, “on which in all probability, no *one* present will meet again.” (p. 2.) He therefore assiduously improves the opportunity of extolling the character of the king, of recommending unconditional obedience to the government, of praising the established churches of England and Scotland, and of loading the emperor Napoleon with varied, and by no means select abuse.

There are several passages in the discourse which we had marked for animadversion; but it would be idle to attempt seriously to check the evil tendency of a publication which is already probably forgotten.

One general feature of the sermon is its hasty avoidance of every uncourtly topic. The preacher seems to have been quite unconscious of all our national sins; and he extenuates, while he is forced to acknowledge, our national calamities. Text is piled

upon text, without explanation, in support of the vague duty of “loyalty;” and a pretty broad intimation is given of the impropriety of censuring, even in the “daily prints,” “the impotence of a minister, the treachery of a general, the want of co-operation among allies, or the half-measures of a government.” What a strain of preaching for such a period. The publication of the discourse bespeaks, we fear, that we have “fallen on evil days;” and there is much in it, we confess, that leads us to apprehend that there are not wanting, writers amongst us, who are prepared to be the apologists of worse men and worse measures than have yet afflicted us.

The abolition of the slave trade supplies Dr. Collyer with one of the least objectionable subjects of panegyric on the king, but even here he obtrudes upon us fulsome adulation, and shews us the extent of his political prejudices. “The name of Wilberforce, (he says) will descend with that of his GRACIOUS MASTER, George the Third, to the remotest posterity.” Who would not infer from this that Mr. Wilberforce was *the servant of the crown* at the time

when this memorable event took place, or at least that he has in some period or other sustained this relation: but no; the application of these epithets to an independent member of the House of Commons is no more than the pomp of oratory; it is an imitation of the Eastern style,—not unnatural, we allow, in a sermon better suited to the political meridian of Hindostan than of Great Britain. There was, however, a minister of the king's, whose great services in the cause of the abolition, might, one should think, have occurred to the memory of a Protestant dissenting teacher, a statesman who was too seldom, and far too short a period, alas! the king's adviser, who devoted his matchless talents to civil and religious liberty, and to philanthropy and peace, who was not less earnest, certainly not less eloquent, scarcely less laborious in behalf of the Africans than Mr. Wilberforce himself, who made it the first and last object of his administration, the condition of his coming into power and the test of his ministry, to wipe the foul stain of negro-slaving from the annals of his country, and who encountered in this generous labour the opposition of parlia-

mentary, and even *court* influence; but the name of Fox would have been discordant in a jubilee sermon; it would have "grated harsh" music upon ears attuned to royal praises; or it might have revived recollections and anticipations which would have obscured the lustre of the preacher's eloquence, and mingled national regret with "National Gratitude," and changed a day of rejoicing into a day of mourning.

We have adverted to the preacher's eloquence, not so much because he has attained this distinction of a writer, as because he is obviously ambitious of it. Let him consider that there can be no real eloquence without simplicity and truth. The commonplaces of courtly panegyric are fairly worn out; they pall upon the hearer! they have been repeated till they have lost their meaning. It is remarked by a French writer,* that the most eloquent address, ever delivered to Lewis xiv. was that of a religious missionary, who, on his first appearance before the king, thus began his discourse:—"Sire, I mean not to pay a compliment to your majesty; *I have found none in the Gospel.*"

ART. II. *The Substance of a Sermon, preached at the Blessing of the Catholic Chapel of St. Chad, in the Town of Birmingham, on Sunday, December 17, 1809. By the Right Rev. Dr. Milner, Bishop of Castabala, in Cilicia, V. A. F. S. A., &c. Birmingham, printed and sold. Sold also by Wilkie and Co. London. 8vo. pp. 49.*

Dr. Milner, in the beginning of his discourse (from 2 Chron. vii. 12, 15,) endeavours to esta-

lish three points, viz. "the obligation of paying a distinct worship to our Creator, the duty

* D'Alembert. *Select Eulogies*. Translated by Dr. Aikin. Vol. i. p. 15.

of paying this at stated times and places, and the duty of paying it according to the forms and ordinances which God himself has supernaturally prescribed to us." These propositions, no well instructed believer in revelation will controvert. We shall protest, however, against our author's argument from the pomp and splendour of divine worship under the Jewish dispensation, in favour of the same pomp under the Christian. The scriptures of the New Testament enjoin no such magnificence: nor is it agreeable to the simplicity and spirituality of the gospel. Accordingly, it was not till Christianity was grossly corrupted that the professed disciples of Jesus were ambitious of not being "behindhand with the ancient people of God, in the solemnity of their religious worship." (pp. 6, 10.)

In the second part of his sermon, the preacher undertakes to point out "a plain and easy rule by which the unfortunate divisions of the religious world may be effectually healed, and the truth of revelation, upon each point of controversy, be clearly discovered by every well meaning individual possessed of common sense." Dr. M., we perceive, excessively laments the endless variety of discordant sects among Christians, and the contradictory systems of religion which a large proportion of them hold. We have no wish to disguise the fact, or to deny the evil. But is there no other or greater evil in the church of Christ? How are sects created? What does the existence of them imply? Usurpation on the faith

and consciences of men—the attempt to bring human beings into an imagined uniformity of opinion, in the bonds of ignorance or hypocrisy, has been productive of far worse effects, than any which have flowed from sects the most various and clashing. (pp. 6, 13. &c.)

"It would be blasphemy," says this writer, "to assert that the divine founder of Christianity has left it destitute of a rule and a guide to conduct his followers into truth and amity." Who supposes that he has? Our Saviour's language on this very case is too clear to be mistaken; since one of his prayers, in behalf of his disciples, is,* *Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth.* Is it, however, a necessary consequence of a rule and a guide being given, that they shall *universally and completely* answer the desired end? Apply this kind of argument to the faculty of reason, even when it is not employed upon religion: and you will shew that reason is not the gift of God; a doctrine too monstrous to be endured. The fact is, that the most important favours bestowed by the Deity upon men are liable to be abused, and the purposes of them to be, in some measure, defeated by human imperfection. In this respect, as in several besides, there is an obvious analogy between natural religion and revelation. (p. 13.)

We have pleasure in observing, that Dr. M., notwithstanding he speaks of "our Catholic ancestors," combats the idea of a merely hereditary religion. "The cause," he remarks, "of the un-

* John, xvii. 17.

happy divisions among Christians is, that they either take up with a religious system without any rule or reason at all, or else they adopt an erroneous rule, which leads them still further from the truth than if they had no rule at all. Many," he adds, "choose their religion as they choose their clothes, from mere fancy. Still more adhere to the religion of their family, because it is that of their family; which motive, if it were a reasonable one, ought to have determined our pagan ancestors to persevere in the horrid rites of Thór and Woden still." These sentences appear to us to admit, that every man is interested in making personal inquiry into matters of religion, and in determining, upon rational principles, and by the exercise of his own understanding, what faith he shall embrace. (pp. 11, 13.)

Among those christians, "who profess to be guided by religious motives alone," Dr. M. finds "that one or other of the three following rules has been adopted: a special private revelation; the Bible as interpreted by each man for himself; and the word of God, whether written or unwritten, as delivered and explained by the church of God." He then proposes "to shew which of these rules is defective and erroneous, and which is exclusively safe and true." We will hereafter ascertain, if we can, what he means by the unwritten word of God. For the present, it becomes us to attend to his two preliminary observations. (p. 14)

"The first is, that there can only be one true religion." Here we agree with him, provided the

term *religion* be previously and well defined. True religion, the religion of a christian, is to "deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live soberly, righteously and piously in this present world, looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." There is no professor of christianity, under any of its modifications, who does not cordially subscribe to this apostolic declaration: this has been the universal belief of the avowed followers of Jesus, at all periods of the church, and in every quarter of the globe. Consequently, according to a known and favourite maxim, among those who stile themselves Catholics, it should be considered as the only christian religion: it is simple and practical, and regards the heart, life, and character. But then, additions have been made to it, by which it is deformed and injured; and hence that diversity of creeds and discipline which Dr. M. bewails and wishes to remedy, and, if possible, prevent. (ib.)

He asserts that "there can only be one true system of christian revelation, among the many which are found in this age and country." If, dissatisfied with the statement which we have just made, he intends to say that, of these varying systems, there is one which has no portion whatever of error, let him adduce facts to establish his proposition. Is it not at least *possible* (we could perhaps shew it to be *probable*)

that all christian communions have departed, in some degree, from the truth as it is in Jesus? That "Christ is the eternal truth," that "he could not say the yea and the nay upon the same subject," that "he could not contradict himself in the way in which many of the communions in question contradict each other," is allowed. Must it follow that the same uniformity, the same infallibility, shall subsist among those who bear his name, and who, be it remembered, are imperfect human creatures? As justly might we maintain, that none who are endued with reason will ever be the slaves of prejudice and ignorance. Such arguments are inconclusive against the evidence of facts. (p. 15.)

Dr. M. appeals, on this point, to the authority of Scripture.

But we must be permitted to remark, that he does not seem to understand the texts on which he places his reliance. "There is no quality," says he, "of his disciples, which Christ insisted upon more frequently, or more energetically, than upon their unity; and he expressly assures us, that he shall collect the whole flock which belongs to him in *one sheep-fold under one shepherd.*" Now it is true that he does insist pre-eminently upon their unity; but it is unity in love to him and each other.* And when he prophesied that there should be *one fold, under one shepherd*, his meaning was, that he should form believing Jews and believing Gentiles into one body. This passage therefore is perfectly foreign to our author's purpose. (ib.)

[To be continued.]

OBITUARY.

1809, Nov. 11th. In Tryon Place, Hackney, aged 85, the Rev. PHILIP DAVIES.

"He was born in 1704, at Haverfordwest, where his father, the Rev. Evan Davies, was pastor of a dissenting congregation. Removing from thence to take charge of the dissenting academy at Carmarthen, his son Philip received the early part of his education in that establishment. In his 17th year, he was sent to the academy in London, where he continued his studies under the Rev. Dr. Jennings, and finished them under the Rev. Mr. Eames. He had for a fellow-student Dr. Price, with whom he enjoyed an uninterrupted friendship till the death

of that excellent and justly celebrated man.

"Upon his leaving the academy Mr. D. was chosen pastor by a congregation of Protestant Dissenters at Billericay, Essex, where he resided forty years, most highly respected and beloved. During the latter years of his residence there, he was induced, by the hope of providing more amply for his family, to enter largely into agricultural concerns. Being, in these, unsuccessful, he left Billericay and resided for the last twenty-four years of his life at Hackney.

"Mr. D.'s religious principles discovered themselves by an exalted piety and great benevolence of character.

* John, xvii. 18, &c.

The last scene of his life was truly sublime. He resigned himself into his heavenly Father's hands, not only without a doubt or complaint, but with cheerful confidence."

With the above account of this venerable person we have been favoured by his nearest relations, who enjoy that invaluable consolation under the loss of such a father, the recollection of their unwearied attention to his declining age.

Mr. D. had been through life a student, especially applying the advantages of his liberal education to a diligent examination of the Christian Scriptures. In his advanced years his religious opinions became more and more what are generally called Unitarian. Very late in life he adopted the *Necessarian* hypothesis, and held it, as is rather unusual, in connexion with the belief of an immaterial principle in man, and its existence in a state of separation from the body.

As a companion, while he could enjoy society, Mr. D. was an ample contributor to the amusement and information of his friends. An extended life passed in or near the metropolis, had made him personally acquainted with names and events long consigned to the records of history. He was received into christian communion by Watts, and assisted in his studies by the instructions of Chandler. He had often heard Doddridge preach, and witnessed the crowds who attended the lectures of "Modest Foster," the charm of whose popularity he used to describe to have been the modulation of his voice, clear as the sound of a trumpet. He had stood among the thousands whom Whitfield harangued in Moorfields with uncommon powers, and had heard that extraordinary man, when his voice and constitution were enfeebled by such excessive efforts.

Mr. D's residence at Hackney introduced him to an intimate acquaintance with Gilbert Wakefield. With his lines on the lamented death of that accomplished scholar, we close the present article, adding those to which they gave occasion, as they serve to shew the esteem in which Mr. D. was regarded by his associates.

Wakefield is dead! see sacred Science mourn,
Like her own Aikin, bending o'er his urn;

While ev'ry muse, by his fair daughter led,
In precious tears embalms th' illustrious dead;
While gen'rous youths, enwrapp'd in classic lore
The Master-Genius of the song deplore;
Here, tott'ring age essays, with trembling tongue,
Falt'ring to mingle in the tuneful throng,
And cast his feeble, last, expiring strain
On Friendship's altar, soon to blaze again.
Thus age and wisdom, youth and beauty join,
T' anticipate a sentence more divine.
Who would not thus, like Wakefield, wish to die,
Secure of fame and immortality.

Hackney,
Oct. 1801.

P. D.

TO P. D. ON HIS VERSES.

Friend, be not this thy "last expiring strain,"
Though joys are fled we ne'er shall greet again,
Such, as in social hours remember'd long,
We shar'd from Wakefield's science-gifted tongue:
Yet may kind heav'n extend thy life's sojourn
Though "bending" oft, regretful,
"o'er his urn!"
Yes, live, till friendship's pious care has join'd
Each scatter'd fragment of his mighty mind;
And as thy judging eye the form surveys,
The semblance still may faithful mem'ry trace.
Live, yet to teach the vanity of youth,
How letter'd age reclines on heav'nly truth,
And waits the bliss of virtue's promis'd days
When "Friendship's altar" shall for ever blaze."

(See *M. Mag.* XII. 518 and XIII. 46.)

Nov. 11. 1809, Died at Headcorn, Mr. JOHN IGGLESDEN, in the 73rd year of his age. The mind of this worthy man appears to have been early impressed with the principles of Christianity, as, in the year 1758, he was

baptised, on the profession of his faith in the Gospel, and became a member of the General Baptist church, at Cranbrook. About nine years after the above period, he was dismissed from this society to another of the same denomination at Bessell's Green, near Sevenoaks. Through attachment to his friends in the latter place, he kept up his connection with them to the end of life, although his business led him afterwards to settle in the village where he died. He was remarkably steady in his attendance upon public worship, and subscribed liberally towards its support. The prosperity of religion afforded evident pleasure to his mind, and he was especially attentive to such young persons as manifested a disposition to walk in the path of Christian duty. Indeed, his general conduct evinced his regard to rational piety, and his zeal for the promotion of truth and righteousness.

Having acquired, through the blessing of Providence, considerable property, his latter years were spent in retirement from the more active scenes of life. During this period much of his time was employed in reading; and the writings of Lindsey, Toulmin, and Cappe, he particularly esteemed. For several years his health had been much impaired by an asthmatic complaint, and a few months before his death, he had the misfortune to receive a fall from his horse, from the effects of which he had not entirely recovered, when he was attacked with the dropsy, which terminated his life. During his illness he expressed an unreserved submission to the will of God, and his hope of future happiness clearly overpowered the fear of death. On Sunday, the 5th of Nov. his disorder took a decisive turn, and on that, and the following day, his dissolution was hourly expected. On Tuesday, however, he so far revived as to call his attendants around him, when to their surprise, he engaged in prayer for a considerable time, expressing himself with greater energy than he had been able to do for some weeks. This, however, was his final effort, as he languished in great pain and weakness from that time until Saturday morning, when he breathed his last. He was interred in the General Baptists' burying-ground at Headcorn, on the Thursday after his death. Agreeably to his own request, a discourse was preached

on the occasion, from 2 Cor. v. 10, "For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ," &c. The congregation was unusually large and attentive.

The deceased has left one daughter to imitate his pious example, and to cherish the remembrance of his affectionate solicitude for her welfare.

Headcorn,

J. C.

Dec. 22, 1809.

1809, Nov. 11. At Chester, Mrs. LYONS, wife of the Rev. James Lyons, Unitarian minister in that city. She was the daughter of the late Mr. John Beatson, pastor of the Baptist congregation, at Hull, a correspondent of Mr. Robinson's, at Cambridge, and author of two treatises on the Divine Character, and the Satisfaction of Christ. Her character was distinguished by simplicity, truth, affectionateness, and undissembled piety. She retained, for the most part, the religious principles (those of moderate Calvinism) which had been taught by her father, though she felt and acknowledged many of the difficulties with which they are attended; but her views of the paternal government of God were such as to afford her much happiness, and to banish from her mind every degree of bigotry and intolerance. She believed that good men of the most opposite sentiments, will finally meet in perfect harmony, in the presence of their heavenly Father in a better world; and this made her easy respecting Mr Lyons's change of sentiments. [Vol. III. p. 166.] Her death was affectingly sudden. She had been slightly indisposed for about ten days, but seemed, on the day before she died, perfectly recovered. She awoke during the night in great agony, and before medical assistance could be procured, was gone for ever beyond the reach of pain. She has left three children, to join with their afflicted father, in regretting her loss and cherishing the memory of her virtues.

1809, Nov. 20. Died, of consumption, in an obscure dwelling in Crossfield, Halifax, and in circumstances of extreme distress, Mrs. STANDEVENS, aged 30. The short history of this accomplished and unfortunate young woman is painfully interesting; but as the lesson which it teaches is full of instruction, a few particulars are added, in the hope, that, as a warning example to

female youth, her sufferings and melancholy fate may not have happened in vain.—Eliza Evans was the only child of the Rev. Mr. Evans, of Malpas, in Cheshire, domestic chaplain to Lord Cholmondely. His character, as given by one who knew him, was in every respect excellent. He was exemplary and useful in the discharge of his sacred office, noticed and caressed by the rich and great for his acquirements and virtues, and beloved by the poor for his piety and charities. Eliza lost her mother at the early age of five years, and ten years afterwards was bereft of her father. The interval between these two deprivations was spent at the best schools which Chester and Shrewsbury afforded. Her attainments were worthy of the opportunities which she enjoyed. In addition to her native language, she became mistress of French and Italian, excelled in music and drawing, and attained eminence in the variety of fancy-work, without having neglected the more useful acquisition of plain-work. She was sent for from school to attend the death-bed of her father: he left her, at the age of fifteen, about 800*l.* under the guardianship of Sir Thomas Edwards, of Frodesley. To this little fortune Lord Cholmondely added the life-interest of the leasehold property possessed by her father, estimated at from 60*l.* to 70*l.* per ann. Her guardian died soon after his curate, and his ward continued to reside with Lady Edwards. Some circumstances, which at this distance of time it were useless to detail, separated her from the protection of this family, and she left them, to reside with an old servant and housekeeper of her father. It is unnecessary to give any particulars of the early disappointment of her hopes.—Young, accomplished, in some degree independent, separated from any near connections, and womanly beyond her years, by one imprudent act she plunged herself into embarrassments which ended only with her life. At this period she became acquainted with Mr. Standevens, a young man of three-and-twenty, the hero, at that time, of the Shrewsbury Theatre, and who wore the sock and buskin alternately, with equal and no mean provincial celebrity. They met at a musical party: they were both musical. At sixteen, whilst in mourning for her father, she became a wife—
at seventeen a mother. Her history is

now soon told. Her life is what may be seen in the green-room of every provincial theatre. Her talents were not adapted to the stage; her figure was little, her voice had lost its sweetness, and in particular she could not get the better of a timidity which made her never feel at home upon the stage. She did not rise above very subordinate parts in the theatre; and, during the greater portion of her career, she was an actress, not from choice, but necessity. She dressed her face with smiles, and her person with finery, to enable her to still the clamorous craving, and to clothe the nakedness of six poor children at home. To the wear and tear of the first actor in all parts in a provincial theatre, Mr. Standevens' constitution, originally robust, fell a sacrifice. As his health, and perhaps his theatrical fame and his powers of entertaining decreased, his family increased. A long sickness destroyed his only means of helping his wife and children, and added to their embarrassments. The leasehold property, the gift of Lord Cholmondely, had been disposed of. About two years ago death removed poor Standevens from the contemplation of poverty and suffering, which he could not alleviate. It ought not to be omitted, that when separated from his wife by sickness, whilst she followed, with part of her family, the fortunes of the company, this poor man's letters endeavoured to cheer and support her, and breathed unabated tenderness and affection for her and her children. Mrs. S. endeavoured to retain her station on the stage, humble as it was, but in vain. On the expiration of her engagement, it could not be renewed; her strength was unequal, even to her subordinate parts; the insidious disease to which she fell a victim was gradually undermining a constitution naturally delicate, and her spirit was completely broken. On foot, with her children, in rags and wretchedness, she travelled from Tidswell, in Derbyshire, in search of her husband's parish. About a year ago, whilst on this route, she arrived at Halifax, and entering at night, without any previous intimation, the house of a distant female relation of her husband, threw herself and her children upon her protection. But the circumstances of this relative were entirely unequal to such a call: she had for many years taken care of and edu-

cated the oldest boy, and has continued her kindness to this unfortunate family to the present hour. Mrs. Standevens and her children lived some time in a room in Copper-street, and afterwards about three months in Cross-field. Here they were supported by a small allowance from her husband's parish—by her needle—by her teaching a few scholars—by the kindness of their relation—and by the casual bounty of the charitable. Her disease had now nearly run its course; its last stage was alleviated, and the passage to the grave rendered easier by medical assistance. A few days before her death, she was admitted a home-patient of the Halifax General Dispensary, and was relieved from the fund of the Benevolent Society by the visitor of the district in which she lived. She was perfectly aware of her approaching dissolution. On the evening on which she died, she said to a poor, kind neighbour, "Do not leave me, Martha!" the poor woman knelt beside her (the bed was on the floor), and supported the dying mother in her arms. After having in this situation been a short time engaged in prayer, she looked for her oldest daughter, who was kneeling at the foot of the bed; and, fixing her eyes upon her, serenely breathed her last. Her dying words were, "I bequeath my children to God, and resign myself into his hands!"—She thus commended her orphans to the protection of Him who is the Father of the fatherless; and, trusting to his merciful acceptance, gave back her spirit into the hands of the widow's God. This is a sorrowful tale, but there are some circumstances on which the feelings may dwell with pleasure. The acquirements of her youth she retained to the day of her death. In her accumulated distresses they ministered to her support, and mitigated the sufferings which they could not remove. She was thus enabled to be the instructress of her children.—In the several towns which the company visited she taught drawing and the use of the piano-forte, and made raffles of pictures and fancy-work for the support of her family. Her quickness in plain-work contributed to the same end; and when her work failed, or was finished, she spent her hours in reading. She more than once attempted to establish a school, but the world's prejudice marred her success: "She had been, or

was a player!" and it is no wonder that this laudable purpose failed. Unfortunate woman! one single act of imprudence altered entirely the complexion of her life. What a contrast do the two portions of it present! though in the first fifteen years she felt the *irreparable* loss of a mother, and though her father's death ultimately deprived her of an adviser and of a home, her childhood and youth were spent happily and usefully, in the acquisition of knowledge, and in the society of valuable friends. The last fifteen years present a melancholy and different picture;—but, in circumstances and in society by no means favourable to virtue, her character remained without blemish and without reproach. And surely it is highly gratifying to find, that the religious impressions of her infancy and youth, so far from being effaced by subsequent years spent in a dangerous profession, and marked with a variety of suffering, were recognized during her illness and in her last moments; that they did not forsake her amidst the most squalid wretchedness, or during the most acute sufferings; but enabled her, in circumstances of extreme distress, to die in peace with humble resignation and hope.—Five destitute orphans survive her—two daughters of the ages of twelve and ten, and three boys of the ages of thirteen, four, and two years; the sixth child died five years ago. It is particularly desirable to prevent the *girls* from being sent to the work-house of their parish, to save them from the dangers incident to their sex, to their youth, and to their unprotected situation. To effect this purpose, and to fit them out for service, the contributions of the charitable are solicited. Should any thing remain when this is attained, it will be expended as may seem best, for the advantage of the boys.

Donations, however small, will be received by Dr. THOMSON, King Cross-Lane; Mr. CHRISTOPHER RAWSON, at the New Bank, Halifax; Messrs. JONES, LLOYD, and Co. Lothbury, London; and the EDITOR, at the Printer's.

Halifax,

J. T.

Nov. 2, 1809.

1809, Dec. 8, In London, aged 45 years, Mr. — BOWLES, of Brompton, Kent. He was an honourable member of the Society of General Baptists at

Chatham. He was beloved by his family; and his loss is lamented, not only by his intimate friends, but also by the whole neighbourhood of his residence, in which he was generally known and esteemed. This is a heavy addition to the affliction of his surviving partner in life, who had been recently mourning over the grave of a tenderly-beloved daughter. ELIZABETH BOWLES died after a short illness, Oct. 23, 1809, aged seventeen years. She was of a very amiable disposition, and promised to be a great comfort to her family.

1809, Dec. 10. Aged 64, Mr. THOMAS HAWKES, of Piccadilly, London, army accoutrement maker. He had been indisposed for some time, and it was feared that his disorder might terminate fatally; but he had walked out on Saturday, to call on several of his friends, and did not appear worse than usual. He arose on Sunday morning and united with the family in worship, which was conducted by Dr. Hawker, then on a visit at the house. After making some arrangements for their going to public worship, he retired while breakfast was preparing. A noise was soon heard in the chamber over the room in which the family was sitting down. A servant went up stairs who called Mr. Hawkes; but no answer being given, others followed, who, bursting open the door, found him on the floor. The position in which he lay indicated that he expired either in the act of kneeling down to prayer, or while actually engaged in it; his countenance was undisturbed, and presented a pleasing smile, rather than the effect of pain. Thus quietly was this good man dismissed from a world, in which he had been eminently useful; for as it pleased God to afford him great prosperity in his business, so he gave of his abundance, in a princely, but unostentatious manner. He had long been a generous contributor to many useful and charitable institutions; but his name was often concealed. Only a few days before his death, he presented to the Missionary Society the noble donation of *one thousand pounds*. Mr. Hawkes has left legacies to several religious and charitable institutions, to a very considerable amount.

Evang. Mag.

1809, Dec. 12. After a short illness, JOSEPH LATHAM, of Thorne, in Yorkshire. He was one of the first

persons in that place who received the Unitarian doctrine, and exerted himself for its promotion. Mr. Wright, of Wisbeach, being in Thorne at the time, preached his funeral sermon, on Thursday evening, Dec. 14, the day on which he was interred, to a crowded audience, from 1 Thes. iv. 13, 14.

1809, Dec. 20. In our number for December (vol. IV. p. 694), we briefly noticed the death of Mr. JOSEPH JOHNSON, of St. Paul's Church-yard, a most respectable bookseller, who through a long life sustained the character of an upright, disinterested, liberal, and benevolent man. He was born in the neighbourhood of Liverpool, in November 1738, and had, of course, just entered into his seventy-second year when he died. His parents were dissenters of the Baptist denomination, who probably had inspired him in early life with a love of those principles of free inquiry and independence in matters of faith which characterize those who understand the reasons of their dissent from the established doctrines of the country. He was apprenticed to Mr. George Keith, a bookseller in Gracechurch-street, and did not fail to exercise, in that situation, those qualities which obtain the respect and regard of superiors. During a good part of this time, he was under the guardianship of an elder brother, to which he referred with satisfaction and pleasure to almost the last period of his life, and from him he learnt a prudential regard to the principles of economy: "he always reminded me," said the deceased a few weeks before his death, "whenever I drew upon him, that the more I received during my apprenticeship, the less he should have to pay me when I came of age."

Mr. Johnson began business on Fish-street-hill, from whence he removed to Paternoster-row, and lived some years, in partnership, first with Mr. Davenport and then with Mr. Payne; but in the year 1770, the house, stock, and furniture were all destroyed by fire, and being wholly uninsured, the partnership was dissolved. Mr. Johnson had, however, lived long enough to be well known and highly respected, and on this unfortunate occasion he met with a number of zealous friends, who enabled him to begin life again, in St. Paul's Church-yard, where he carried on his business without a partner till his death. The assistance and kindness

which he experienced at this period of his distress, impressed his mind with sentiments of gratitude, which time could not obliterate. Mr. Johnson now became distinguished as a publisher, and his honourable dealing in this branch of business connected him with some of the most respectable authors of his day, and it scarcely ever happened that Mr. Johnson stood in the place of publisher to persons of literary merit and moral worth, without being at the same time regarded as a confidential friend. Such was eminently the case with regard to Dr. Priestley, who was one of the early distinguished writers connected with Mr. Johnson: and also with respect to the late Rev. Theophilus Lindsey, who came to London about the year 1774. For the former of these Mr. Johnson published every thing he wrote, till he felt himself bound to quit a country which he had honoured by his writings and discoveries, for the sake of that peace and quiet which his latter years required, and which an infuriated mob seemed unwilling to grant him: and during the Doctor's residence in America, Mr. Johnson was his constant and active friend, ready on all occasions to render him and his family any services in his power, in the way of business or of friendship.

When Mr. Lindsey resigned his living at Catterick, he was introduced, probably by Dr. Priestley, to Mr. Johnson, who published, first his "Farewell Address," and then the "Apology," for resigning his vicarage, both these were eagerly bought up by persons who either sympathised with the noble sentiments of the author, or who, estranged from the principles of free inquiry and a regard to religious truth, were curious to know how a man would justify himself in giving up a certain and handsome maintenance, with excellent prospects, at the risk of poverty, and the desertion of his friends. The motives which influenced Mr. Lindsey were duly appreciated by his publisher, who, probably, by this time had not only abandoned the Calvinistic doctrines, in which he had been educated; but, from his great zeal in behalf of Mr. Lindsey, it would seem that he had become an Unitarian in the strict sense of the word.

From the moment Mr. Lindsey left the Church of England on account of

the doctrine of the Trinity, and other tenets equally subversive of the attributes of the true God, he was desirous of officiating for any number of Christians who might feel difficulties and objections similar to those by which he had been embarrassed, and who were willing to make a public avowal of their sentiments respecting the leading doctrines of revealed religion. In forwarding his plan, Mr. Johnson took a most active part: he hired a room in Essex House, well adapted to the purposes of public worship, and fitted it up at his own expence, at least at his own risk (had the scheme failed for want of support); he was active also in procuring subscribers to the minister, most of whom were dissenters, and he undertook the trouble of getting the place licensed by the magistrates. In this he was much thwarted by obstacles thrown in the way of the intended public avowal of Unitarianism. Mr. Johnson would not, however, take an evasive denial, well knowing that the bench of justices at Hicks's Hall could not legally refuse the thing applied for: he repeated his demands again and again, as it appears from some M. S. letters of the late Mr. Lindsey, who mentions the indefatigable zeal of his friend and publisher with applause and gratitude. At length, finding that it was intended, if possible, to baffle their expectations, Mr. Lindsey applied to Mr. Lee, an eminent barrister, and afterwards his Majesty's Attorney General; they all went together to Hicks's Hall, and upon Mr. Lee's representing to the justices that they had no discretionary power, but must by law grant what was asked, they conceded, and the chapel was immediately opened. At this chapel Mr. Johnson constantly attended for many years, till an asthmatic complaint rendered it necessary for him to abstain from the duties of public worship.

We have mentioned but two of the authors connected with Mr. Johnson, but he stood in the place of publisher to many of the most distinguished writers in science and literature for nearly forty years. He was, however, never sanguine, but frequently manifested a seeming indifference to the success of the works which he published, and which he had purchased. He was decidedly averse to all the arts of puffing and parade; the confidence and attack-

ment he inspired were entirely the result of his solid judgment, his unaffected sincerity, and the friendly benevolence with which he entered into the interests of all who were connected with him. Although he was not remarkable for the encouragement he held out to authors—the consequence of his being neither sanguine nor pushing; yet it was his invariable rule, when the success of a work surpassed his expectations, to make the writer a partaker in the emolument, though he lay under no other obligation to do so than his own notions of justice and generosity. The kindness of his heart was equally conspicuous in all the relations of life. His house and purse were always open to the calls of friendship, kindred, or misfortune; and perhaps few men of his means and condition have done more substantial services to persons whose merits and necessities recommended them to his notice.

It is well known that Mr. Johnson's literary connexions have lain in great part among the free inquirers both on religious and political topics. To these he applied for assistance when he established his "Analytical Review," which was first published in 1788, and which, during the ten years of its existence, was unquestionably a principal repository of sentiments most favourable to the cause of liberty, both in politics and religion. For this exertion in favour of free inquiry, he was marked out as a victim by the administration of that important period of our history; an administration that must for ever be execrated by all those who wish well to the interests of mankind. For the unconscious offence of selling a few copies of a pamphlet of which he was not the publisher, and which was a reply to one, of which he had sold a much larger number, the opportunity was taken of involving him in a prosecution that brought upon him the infliction of fine and imprisonment. Mr. Johnson, who was not the publisher, who probably did not know the contents of the pamphlet, was sentenced to nine months confinement in the King's-Bench prison, and to a fine of 50*l.* while the publisher, who might be supposed to know the contents of the work, was, for the same offence of selling, sentenced to a fortnight's imprisonment only. Nevertheless it is understood, by the principles of our constitution, that judges, in

their sentences, as well as juries in their verdicts, know nothing more of any man than is proved in open court. It is gratifying, however, to relate, that during the height of party animosity, so little was he regarded personally as a party man, that he continued to number among his intimate friends, several worthy persons of opposite sentiments and connections, who, with himself, were capable of considering a man's performance of the duties of life apart from his speculative opinions.

Mr. Johnson was superior in a high degree to mercenary views; he frequently re-published works which he considered as conducive to the best interests of man, with no expectation of profit, sometimes with the almost certain prospect of loss. He often purchased manuscripts of worthy and distressed persons, without any intention of printing, but as affording him an opportunity of relieving their necessities in the most handsome way, making them appear, as it were, parties in a contract, rather than dependents on his bounty. His mind was so admirably formed, as scarcely ever to be worn out by importunity; and, perhaps, he rarely refused the solicitations of a needy author without expressing those feelings of sympathy and kindness which rendered him the object of general esteem: "I cannot," said he, "afford you employment, and I am truly grieved that so many worthy characters should be willing and anxious to employ their industry and talents, and yet be without the means of so doing."

Mr. Johnson was of a weak and delicate frame of body, and was much afflicted with asthmatic complaints, which visibly gained ground upon him as he advanced in years. The immediate cause of his dissolution was a pleuritic attack, under which he quietly sunk after three days of patient suffering. His remains were deposited in the church-yard of Fulham, in which parish he had a country house. He was never married. He died on the 20th of December, the same day nominally, that finished the earthly career of Mr. Thomas Frmin, another benevolent citizen of London, whose character has been held in the highest veneration for more than a century. In many respects, there is great similarity between these two excellent men.

Both were descended from respectable, but not affluent parents in distant counties:—both educated in the gloomy tenets of Calvinism;—both sent from the country to be apprenticed in the metropolis:—both, in after-life, abandoned the doctrines infused into their youthful minds by pious, excellent, and well-intentioned parents, and becoming active Unitarians:—both set out in life as tradesmen, and obtained the general respect and affection of all who knew them:—both sustained the loss of their whole property by the ravages of fire: and both equally assisted and protected, beyond their most sanguine hopes by kind and benevolent friends. Firmin, in defiance of the frowns and terrors of a Cromwell, was the open and avowed

friend and benefactor of the honest, persecuted, and exiled Biddle; Johnson, regardless of the terrors of a tyrannical administration, was not less the friend of the injured and persecuted Priestley, the admirer and follower of the illustrious Biddle. They both courted the esteem and friendship of literary men, and of the clergy of different denominations, and were both the patrons of those in that class who stood in need of their assistance. Firmin was, however, one of the most sanguine men that ever lived; and Mr. Johnson, at least in late years, had little of that temperament in him; but the lives of both were a continued display of the virtues inculcated by Christianity. J. J.

MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS;
OR,
The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

The events at home and abroad, which have of late years agitated the see of Rome, must have struck every person, at all acquainted with the politics of Europe. To the true Christian they must be doubly interesting, as connected with those prophecies which assure us of the downfall of the apostate church, and the final victory of the kingdom of Christ over all opposition. On the continent the pope still retains great authority, and in the united kingdom he has many followers. That so few should have come over to the principles of the reformation need not surprise any one who considers, how little real progress was made by that reformation, and how many gross errors were left to vitiate those truths of the gospel, which were expected to shine forth in the utmost purity. It is of little consequence by what name men distinguished themselves, by that of Protestants or of Papists, if they set up an authority paramount to that of our Lord and Saviour, and lay down rules for faith upon their views of scripture, and slander others for not being of their opinion. The lords of the gentiles exercise authority but it shall not be so with my disciples, says our Saviour. Be none of you called master, for one only is your master; and where two or three are

gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of you.

These are awful truths: and let Protestants and Papists equally ask themselves, whether they are obedient to their lord and master or not. Let every one indeed put it to himself, whether he is really a subject of Christ, or a mere nominal Christian, guided by the traditions of men, in the sect in which he happened to be born. We are led to these reflections by the great stir, that has been lately made in part of the kingdom by our catholic brethren, who have had various meetings, and come to very strong resolutions, in which their claims are advanced to a perfect freedom from all civil restraints in matters of conscience; and to the civil power is denied that interference, which seemed in a former application to have been allowed.

The question is of great importance, and we, who profess unbounded toleration to every religious opinion, not interfering with the just laws of the land, should be sorry to advance any thing which should seem to impugn the right of every man or body of men to worship god in the manner, best adapted to their views of religion. But there are limits to this question, which it will not be difficult to mark out. A state may vio-

late the laws of God, and be odious in his sight for its conduct against an individual, and an individual, in the pursuance of a meritorious object, may act in a manner to draw upon himself the just punishments of the state. As an instance of the former, we may quote the case of the persecutors, Roman imperial and Roman popish; and of the latter the case of injudicious men, who in their abhorrence of idolatry have subjected themselves to just punishment, for breaking the idols worshipped by their sovereigns. Our Saviour has drawn the true line, when he says, "render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and to God the things which are God's."

By Cæsar was meant the sovereign existing in our Saviour's time, and it applies to the sovereign of every state, by whatever name he or they may be called. We may render to the civil power, allegiance and duty, in every thing which does not belong to God: but in what belongs to God we are to submit to privations, banishments, death itself, rather than break through our highest obligations. In trying every question by this rule, we shall find, that the sovereign of a state can never have real cause of complaint against Christian subjects, and that they will be in fact his best subjects; for there is nothing in Christianity incompatible with civil government: but men calling themselves Christians, may set up claims, which their religion does not authorise them to make, and governments may usurp a power which is in direct opposition to the precepts of him, whom they call their Lord and Saviour. Both are amenable to his authority, and it behoves them both to repent of their errors, when they are pointed out; and at any rate to receive with Christian charity, Christian admonitions.

We will suppose then, that the claims of our brethren the catholics, were submitted to a committee of real Christians, who of course denied to the legislature the right of making any law contrary to the precepts of our Saviour, and to the subject the right of claiming any privilege from the state on account of any peculiar religious opinions. The catholics then demand to be admitted to all civil rights in common with their protestant brethren, and bring as proofs of the propriety of their claims, that they are willing to give every test of civil allegiance, that can be required: they state also, that they differ from

their brethren in having separate places of worship, and a separate form of discipline. The committee would inquire into the nature of the worship, to see whether it interfered with the laws of the land; and finding that they had no obscene meeting, nor clandestine tumultuous assemblies, that access was always open to the civil magistrate to their places of worship, they would not scruple to allow them, as far as worship was concerned, all civil rights. But proceeding in their inquiry, they find a certain form of discipline subsisting among them, and that the affairs of the community are regulated by officers not appointed by themselves but by a foreigner. This will naturally excite farther investigation, and they find that this foreigner is the subject of another power, and that power is openly at war with their own country. The catholics in reply, observe that they correspond with the subject of the enemy only upon religious matters, and an intercourse is absolutely necessary for the preservation of their religion. May not the committee justly determine: the legislature of every country has a right to prohibit its subjects from all intercourse with the enemy. The Christian religion offers no grounds whatever for encroaching upon this right. We shall grant to you all civil rights; but, the right of corresponding with the enemy is not a civil one, and there is no reason for granting you a privilege above your fellow subjects. This seems to us a convincing argument, built upon true Christian principles; and shewing that popery is incompatible with Christianity.

It might be said then, that popery cannot be tolerated. Such a conduct does not become Christians, nor is it authorized by the experience of the past. The popish was at one time the universal religion; the Protestants are dissenters from it; and still form only the minority in the Christian world. Though the Papists cannot demand as a right the correspondence with the pretended head of the church, whilst he is an enemy to this country; yet we know that licences are granted continually to subjects for the sake of trade, or other causes, to correspond with the enemy, and what is granted for trade, might be allowed for religion. Of course, the person permitted to be sent to the pope, must state his business to the government, his route, and his time of stay. We

cannot apprehend the least danger to a country where this is the case; and, if the Pope should send foreigners into the kingdom, their dismissal is provided for by the alien act.

But a plan was devised last year for the accommodation, or it might rather be called the establishment of the Popish religion; that the government of its religious concerns should remain on its present footing, except that the king should have a veto on the persons presented to the Pope for his choice in the election of a bishop. This concession on the part of the catholics is with great clamour drawn back; and they seem to be very fearful of granting, what a Protestant king most assuredly ought to refuse to accept. The Dissenters are a large body in this kingdom, but the king does not interfere in the choice of their ministers. Where ministers are paid by the state, and form a corporation in the state, and are held together by articles of faith framed by the state, it is right that their appointments in every respect should depend on the state. They are state officers, appointed to perform certain devotional, just as officers of the navy and army, military, services. But the union of a Protestant king with a Pope, in the forming of a bishop, seems to be such an inconsistency as could not be desired, but with a view to some base political purposes. The Protestants are justified in refusing to sully their crown with such a prerogative; the catholics seem to have little reason to be indignant about it. The question, however, of the emancipation of the catholics, from the degrading tenure under which, in common with other Dissenters, they have been held by their Protestant brethren of the Church of England, a church, which does not contain a third part of the population of the two islands, nor a fifth part of the population of the empire, is again to be tried in parliament. We are fully convinced, that the true way of converting the Papists to protestantism is to grant them the whole of their requests. The Protestants have behaved to them in a manner unworthy of the Christian religion. It is time to revert to the precepts of their common Saviour, to love one another, instead of hating, persecuting, reviling each other, and proving to the world, that whatever they may call themselves, they are far from having embraced the spirit of

the gospel. Common prudence also points out the true line of conduct. The English and Irish papists are the most bigoted part of the Romish church, for obvious reasons. Jupiter, in the fable, could not make the countryman cast off his coat by storms of wind and rain; but he gladly threw it aside when he was favoured by the genial rays of the sun, and fine weather.

Whilst the papists of these islands seem so zealous for their head, his followers in another great kingdom seem likely to be emancipated from his yoke by a very different course of affairs. Spain was a rich mine to the Romish see; the wealth bestowed on its ministers in that country was immense. Apparently also the people was devoted to his cause; for the terrors of the Inquisition crushed the spirit of inquiry, and all were at least outwardly Christians and Papists. Such an infamous subjection of the human mind to the galling yoke of popery was infinitely worse than any thing the Papists have suffered in these islands from Protestants; but the conduct of Spain cannot be brought as an argument of the general spirit of popery; for in no other country were such severe and oppressive measures pursued. However, the wickedness of the Inquisition, and the galling yoke of priestcraft seem now to be nearly at an end. That arm which has declared that the Pope shall be subject to the civil power, seems to have nearly accomplished its purpose.

Spain has been distracted by two powers, the Gallo-spanish king and its Junta. The measures of the former were plain and decisive, tending to one end, the subjection of the whole kingdom; those of the latter were confused, indecisive, inadequate to the cause, in which they were engaged. They wished to preserve the kingdom from the common enemy, yet they knew not how to unite the people in one common cause. The kingdom had been miserably governed; yet for a long time they held out no hopes of a better disposition of affairs; and, when they summoned a Cortez, it seemed to be the last effort of despair, rather than a wish to form a rational and popular constitution. It is no wonder then, that they gradually lost the confidence of the people; that they broke up in confusion from Seville; that they fled in various directions, and that some of them went over to the enemy, and others were imprisoned.

When we consider the length of time that the enemy has been in the country, and the little that has been done by the Junta in its defence, we are lost in amazement at the apparent infatuation of its conduct; but we are far from the seat of action, and know not all the secret springs by which it was guided. It is sufficient to observe, that they have fled from Seville, whose inhabitants formed a new Junta of their own; but the enemy was employed in a very different manner, and directing his powerful resources to higher purposes.

Between Madrid and Seville is a range of lofty mountains, forming a natural barrier for Andalusia. As long as the French were to the north of these mountains the Junta of Seville slept in security, and enjoyed in tranquillity its fancied dominion over the southern part of Spain. The passes in these mountains were guarded by its soldiers; and they were deemed to be so well fortified, that no apprehension was entertained of an attack, and much less that the attack should be successful. The Gallo-spanish king seemed to be at rest in his capital of Madrid, expecting reinforcements from France, and the appearance of his imperial brother to give stability to his throne. The escape of the English out of Spain after the battle of Talavera, and some victories over the Spaniards seemed to have contented him. He was under no dread of the return of the former, whom he left to enjoy a little respite in Portugal; and as to the latter they had no plan of attack, and he was under no concern lest they should interrupt his measures. But the French are not an idle, dilatory people. They were at the time meditating a great attack, and, it is probable, that as the fresh troops entered Spain, the advanced bodies marched into the interior, and gave the king a formidable army near his capital.

The time was now come for his attack upon the south of Spain. By one of those plans, which have distinguished the operations of the French in their late wars, they made at the same time their attacks on every pass in the mountains. These formidable barriers, these insurmountable obstacles, these well-guarded ramparts, are every where carried. The Spanish troops are put to the rout, and flee away in the utmost disorder. The French advance into the plains of Andalusia, spreading terror in

every direction. Resistance is in vain and in fact there is no where an armed force to meet them in the field. A large body of the Spaniards have retreated to Cadiz, and the last hopes of Spain are in the defence of that city. The French have probably by this time invested it, and from the Pyrenees to this city, the direct road is filled with troops, prepared to repress any insurrection that may take place. The Spaniards, without any Junta, without any commanding head, are left to their own resources, and it is scarcely credible that they should be able in any of their provinces to bring a regular army into the field to meet their opponents.

Cadiz is capable of sustaining a long siege. Open to the sea it is in no danger of being compelled by famine to a surrender. A large body of troops is within its walls, and its population is numerous. The Spanish navy, which was in the harbour, is placed in security. The works are every where put into a state of defence; the people are roused to energy, and every thing portends a vigorous resistance. But the enemy is also vigorous, well acquainted with all the resources of war, and having now a fertile country at his command, and being ardent with the hopes of speedily overcoming this last obstacle to his desires. The circumstance of the sea being open to the escape of the inhabitants is beneficial to him. He may hope that many will avail themselves of this advantage, and carry with them their fortune to the shores of America. Besides, an usurper so far successful will find those, who are in possession of landed property, anxious, in the approaching settlements of the state, to retain some share of their former fortunes; and whilst allurements and terrors are held out with no sparing hand, it is not improbable that they will meet with a considerable degree of success, and infuse jealousy and fears among the defenders of the place. With the fall of this city all expectation of retrieving the affairs of Spain may be given up, and the new kingdom will be placed under a constitution, which probably will be far more favourable to the civil, and assuredly infinitely more beneficial to the religious rights of its inhabitants, than they ever did enjoy, or could expect to enjoy under the prejudices of a Bourbon, and the abominable tyranny of its priests, and monks, and inquisitions

On the latter subject it is some consolation to observe, that in one instance the Spaniards have redeemed their character. The Inquisition at Valladolid was on fire; the inhabitants, so far from endeavouring to extinguish the flame, rejoiced at the destruction of the abominable building, and its horrible engines of torture. We cannot wish that the same destruction should take place in every city, in which the wicked instruments of priestcraft have been used; but we trust, that to the universal satisfaction of the country they will be converted to honest purposes, to the reception of useful manufactures.

Portugal is still free, and will probably rejoice at the idea of thirty thousand of its troops being taken into our service. As to their use in defending the country, time will discover their efficacy. The sea is open for their retreat to England, or the Brazils; but, when the French have conquered Spain, it is not to be expected, that thirty, or forty thousand Portuguese, with as many English, will be capable of making a very great resistance. We do not know what is the state of their present government, or what advantages are held out to the natives to fight for the present system, in preference to subjection to the French; but, if the prejudices of the old government are persisted in, if their priestcraft, and monkery, and Inquisition, remain in their ancient force, we may prognosticate very little energy in defence of the country.

Buonaparte is not yet married. He has been employed in Paris in making arrangements for his troops, in sending numbers to Spain, and in completing his Napoleon code. The system of laws which he is establishing, will have the merit of driving out and making superfluous an immense quantity of folios on their ancient laws, whose commentaries were full as difficult to be understood as the text. All his great works are going on, and among them the uniting of part of Holland to his empire, by which the Scheldt will be entirely within his dominions, and he will possess a naval arsenal, whence he may proceed to sea with as many ships as he pleases to build and can man, to encounter our fleets in the North Seas and the Downs. Let us hope that the destructive spirit of warfare may not last for ever; that nations which from their proximity are formed to assist each other, may forget the bar-

barous language of being natural enemies; that they may consider to how great an advantage human industry might be applied, when it has for its object the happiness not the destruction of mankind.

The affairs of Holland are not completely settled, and it is not known whether the whole or only a part will be enveloped in the French territories; and the king of this unhappy country is at Paris not knowing by what title he may be hereafter called. Sweden is tranquillizing very fast: the heir acknowledged of the crown has made his entry into Stockholm, and the ancient league between France and that country is restored. Russia feels the effects of its new alliances by an improvement in several of its courts, and despotism is learning, that by giving up some barbarous tenures, and modifying others, it may rule with greater advantage. Turkey does not push forward its victories: and Austria feels that its population is completely downcast and dispirited by the miserable system to which it has for so long a time been subjected.

In America commotions have broken out, as might be expected in the Spanish part; but to what extent from this distance it is not easy to ascertain. The separation of Spain from their supposed beloved Ferdinand will drive them to independence. We regret to add, that Jamaica has renewed its discontents, and the governor has dismissed the Assembly with asperity. The grounds of the disputes will probably be laid before parliament. The United States have had warm debates in their legislature on the affairs of England, but it is to be hoped that they will end without a rupture between the two countries. The news from India is very satisfactory, and gives reason to expect a better management in military affairs.

In the House of Commons, as was to be expected from the appearances of last month and the state of things, the minister has been repeatedly in a minority, but the chief subject of public curiosity has been the inquiry into the calamities at Walcheren, and the plan and execution of that melancholy expedition. This has been carried on with doors shut, upon the motion made every night to this purpose by Mr. Yorke, whose conduct was upon this occasion made the subject of debate at a forum of discussion, and the paper announcing it was

by him brought before the house as a breach of privilege. In consequence both printer and author were brought to the bar of the House of Commons: the former, after a confinement of about twenty-four hours, was dismissed without paying his fees, the latter, who confessed the writing and threw himself upon the mercy of the house, was sent to Newgate. The inquiry has extended as yet no farther than the examination of the principal officers, naval, military and medical, and the production of various important papers, among which the most remarkable is the relation of the expedition delivered by Lord Chatham to the king. A more direct contradiction to the king's speech to the city of London could not have been drawn up. The king is made to say that no inquiry is necessary into the conduct of officers either of the navy or army: Lord Chatham has so arraigned the conduct of the admiral, that if he speaks truth an inquiry is absolutely indispensable. The evidence delivered at the bar is printed for the use of the members, and by the daily papers is distributed over the whole kingdom. The

medical department has afforded peculiar objects of animadversion, and will no doubt occasion considerable alterations in the nature of that service. The questions to be decided upon are of the greatest importance. The first will naturally be on the plan of the expedition, which falls totally to the share of the ministry; its conduct to the embarkation of the fleet will also be theirs, but the two duellists will soon cease to have any concern in it. On the execution the blame will be to be fixed on the commanders of the navy or army or both, and this probably cannot be determined but by courts martial. On the stay of the troops in Walcheren, and subsequent evacuation of the island, the ministers must again be arraigned, and where the guilt will fall time must determine. Enough has appeared to afford the highest possible triumph to our enemy, of which the *Moniteur* will not fail to avail itself. Whatever may be done at home Europe in some degree is the spectator and judge, and the page of history will record the melancholy effects of wavering councils.

INTELLIGENCE.

OPENING OF THE UNITARIAN CHAPEL, AT YEOVIL.

On Wednesday, Nov. 8. 1809, a new chapel was opened at Yeovil, Somersetshire, sacred to the worship of the One only true God, the Father. The Rev. Samuel Fawcett, minister. A sermon was preached in the morning by the Rev. E. Butcher of Sidmouth, from John iv. 23, 24, in which he gave a very judicious and impressive view of Chris-

tian worship. In the evening, the Rev. T. Howe, of Bridport, preached an excellent discourse on the glorious character of the gospel, from 1 Tim. i. 11. The house, which is plainly neat and commodious, was well filled; and most of the pews are taken by persons who have not been in the habit of attending Dissenting or Unitarian worship.

ACCOUNT OF THE QUARTERLY MEETING OF PRESBYTERIAN MINISTERS, &c. AT MANCHESTER, DEC. 27, 1809.

Divine service was performed in the morning at the chapel of the Rev. Wm. Hawkes in Moseley street. The Rev. Mr. Rudd introduced the service, and the Rev. Mr. Smith preached a much approved sermon, *on zeal*, from Gal. iv. 18.

The Rev. Mr. Davies of Chewbent

was chosen to be Mr. Rudd's supporter at the next meeting at Bolton.

The meeting then adjourned, to the White Bear Inn; where fourteen ministers, and about thirty lay gentlemen dined together.

After dinner some conversation took place concerning the expense of educa-

tion for the ministry at the York Institution, from which it appeared that the liberality of the present plan does not admit of a less expense than fifty guineas a year.

Before the gentlemen who attended the meeting separated, the Rev. Mr. Rudd, deeming the opportunity too favourable to be neglected, proposed the forming of a religious tract society. The proposal at first met with some opposition from the apprehension that it was meant to be identified with the *Presbyterian Quarterly Meeting of Ministers*, and that it was intended as a vehicle for Unitarian sentiments exclusively.

But it being fully explained and understood, that the tract society was meant to be conducted on the same liberal and general principles as the quarterly meeting, and to stand wholly distinct from it, (as indeed it necessarily must) the plan met with general approbation; and a committee was chosen to carry it into effect.

Divine service was likewise performed in the evening. The Rev. James Hawkes introduced the service with prayer, and the Rev. Mr. Higginson preached a very excellent sermon from Eccles. xi. 1, 6.

Manchester,
Jan. 15. 1810.

W. J.

A COMPLETE LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS ON MORALS AND THEOLOGY, IN FEBRUARY, 1810.

I. *Select List.*

Sermons on Devotional, Evangelical, and Practical Subjects. By Joshua Toulmin, D. D. 8vo. 9s.

A Manual of Morning and Evening Prayers. By the same. Second edition, corrected.

An Address, delivered Sunday, November 26, 1809, at Worship-street, Finsbury-square, upon the Interment of Stephen Lowdell, Esq. By John Evans, A. M. 1s.

2. *Publications relating to the Jubilee, October, 25, 1809.*

(Continued from p. 46.)

An Historical Chart of the Reign of his present Majesty George III. from his Accession to the Jubilee Year. By W. Ticken. 10s. 6d. or mounted on rollers, 14s.

Jubilee Sermons.

A Sermon, preached in the Parish Church of Trowbridge, Wiltshire. By Walter Birch, B. D. Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. 1s.

Jubilium Regis; a Discourse on the Objects and Consequences of the Present Royal Jubilee, preached at Diss, October 25, 1809. By W. Ward, M. A. 6d.

The Crown of Pure Gold and Patriotism our surest Bulwark; being the Substance of two Discourses delivered in the Parish Church of All Saints, Maidstone. By R. Finch, A. M. 2s. 6d.

3. *Sermons in Volumes.*

Sermons on Select Subjects, by C. Buck. 12mo. 4s.

4. *Single Sermons.*

The Cure of the Blind Man near Bethesda, proved to have been Miraculous by Internal Evidence, deduced from the peculiar Manner in which that wonderful Event is described in the Gospel, By the Rev. James Drought, D. D. formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. 8vo.

5. *Controversy.*

Candour and Consistency United; or Considerations on some Important Duties connected with the Belief of Evangelical Truth. 12mo. 3s.

A Letter to Sir John Nicholl, on his Decision against a Clergyman, for refusing to Bury the Child of a Dissenter. With a Preface, addressed to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church. 2s.

A few Words on the Increase of Methodism, occasioned by the "Hints of a Barrister, and the Observations of the Edinburgh Review." 1s.

Fresh Cautions to the Public; or a Letter to the Rev. Edward Pearson, D. D. in Reply to his Cautions to the Readers of Mr. Simeon's Sermon. From the Rev. C. Simeon, M. A. 1s.

A Letter from Lord Grenville to the Earl of Fingal on the Catholic Question. 1s.

An Answer to Lord Grenville's Letter to the Earl of Fingal, on the Subject of the Veto. By a Fingalian. 1s. 6d.

6. *Biography.*

Memoirs of the Life and Writings of John Calvin, with an Appendix, containing Biographical Sketches of the Re-

formation. By J. Makenzie. 8vo. Portrait, 9s.

The Narrative of the Rev. Jos. Samuel Frey, C. F. Minister of the Gospel to the Jews. Including all the circumstances which led to his separation from the Missionary Society, and his union with the London Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews. Portrait, 7s.

7. Poetry.

Philemon, or, the Progress of Virtue, a Poem. By William Lawrence Brown, D.D. Principal of Marischal College and University, Aberdeen, &c.

John the Baptist; a Prize Poem, recited in the Theatre, Oxford, in the year 1809. 8vo. 1s.

The Conquest of Canaan; a Seatonian Prize Poem. By George Pryme, Esq. M.A. Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

8. Miscellaneous.

An Essay on Public Worship, which gained the Norrisian medal in 1808. By G. C. Gorham, B.A. of Queen's College, Cambridge. 2s. 6d. stitched.

The Hindu Pantheon. Illustrated by one hundred and five Plates, containing considerably more than a Thousand mythological Figures and Subjects, all taken from original Images, Pictures, Excubations; Colossal, and other Statues, Obelisks, Coins, Medals, &c. never before engraved. By Edward Moor, F.R.S. Member of the Asiatic Society of Calcutta, and of the Literary Society of Bombay. One large volume, royal 4to. 5l. 5s.

The Fasts and Festivals of the Church of England, abridged from Nelson, interspersed with Dialogues for Youth. By Elizabeth Belson. 8vo. 7s.

On the Education of the Poor; being

the First Part of a Digest of the Reports of the Society for Bettering the condition of the Poor. 8vo. 5s.

Strictures on Clerical Education in the University of Cambridge. By W. Cockburn. 3s.

Way to Ruin, or History of a Young Farmer. 6d.

Sacred Geography; a Companion to the Holy Bible; being a Geographical and Historical account of Places mentioned in Scripture. Originally composed by Dr. Wells, with new Geographical Excursions; incidental Illustrations of Manners, &c. By the Editor of Calmet's Dictionary, with 44 plates. 4to. 6 Parts, 5s. each.

The Fulfilment of Revelation; or Prophetic History of the Declension and Restoration of the Christian Church. By William Ward A. M. 4s.

9. New Editions.

The East Cheap Lectures; containing twenty four practical Discourses. By Benj. Grosvenor, D.D. Thomas Bradbury, Jabez Earl, D.D. William Harris, D.D. John Newman, and Thomas Reynolds. 2 vols. 12mo. 9s.

Observations on the Plagues of Egypt. By Jacob Bryant, Esq. 8vo. 9s.

Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson, Governor of Nottingham Castle and Town, &c. Written by his Widow. 3d Edition, in 2 vols. 8vo. with Portraits and other Engravings. 1l. 1s.

Observations on Man. By David Hartley, M. D. to which are now first added, Prayers and Religious Meditations; with a Sketch of the Life and Character, and a Portrait of the Author. 5th edition, 2 vols. demy 8vo. 1l. 10s. Super-royal 8vo. 2l. 2s.

CORRESPONDENCE.

The following sums have been received this month:—
For the Rev. F. Stone,

	l.	s.	d.
M. H.	5	0	0
Mr. James Conway, of Bingham's, near Bridport.	5	0	0
A Friend to Free Inquiry, by Mr. Colfox, of Bridport.	5	5	0

15 5 0

For the Rev. J. Gisburne's Meeting-House, Soham, Cambridgeshire,

Mr. H. 5 0 0

Received also communications from M. H. A. H. and M. A. P. for the
CHRISTIAN TRACT SOCIETY.

The following communications are intended for publication, viz. E. M. on the Review of Mr. Evanson's New Testament.—Mrs. Cappe on Mr. Cappe's Principles of Scriptural Interpretation.—Also, from the same, a Paper by the late Rev. N. Cappe, on Christ's coming from Heaven, &c.—Mr. Marsom on the rendering of "Hades" in the Improved Version.—Reply to a Letter sent to an Unitarian Minister.—Mr. Ashdowne's Remarks for the consideration of Mr. Allchin.—Independence, a Poem, by Mr. George Dyer.—A Farmer's answer to the Inquiries on Gen. i. 26.—Theologus, on Acts xi. 31.—Mr. Woodham's Remarks on Mr. Parkes's Opinion of the Nature of Mind.

We have received a "Sketch of the Life of Servetus, in a Series of Letters to the Rev. Jedidiah Morse, D. D." drawn up by a learned Unitarian in America, which, notwithstanding the notoriety of the subject, we intend to insert, on account of the great mass of information which they contain, derived from sources unknown or inaccessible to even the literati in this country. The author is thoroughly conversant with the whole range of German literature, and has brought together a most interesting collection of facts and proofs, for the instruction of the English reader, from rare authors of high credit.

In our next shall appear B's Letter to the Editor of the Evangelical Magazine, on the Obituary in that work of A. G. Esq. of Sheffield. We had before received a Letter from *Philanthropos*, on the same subject, which we should have willingly inserted, especially as the writer is a Calvinist, had not its inconvenient length prevented us.

A letter has been sent us for insertion, signed by twenty-eight members of the Unitarian Congregation of Mansfield, Notts. In refutation of some reports abroad concerning the Rev. Mr. Bull, their minister. It is not within our plan to admit of any personal dispute, which it is obvious this would immediately become; but we are happy in the opportunity of declaring, that the letter bearing such respectable authority, contains the most unreserved attestations to Mr. Bull's acceptableness and usefulness. We should not have said so much on such a painful subject, if the congregation at Mansfield were not at this time appealing to the liberality of their brethren throughout the country for assistance, in placing their meeting-house in a state of repair; and if their applications were not likely to be rendered ineffectual by the rumours which it is the design of the letter to repress. The letter shall be left with the printer, for the inspection of any that may wish to see it previous to their contributing to the help of the writers, in the cause of religion. With this notice, the subject, as far as regards our work, must finally drop.

Olivia's Birth-day Retrospection is too faulty in the construction of the rhyme, to appear with advantage in our poetical department. For the other favours which accompany it, the fair writer will accept of the editor's thanks.

X. Y. is informed that it is deemed inexpedient to revive the controversy with *Charicle*, on the ascension of Christ, in the present volume.

Mr. Thomas Walker, Portrait Painter and Drawing Master, Hull, wishes us to inform our readers, that he proposes to publish *A Treatise on the ART OF FLYING, by Mechanical Means alone*, in 8vo. price 3s. 6d. Such as wish to attain a knowledge of that useful art, are requested by Mr. W. to give in their names to any one of the principal booksellers in Hull.

ERRATUM.

M. R. Vol. iv. No. for December, p. 658, col 2, l. 5. for "Kage Street," read *Kaye Street*.