

THE  
**MONTHLY REPOSITORY**  
OF  
*Theology and General Literature.*

No. XCIV.

OCTOBER.

[Vol. VIII.]

**HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.**

*Historical Account of the Warrington Academy.*

(Continued from p. 579.)

On Dr. Aikin's death, the Rev. Nicholas Clayton, of Liverpool, became his successor as Tutor in Theology. This excellent person can scarcely be considered as connected with the Warrington Academy, for though he had at intervals been invited to each of the three professional chairs, the institution was almost past recovery before he, unfortunately for himself, submitted to be nominated Divinity Tutor. If not, however, on account of the Institution, yet surely on his own account, it is desirable to preserve such frail memorials as can now be collected of his highly estimable character.

Nicholas Clayton was the youngest of the three sons of Samuel Clayton, Esq. of Enfield Old Park, in the county of Middlesex, where he was born, probably about the year 1733.\* He received the earlier part of his education, while quite a child, with Mr. Wood of St. Albans,

and afterwards with Mr. Hawtyre of Chelmsford. At this latter place the Rev. Mr. Heckford, the dissenting minister, who was a great mathematician, took great notice of him, and probably laid the foundation of that taste for mathematical studies which he afterwards successfully cultivated under Professor Simpson and in company with George Walker at Glasgow. From Chelmsford he was entered as a Student at Northampton, and on Dr. Doddridge's death was, it is believed, for some time at Daventry, after which he joined his former fellow-student, Mr. Cappe, at Glasgow, where he also became intimate with Mr. Walker, and the late professor John Millar; whom the present writer has heard speak with great delight of these three associates of his early studies.

Where he settled immediately on his return from Glasgow, has not been discovered; but three or four years at least before he went to Liverpool, he was a minister at Boston in Lincolnshire, in connection with the same congregation which Dr. Kippis had left in 1750. He was invited thence, in the year 1763, to the newly-built Octagon at Liverpool, as the first minister of that,

\* A sister of his married the Rev. Timothy Laughner, a respectable minister at Hackney, whom Dr. Price succeeded in 1769. Dr. Kippis preached his funeral sermon from Prov. x. 7.

ultimately unsuccessful, attempt to introduce a liturgy among Protestant Dissenters. He preached the first sermon there on the fifth of June in that year.

It may, however, be questioned, whether this be an accurate representation of the design of that establishment; which, it is believed, may be more correctly stated to have originated in the desire of some liberal Dissenters (who had not, on the one hand, any particular dissatisfaction with the mode of worship observed by their own ministers, or, on the other, the objections entertained by their forefathers to a form of public prayer, provided that it were not imposed), to give the many members of the established church whom they daily heard complain of the Book of Common Prayer, but who yet disliked the Dissenters' mode of extemporary prayer, an opportunity of joining in the use of a liturgy that should be free from all objection. This was at least one great object of the scheme of the Liverpool Liturgy,\* and of the building of the

---

\* In the composition of this Liturgy, it is thought by Mr. Nicholson to be not exactly true, as stated under the Article Godwin (No. 36 of Dr. Rotheram's puils) [M. Rep. v. 428,] that he, Mr. Seddon and Mr. Holland each composed one service, and sent it for correction to the others; but that Mr. Godwin had the least share in the original composition, Seddon the most in the first and second, and Holland in the third. Partial transfers, however, were made, to accommodate the length for the occasion, and for some other reasons, in which it is believed some of them did not entirely concur with the rest. Mr. Nicholson has a sketch-copy (dated 1762), with an advertisement, stating that it is printed "for the learned and ingenious gentlemen for whom it is particularly intended,"

Octagon Chapel, but the experience of nearly thirteen years having proved, that few of these malcontents within the pale of the Establishment had any inclination to support the improved scheme of public worship, unless it had proceeded from authority, and that the majority were in fact more attached to the church, corrupt as they acknowledged it, than to unpopular Christian truth, the few original projectors who were left, after their numbers had been reduced by deaths and removals (but not by desertions) feeling themselves no longer under any particular obligations to support the expence of this additional place of worship, determined to discontinue the use of the Liturgy, and sold their chapel to a clergyman of the established church, who is said to have been complimented by Bishop Porteus, (then of Chester) to whom he applied for a bishop's license (for it was never consecrated) on his having diminished the number of conventicles.†—The sermon with which Mr. Clayton concluded the dissenting services at the Octagon, on the 25th Feb. 1776 was published. From John iv. 19—23, he took occasion to ex-

---

(probably the above three ministers, and such friends as they might choose to circulate it among) "requesting their correction as to general structure, sentiments or language.

† If it be really true that the bishop did thus congratulate Mr. Plumbe, his lordship must have been unacquainted with the proper legal meaning of the term "conventicle," which in 35 Eliz. c. 1., and 22 Car. ii. c. 1. is expressly defined an unlawful assembly. A place regularly registered for public worship, according to the terms of the 1 W. and M. c. 18, is a *lawful assembly*, and therefore *not* a conventicle.

plain the views with which the Liverpool Liturgy was originally composed, and the reasons for laying it aside: "that it was not projected by the dissatisfied among the Dissenters with their old forms, but by disinterested charity for the wants of dissatisfied members of the Establishment. These persons, however, not coming forward as was expected, the undertaking was laid aside. Its original projectors, not finding their disinterested attempt successful, were not disposed to give up the substance for the shadow."\*

Those who had been originally Dissenters went, with their minister, to the chapel in Benn's Garden, from which they had, mostly, separated. With the worthy minister of that chapel, the Rev. Robert Lewin, Mr. Clayton continued to be the colleague till his removal to Warrington, in the spring of 1781.—Those few who had been churchmen continued at the Octagon.

It had always been Mr. Clayton's custom, both before and after his engagement at the Octagon, very carefully to pre-compose his public devotional services. Such a practice was at all times suited to his own humility, and to his profound veneration for the perfections of the Deity. These services, as well as his more private family devotions, were certainly entitled to rank among the most perfect models of that diffi-

cult species of composition: and a more acceptable present could scarcely be offered to the public, than such a judicious selection of his sermons and prayers, as his worthy brother-in-law, their present possessor, would have it in his power to make. Nor can the writer of these notes perceive that it would be any violation of fraternal confidence, or offence against the unobtrusive modesty which characterized their author; who did not abstain from appearing before the public through any jealousy of his productions coming abroad, but was always ready, with true benevolence, to communicate his manuscripts to his friends, particularly his young friends, who wished to peruse them.†

Of his sermons, few persons have ever heard him preach without being struck with the excellence of the composition, and the originality and importance of the sentiments. It was a common

---

† A particular instance of this is recollected. When, in the year 1779, on an occasional visit to Warrington, he had preached an excellent sermon on the danger of being influenced by the judgment of the world from 1 Cor. iv. 3, 4. some of the students had meditated a request to be allowed to print it; when, hearing of their intention from Dr. Enfield, whom they had consulted on the subject, he sent them the manuscript with the following note; "Mr. C. desires to express his best thanks to those young gentlemen who had the goodness to hear his sermon with attention, and to judge of it with candour.—The sermon itself is at their service, if they think it worth the perusal. But as he has no reason to expect the same indulgence from the world, he trusts that upon reading it over, they will see sufficient reason for his declining a request, which it would give him pain to refuse."

---

\* Some very ill-tempered remarks on this sermon having appeared in the review of it in the Gentleman's Magazine for 1776, were replied to with considerable shrewdness by the Rev. John Palmer, then of Macclesfield, afterwards of Birmingham, in p. 450 of the same volume.

remark of Dr. Aikin's, that he never heard a sermon from Mr. Clayton, that was not fit to be immediately sent to the press.

The same originality characterized his conversation. The present writer has heard his uncle, Mr. Philip Holland, say, that he never was in Mr. Clayton's company without hearing either something entirely new, or something placed in an entirely new point of light.

Out of the line of his proper profession, he was particularly eminent in mathematics and natural philosophy. His services in this department at second-hand have already been noticed, p. 430; but he was also, more directly, a great benefactor to the academy. He was not merely a theoretical, but a practical mechanic; he was an excellent workman, both with the lathe, and in cabinet-work. Some of the most accurate and highly finished articles in the Warrington apparatus (long since lost in the wreck of Hackney College) were invented and finished by him, during his residence at Liverpool, for the use of his friend Dr. Enfield. An apparatus for demonstrating the laws of the composition and resolution of forces, another for the phænomena of the collision of elastic and non-elastic bodies, and a pair of whirling tables, the comparative velocities of each of which might be accurately adjusted according to a variety of rates, are recollected as particularly curious.

Of the manner in which he conducted his lectures, or of the subjects treated of in them, during the short period in which he held the theological chair, the present writer has no means of

conveying to the public any accurate information. He thinks it probable, that, as there was at that time only one student in divinity, and he not in an advanced period of his course, his instructions to him might be conveyed chiefly in the way of familiar conversation, on the books which he might direct him to read, and in lectures on the scriptures, particularly on the New Testament. Whether any other students enjoyed the advantages of his instructions, he knows not.

In the spring of 1782, probably at the suggestion of Dr. Percival, who had before procured this honorary distinction for others of the tutors at Warrington, (see the life of Dr. Priestley) he received the diploma of Doctor in Divinity from the University of Edinburgh. The present writer happens to know, that the same compliment was, at the same time, preparing for him, by his proper Alma Mater, at the suggestion of his friends Dr. Wright and Mr. Millar of Glasgow.

On the dissolution of the Academy, in 1783, Dr. Clayton retired, with broken spirits and shattered health, among his former friends at Liverpool, from whose kind attentions he received such undoubted proofs of affection and strong attachment as greatly contributed to lessen the blow of an event by himself quite unforeseen; and though its remembrance could scarcely fail to embitter, as he himself says, in a letter now before the present writer, the future happiness of his life; yet these attentions had a great effect in restoring his tranquillity. In 1784 he received an invitation, first to Norwich, which



he declined; but afterwards, probably in 1785, complied with a similar invitation from Nottingham, to become the colleague of his quondam fellow-student Mr. Walker. The religious sentiments and literary pursuits of these two eminent men were, in many respects, congenial, but scarcely any thing could be more dissimilar (to be both, in their respective ways, good), than their mode of conducting the public services, both as to prayer and preaching. During his residence at Nottingham, he was prevailed upon by his neighbouring brethren to print, but not to publish, an excellent discourse on prayer, preached at a meeting of ministers at Alfreton, in Derbyshire, in Aug. 1786. From 1 Thess. v. 25. (*Brethren pray for us*), he shews the great importance of a hearty union between ministers and people—that prayer is a natural consequence of affectionate good wishes, and a means of promoting them—prayer, that the great ends of the Christian ministry be answered in the real improvement of men's hearts in piety and charity, whatever becomes of the particular interests of any particular party; “uniting the love of truth with the superior love of virtue:” 2. The propriety of ministers praying for one another. They meet to enquire how they may best promote the good of men and of each other. “Let others aim to make men think alike, let us endeavour to make them act virtuously.” “Generally speaking, the greatest candour, the greatest tenderness and the greatest generosity, are to be found in men of the best understanding and the most extensive knowledge.”

It appears from the information of a gentleman who was a member of the congregation at Nottingham during Dr. Clayton's residence there, that he was very assiduous in discovering, and secretly relieving, to a great extent, considering his means, objects of peculiar distress among the poor of that town; especially those, whose unobtrusive modesty particularly recommended them to his own congenial disposition. It was probable that this had also been his practice in former situations.

While resident in Liverpool, he had married, in 1765, Dorothy, the eldest daughter of Mr. James Nicholson, and sister to the present Mr. Matthew Nicholson of Liverpool; an excellent and amiable woman, but of very delicate health. She died in the year 1785, at the house of her brother-in-law, Mr. Clayton of Old Park.—Dr. Clayton returned to Liverpool in 1795, and died after a long state of declining health in the spring of 1797.

Having thus occupied so much of your valuable Miscellany with an account of the tutors at Warrington, perhaps your readers may be alarmed, Mr. Editor, at the prospect of a similar account of the students. But of these, for various reasons, a very select list will be presented. In the mean time, I must beg a page or two, probably of your next Number, for a few observations on the causes of the decline and ultimate dissolution of the Warrington Academy.

I remain, Sir,  
Your's respectfully,  
V. F.

## EXTRACTS FROM NEW PUBLICATIONS.

*Present State of the Mahometan Religion in Turkey.*

[From Hobhouse's Journey, &c. &c. (see M. Repos. p. 433.) pp. 912—925.]

The descriptions of Rycaut (and much earlier writers might be mentioned) apply to the Mussulmans of Constantinople at this day, as much as to those of the seventeenth century, and the decay of their relative strength, as an European power, has but little affected their national character. The Mahometan religion has prevented, and ever will prevent, any material change in the individual condition, and consequently the character of the Turks. The light thrown upon the manners and customs of this people during the last hundred years, has left it unnecessary to disabuse the world on the subject of the religion of Mahomet. The times are past, when the Mussulmans were charged with believing that God is a corporeal Being, the author of evil, without providence, and not eternal; that the soul is mortal; that the devils are friends of Mahomet, and of God; that Venus is the proper object of worship; that man was created of a leach; and many other absurdities, originating only in the ignorance of their accusers.\*

\* Pope Pius II. in a Letter to the Sultan of the Turks, made the first charge; Cedrenus the second; the same Pope the third; Bartholinus of Odessa the fourth, and fifth; Polydore Virgil the sixth; Johannes Andreas the seventh; the great Selden, in his 4th chap. on the Syrian Deities, the eighth; and Euthemius Zigalenus the

Into the doctrinal part of their religion the Turks do not enquire, but content themselves with an implicit faith in the one eternal Deity, in his angels, in the prophets, in the day of resurrection and judgment, in the decrees of God, and in the virtue of purification, prayer, alms and fasting. There are some of their priests, as might be expected, who disturb themselves with the subtleties of the controversialists, and engrafting upon the simplicity of the original law a variety of strange creeds, have established sects, the opinions of which, if we are to believe some writers, are not only different from, but altogether inconsistent with, the faith of Mahomet. Rycaut mentions one brotherhood, whose mystery, which it required a long noviciate to penetrate, consisted in a profession of atheism, and a practice of the most horrid debaucheries; but Islamism can no more be affected by such a perversity, than the religion of England by the monks of Medenham.

The sect does not, as far as I could learn, exist at this day, but institutions and practices no less foreign to the original faith, may still be found. Such are the invocations of dead, and the re-

last. Sylburgius accuses Mahomet of having called the Blessed Virgin the sister of Moses; and Bartholinus of Odessa upbraids the Koran for saying that she was impregnated by eating dates. Those who would see the origin and refutation of these follies, may consult the second book of Adrian Reland's System of the Mahometan Theology.

verence of living, saints, a belief in prophecies,\* omens and dreams and the power of amulets and charms, and the admission of numerous orders of Dervishes; the removal of all which excrescences, and the restoration of the simple Unitarianism of the Koran, it is the professed object of the Wahabees to effect. These powerful sectaries have taken the holy cities, and overrunning all Arabia, and part of Syria, have menaced at the same time the Sophi of Persia and the Sultan of Constantinople, peremptorily inviting them to recognise the divine commission of Wahaub, the Unitarian Chief, and restore the faith to its primitive purity. Should the mission of this reformer accomplish its aim, and meet with general success, we may then expect to become acquainted with Mahometanism, such as it was in its infancy.

Mr. Leibnitz says of it, that "this is a kind of deism joined to the belief of some facts, and to the observation of some performances, that Mahomet and his followers have added, sometimes unluckily enough, to natural religion, but that have been agreeable to the inclinations of several countries:" and he adds, "we are obliged to that sect for the

\* The knowledge of future events is obtained, they think, by the constant practice of virtue, fasting, and humiliation. The *Etishmyshlerden*, "the attainers to the fulness of divine fervour," pretend to visions; yet Mahomet is declared in the Koran *Achir Persan* the last of the prophets, which the modern Mahometans have explained, as usual, to suit their own notions.— See Cantemir, Ottoman Hist. book i. p. 39. Tindal's translation.

destruction of paganism in many parts of the world."†

To this brief and just exposition, and the subsequent eulogy of the religion, I shall only add, that its main doctrine has been allowed to be so similar to that of a great heretical Christian, that in times when theological controversies were more bitter than at present, sober treatises were written, to prove the conformity of the Mahometan belief with that of the Socinians; and that sect, on account of the irregularities of Adam Neuser, was charged with a conspiracy against Christianity, in conjunction with the Emperor of the Turks.‡ What was once thought a disgrace to Socinus, may now be considered an honour to the author of Islamism, who, when he declared *There is but one God, and Mahomet is his prophet*, may, considering the infirmities of human nature, be scarcely so much condemned for the imposture of the latter article, as praised for having promulgated the sublime truth contained in the first half of his concise creed. In short, of the prophet of Mecca we may say what Adrian Reland has pronounced of his commentator Kerabisensis, *This Arabian delivers some truth, covered over*

† A letter from Mr. Leibnitz to the author of the *Reflections upon the Origin of Mahometanism*, dated Berlin, 1706.

‡ See *Historical and Critical Reflections upon Mahometanism and Socinianism*, translated from the French, London, 1712. *A Turk hearing a Polish Socinian discourse on the Trinity and Incarnation, wondered he did not get himself circumcised.* See the letter of Mr. Leibnitz, who, of the two, prefers the Mahometan, as more consistent than the Socinian.

*with a shell of fiction, being destitute of divine revelation.*

The rapid progress of Islamism has been attributed to the vicious licence permitted and promised to its votaries; but an Arabian impostor, many years after the Hegira, allowed a much greater laxity of morals to his followers, and notwithstanding some success, his sect did not survive him. On the contrary, the prophet, in forbidding the use of wine, created a restriction to which the Arabians were not before accustomed; nor will any religion owe its dispersion and prevalence to a declaration of freedom of action; for it is consonant to the genius of man, to admire and follow systems abounding with rules and regulations, and even prescribing a conduct which seems to do violence to all the natural feelings and unbiassed inclinations of the human breast. Were this not the case, Fakeers, Monks, and Dervishes could never have existed: it would have been impossible that any man in the world should, like Uveis, the Mahometan, have established a sect and met with proselytes, whose pretensions to piety were founded on the extraction of all their teeth.

Mahomet was too wise to omit the palpable parts and outward ceremonials, which are the life and soul of all superstitions; which, in fact, are the superstitions. He was too wise, to make his Koran a promulgation of licences instead of restraints; his fasts and abstinences, his ablutions, his pilgrimage to Mecca, are so many meritorious mortifications, which have all tended to the propagation of his doctrine. To the same knowledge of the

human mind may be attributed the miraculous relations of the Koran.

It has been before hinted, that a variety of principles and articles of faith have been invented by the founders of different Mahometan sects, but that these heresies do not engage the attention of the great body of the people. Some persons are inclined to think, that many of the higher classes in Turkey are very sceptical in matters of religion.\* Of this I could form no judgment, but it was not difficult to see, that few, except the lower orders, retain that spirit of intolerance and bigotry which Mahometans are accused of displaying in all their commerce with Christians. A notion has very generally obtained, of their contempt and hatred of infidels so far prevailing, that it is established amongst them, that they may break any engagement with an unbeliever; but nothing is more unfounded than such a supposition, for the contrary conduct is expressly commanded by the Koran;† and they have been always notorious for their good faith in their commercial intercourse with other nations. "*How do we trade amongst the Turks,*" enquires Mr Harley, who had fallen into the common error, "and trust the Mahometans, one of whose doctrines in the Alcoran is, not to keep faith with Christians? They have obtained it by

---

\* It must, however, be confessed, that in so great a nation there are many of the learned Turks who do not implicitly believe all that is said in the Koran, &c. Cantemir, Ottoman Hist. book i. p. 31 Tindal.

† See a Short System of the Mahometan Theology, book ii. sect. 25.



a just, punctual, and honourable practice in trade, and you credit them without scruple, nay, rather than some Christians.”\*

All the people of the East, except the Mahometans, as Montesquieu† thought, look upon all religions in themselves as indifferent, and amongst the Calmucks the admission of every kind of religion is a point of conscience. The truth is, the Mahometans themselves, whether originally from climate or otherwise, notwithstanding great apparent steadiness in their own faith, are perfectly tolerant in their practice; and I cannot help supposing that they entertain very charitable notions on this head, for I recollect a person of authority, to whom one of us had introduced our Albanian attendant Dervish, with the recommendation that he was a Mus- sultan, observing that he did not enquire into a man’s faith, but his character, and that he presumed heaven would be wide enough for persons of all religions.‡ The

\* Essay on Public Credit, 1710, (re- printed 1797,) p. 17.

† Liv. xxv. chapit. 15, de l’Esprit des Loix.

‡ The Koran, Surat 2, verse 59, has these words: “ Verily, those who believe, both Jews and Nazarenes (Christians,) and Zabians, (Gentiles in Arabia, or Ishmael- ites,) whosoever of these believe in God and the last day, and do good works, have their reward with their Lord, and no fear shall come upon them, neither shall they be affected with sorrow.” Artus Thomas, in his Triumph of the Cross; Bellarmine in his Controversies, vol. 2. p. 293, 294; and Thomas a Jesu, on the Controversies of the Gentiles, p. 677, and others cry scandal against this toleration, the last dotage of Ma- homet; and Reland has, I fear, with some success, defended the prophet against the heinous charge. A Short System of Mahometan Theology, Book 2. sect. 2.—The Cham of the Tartars told Rubruquis, in 1253, “ Que comme

generality of the Turks are at the same time exceedingly attentive to all the forms prescribed by their law, and perform their religious duties without either affectation or levity. The obligation to exter- nal piety is not confined to the priesthood. They pray in the streets and in their open shops at Constantinople, not for the sake of ostentation, since every one is equally pious, but to perform a portion of their civil duties. On the same principle, no one, what- ever may be his private opinions, utters any sentiments disrespectful to the faith. Such a levity would be sedition, and a crime against the representative of the prophet; for the Sultan is the Vicar of Mahomet, and is the supreme head of the government, which is not less a theocracy than the an- cient Jewish monarchy.

It has been established beyond doubt, by the writer who, in my humble judgment, has given the truest and most satisfactory ac- count of the Turkish government, I mean Mr. Thornton, that the Ulema, or ministers of the Maho- metan law, at whose head is the Mufti, do not assume or exercise a power paramount to that of the Sultan, however they may have been resorted to, in order to sanction the imperial edicts, or to join with the Janissaries, or gene- ral voice of the people, in depos- ing a cruel or incapable prince.\* The Mufti, who has been likened to the Popes or patriarchs of the Christian sects, but is in fact more similar to the Pontifex Maximus

Dieu avoit donne aux mains plusieurs doigts, ainsi avoit il ordonne aux hommes plusieurs chemins pour aller en Paradis.” Voyage en Tartarie, cap. xlv. p. 119.

\* Present State of Turkey, p. 100 to p. 113.



of ancient Rome, is in dignity, though not in power, the second person in the empire; but he is not, as some have endeavoured to prove, the first. To show this, it is sufficient to say that his continuance in office depends upon the will of the Sultan.

In a despotic monarchy nothing remains fixed but the religion; the Mahometan law is unchangeable and all-powerful; but its immediate ministers possess neither the one nor the other attribute. If the *fetwa*, or decree, of the Mufti were a necessary sanction to every act of importance, which it seems not to be, the person who disposes of the office may be supposed capable of controuling the officer. The religion may be called superior to the Sultan, for by it he holds his power, but I cannot think that any opposition to the imperial authority on the part of the Ulema, however long or successfully it may continue, can be adduced to shew that the Sultan of the Turks is not a despotic prince, or can be considered in any other light than an insurrection, to which every absolute monarch must occasionally be subject.

It is the custom for the Grand Signior to back his ordinances relative to peace and war, and other state matters, by the *fetwa*, as it is for him to go to the mosck publicly on every Friday, and to attend in person at a conflagration; but the two latter obligations are equally strong with the former; nor are the three exceptions to the exercise of his own will and discretion of sufficient importance to be mentioned as a proof of limita-

tion in the Ottoman sovereignty, or of any other point, than that no prince is altogether superior to established usages. Nevertheless, Abu-Taleb, the traveller, commonly going by the name of the Persian prince, a much better judge than either De Tott, Sir James Porter, or other Europeans who have adopted the same notion, informs us in his Travels, that he did not consider the power of the Grand Signior absolute, which I can only account for by supposing that in the Asiatic governments to which he had been accustomed, insurrections were not so frequent, nor the influence of usage so apparent, as in the capital of Turkey.

The identity of law and religion gives a sanctity of character to the Mufti, the Cazy-askers of Roumelia and Natolia, the Istamboul-Effendi, the Mollahs, Cadis, Naibs, and all the administrators of justice in Turkey; but the ecclesiastics, or Murtaziks, are, except in their education, a distinct body from the Ulema, and are not immediately dependent upon the Mufti, but upon the Kiskar Aga, or chief of the Black Eunuchs.\*

\* The Cazy-askers are chief justices; they sit not on the right, as Mr. Thornton says, but on the left hand, of the grand vizier in the divan. The Istamboul-Effendi is chief justice of Constantinople; the Mollahs or Moulas are presidents of great towns, to whom the ancient Ottoman kings paid 500 aspers a day, but who now receive nothing from the government (Bobovius, a Treatise concerning the Turkish Liturgy, sect. 2), the Cadis are judges of small towns, and the Naibs, puisne judges. Each court has a Katib, a secretary, a Mokaiyd, a clerk, and Muhzir, a crier. The Mufti's pension is

\* De l'Esprit des Loix,

The Santons, Alfaquis and Shiaks explain texts of the Koran; but their sermons are not given at any stated time, nor very frequently; the Talismans perform the same office, but are chiefly employed in transcribing the holy books; the Imaums recite the prayers, at stated hours of the day, in the moscks, but not aloud, only animating the people by their example: on Friday, however, before prayers at noon, a reader or chanter (Nat'-chon) sings the praises of Mahomet. To each mosck there is also a Haim, or overseer; Fernesh, a sweeper, and Abkesh, a water-drawer. One Muezzin, or chanter, will serve for several moscks. The burying-grounds are under the inspection of a Turba-dhar, or sexton. There is also a person whose business it is to attend to the innumerable lights with which the larger moscks are supplied, and to provide for the illuminations of the Rhamazan, when all the minarets are adorned with lamps, hanging not only round the galleries and to the tops of the spires, but upon strings from one turret to another, so as to form various figures and verses from the Koran.

There is no part of the religious duties of a Mussulman which requires the intervention of a priest; nor, although a reader and chanter are retained in some great families, is the distinction which separates the Christian laity and clergy, to be recognized amongst the Mahometans. There is nothing in the external behaviour of the Imaums or others of the secular priesthood, which distinguishes

them from their fellow-subjects: they assume no authority, either temporal or ecclesiastical; and are under the controul of the Cadis, or municipal judges: in short, they are the guardians of the moscks rather than of the Mussulmans. The Hogias, or school-masters, (one of whom is attached to each of the great moscks, in Constantinople,) are, in smaller parishes, the only public readers of the Koran.

The extreme simplicity of this religion and of the ordinances by which it is supported, has not, however, prevented all pretensions to extraordinary holiness, or the encouragement of several sects of fanatical impostors, to whom some allusion has before been made. The Christian recluses were the admiration of the Mussulmans before they had adopted the same practice; but since the first institution of religious orders, in the reign and by the patronage of Nasser-ben-Hamed, the third prince of the Samanide dynasty, in the year 331 of the Hegira, there has been a constant succession of saints, distinguished from their fellow citizens by the title and profession of poverty, and supposed to be occupied in the perpetual contemplation of the more abstruse points of the Mahometan doctrine.\* These saints have been known under the names

---

\* D'Herbelot, *Bibliothèque Orientale*, Articles, *Nasser-Ben-Hamed*, *Der-vische*, *Sofi*, *Zaked*, *Faker*, &c. Saadi, in the *Ghulistan*, relates, that the Christian monks of Mount Libanus in his time performed miracles; and Bokhari, in his book entitled *Sahib*, recounts the wonders of the Abyssinian, *Sahib Gioraie*, a Christian solitary, with the good faith of a Capuchin. There is also an Arabic history of Christian monks.

---

five hundred sequins a day from the Seraglio. (*Notice sur la Cour de Grand Seigneur*, p. 121.)

of Calenders, Torlaquis, and other distinct appellations applied to particular sects, but are more generally spoken of under their original title of Dervish, a word having the same signification in the Turkish and Persian language as the Fakir of the Arabic, and denoting a poor man. They have their travelling mendicants, fraternities of settled recluses, and some few solitaries, amounting in all to thirty-two orders; all of which differ from each other, and are distinguished also by particular manners and appearance from the rest of the world.

Although it is expressly said in the Koran, that the vow of celibacy is not received in paradise, the Calenders do not admit of marriage, but the generality of the orders are under no such restriction. Some individuals amongst them have, like Haji Bek-Tash, attained an extraordinary reputation; but the profession of piety, beyond the acquirement of alms, is not attended with any advantages in Turkey. The Mussulmans consider themselves obliged to contribute to the support of the religious; at the same time that not only the more enlightened of them, but the common people regard the Dervishes with but little internal reverence, and rather tolerate than approve of their institutions. The Seyeh, or wanderers, who raise contributions by proclamation, are relieved but not respected.\* Their *kirkah*, or torn

habit, notwithstanding its alleged descent from the ancient prophets, has been the subject of much sarcasm for the Oriental wits, and the vices which it is known to envelope, have not added to its respectability.\*\* — A Dervish attempted to kill Sultan Mahomet the Second, and also Achmet the First; and in the reign of Osman the First another enthusiast ventured to disturb the peace of the empire, by foretelling the triumph of Christianity, upon the strength of a vision seen at Mecca. The prophet was cudgelled to death.†

journey. The *Seyehs* come even from India. One of them delivered to Kioprili Mustapha Pasha, Grand Vizier to Solyman the Second, letters from the Great Mōgul, and told him that his master, hearing of the Sultan's distresses, had sent an offer of assistance to his brother Mussulman. To which Kioprili replied, "that Solyman would be ever grateful for the zeal and friendship of the great Padisha of India, but that his affairs just then being in a prosperous state, he could be honoured with no greater favour from his Indian Majesty, than his commanding his beggars not to enter the Ottoman dominions."—Cantemir, Ottoman Hist. Part I. book i. p. 40, of Tindal's translation.

\* Sâadi, in the eighth chapter of his *Ghulistan*, addressing the religious, says, "*Possess the virtues of a true Dervish, and then, instead of a woolen cap, wear, if you will, a Tartar bonnet*" Ebu-Cassab, one of their spiritual masters, calls their garments the mask of hypocrisy; and Hafiz prefers a goblet of wine to the blue mantle of the Dervish; which the Persians, who have given a mystical meaning to all the verses of this poet, explain as an attachment to divine love, and a hatred of hypocrisy. *Dervishlik khirkhaden bellu doghil*, is a Turkish proverb, which answers to the *Cucullus non facit monachum*. See D'Herbelot, *Bibliothèque Orientale*, Article Dervische.

† In the early ages of the Mahometan religion, a Mohometan said that he

\* On coming into a town, a Seyeh cries aloud from the market place or court of the mosck, "*Ya allah senden besh bin altun isterim*"—"O God, give me, I pray, five thousand crowns—or some other sum or commodity, which he is to collect in the course of his

The character of the mendicant Dervishes of Asia Minor has been already seen.† Yet the Santons and Sheiks, whose exhortations make most impression in the moscks, are the superiors of these fanatics; and a sermon preached by one of the former in St. Sophia, was the origin of the disgraceful expedition, undertaken by Sultan Solyman against Malia, in the year 1564.‡

Attempts have been made to

abolish the institution, but the Janissaries still retain eight Dervishes of the order of Bek-Tash, as chaplains to the army; and the people of Constantinople run in crowds to amuse themselves (for no other motive can be assigned to them) at the exhibitions of the turning and of the howling Dervishes, to which all strangers are carried, as to the theatre or other places of entertainment in the cities of Christendom.

## MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

### Versions of the 59th Psalm.

SIR, Aug. 4, 1812.

Looking lately into a Review of a version of the Psalms in your last volume, [V. vii. p. 319] I recollected a comparison, with which I once amused myself, of three different versions, of the 59th Psalm, composed at very different periods: That Psalm contains, in verses 6, 7, 14 and 15, some expressions, the sense of which it is rather difficult to convey in translated verse and yet escape ludicrous associations. You will, I think, agree with me that Merrick has eminently succeeded, especially when compared with his forerunners.

was God. A man reminded him, that one who had called himself a prophet had been killed. "They were right," said the other, "for I did not give him his commission: he was no prophet of mine."—Paroles Remarquables des Orientaux, Galand.

† Letter XXXVI. p. 648, of this volume. (Hobhouse.)

‡ Notice sur la Cour du Grand Seigneur, p. 148.

Sternhold and Hopkins, about 1550, thus render the verses:

At night they run and seek about,  
Like dogs they howl also,  
And all the city quite throughout,  
From place to place they go.

They speak of me with mouth alway,  
But in their lips are swords:  
They have contriv'd my death, and say  
There's none doth hear our words.

At evening they return apace,  
As dogs they grin and cry:  
Throughout the streets in every place,  
They run about and spy.

They seek about for meat alway,  
But let them not be fed:  
Nor find a house wherein they may  
Be bold to put their head.

*The Psalms of David in Meeter,*  
18mo.

The second specimen is from Manton, Owen, Poole, Calamy and others, in 1673, recommended by the signatures of Nonconformist ministers of that time, who thus close a prefatory Address to the reader. "Divine composures should be represented to us in a fit translation, least we want *David in David*: while his holy extasies are delivered in a



flat and bald expression. The translation which is now put into thy hands cometh nearest to the original of any that we have seen, and runneth with such a fluent sweetness, that we thought fit to recommend it to thy Christian acceptance; some of us having used it already with great comfort and satisfaction." The passage is thus rendered in this translation:

At evening they go to and fro;  
They make great noise and sound  
Like to a dog, and often walk  
About the city round.

Behold they belch out with their mouth  
And in their lips are swords:  
For they do say thus, who is he  
That now doth hear our words?

At evening let thou them return  
Making great noise and sound  
Like to a dog, and often walk  
About the city round.

And let them wander up and down  
In seeking food to eat;  
And let them grudge when they shall  
Be satisfied with meat.

This version of 1673, was exactly contemporary with the infancy of Watts, and enhances his merit as a versifier by shewing how scanty were the means afforded him to form a taste in English Psalmody.

We shall now be relieved from these examples of *made English*, and gratified by the following version of Merrick:

When eve's dark shades o'er heav'n are  
hung,  
See! as the dog with fury stung,  
While hideous yells their wrath betray,  
From street to street they urge their  
way.

Swords in their lips, without a fear  
Their threats they vent: for who shall  
hear?

When eve's dark shades o'er heav'n are  
ung,  
Still, as the dog with fury stung,

Still let them, clam'ring for their prey,  
From street to street pursue their way,  
Insatiate; while their destin'd spoil  
Elusive mocks their fruitless toil.

The third *translation*, alone worthy of the name, appears to retain every sentiment contained in the passages versified, and yet to avoid expressions mean or ludicrous. The 59th Psalm is one which, for obvious reasons, Watts has omitted, being quite impracticable for his purpose of applying the "Psalms of David—to the Christian state and worship."

N. L. T.

### *Retarder of the Abolition of the Slave Trade.*

SIR,

In your Sixth Volume, (p. 449.) I communicated some additions to Mr. Clarkson's List of Fore-runners in the Abolition of the Slave Trade. I have since met with an eminent *Retarder* of that and other benevolent projects. This was Carteret, Lord Granville, of whose opinions Dr. Kippis gives the following account in the *Addenda* to Biog. Britt. Vol. 3rd. from Lord Egmont's manuscripts.

"He maintained that Christianity is incorporated with civil government, as sand with lime, each of which by itself makes no mortar. Where he imagined that the public interest might receive prejudice by Christianity, he was against its being taught. He hoped, therefore, never to see our negroes in America become Christians, because he believed that this would render them less laborious slaves. On the same principle, he was against any attempts to convert the American savages. In



learning Christianity, they would fall into the use of letters, and a skill in the arts being the consequence, they would become more formidable to the plantations. Pursuing a similar train of reasoning, Lord Granville wished to God that the Pope might never turn Protestant, or the Italians cease to be Papists, for then we should sell them no fish. He was glad that the clergy sent abroad to our plantations were ignorant and immoral wretches, because they could have no influence over the inhabitants as better and wiser men would have; and who would use that influence for the purpose of inspiring the planters with a spirit of independence on their mother country. He was hostile to the scheme of sending bishops to America. These, he thought, would labour to bring the several sects to one religion; whereas the security of that people's dependence on England he conceived to arise from their mutual divisions. He was, an enemy, likewise, to the improvement of our colonies in learning. This, he said, would take off their youth from wholly attending to trade, fill them with speculative notions of government and liberty, and prevent the education of the sons of rich planters in England, where they contract a love to this kingdom, and when grown old, come back and settle, to the great increase of our wealth. Even at home he was against charity schools, and was not for having the vulgar taught to read, that they might think of nothing but the plough and their other low avocations.

This nobleman, who would thus have withheld "the key of knowledge" from the people, was an

accomplished scholar and a "distinguished orator and statesman." He died in 1763, aged 73. Half a century has effected such a salutary change in public opinion, that it would be now scarcely possible to find a nobleman who "was not for having the vulgar taught to read."

VERAX.

*Mr. Maurice on a Passage in the Obituary of Mr. Jones.*

*Clifton, near Bristol.*

SIR,

In the Memoir you have published in your last number, p. 551—554 of Mr. J. Jones, my name mentioned in a manner which compels me to address you, least I should seem to be satisfied with praise to which I am not entitled. The following gentlemen employed me as the agent of their kindness to Mr. Jones: The Rev. T. Morgan, S. Boddington, Esq. London, — Strutt, Esq. Belper, Dr. Disney, Dr. Toulmin, Mr. Thomas Hurry, Yarmouth, and my much lamented and ever-to-be-revered friend, Mr. Simpson, of Bath. But there is another gentleman to whom the highest tribute of gratitude is due,—a gentleman to whom Mr. Jones was entirely unknown when he came to Clifton, but whose medical skill and constant services were gratuitously employed during all the time Mr. Jones resided here. Mr. King would never have wished this circumstance to have been stated in the memoir, but the knowledge of the fact obliges me to bestow praise where it is justly due. The kindness of Mr. King was a subject on which Mr. Jones used to enlarge with peculiar plea-

sure; I trust, therefore, I shall be pardoned for giving publicity to the gratitude he was ever anxious to manifest to those who rendered him any service. Your insertion of this letter in your next number will oblige

Yours, &c.

MICHAEL MAURICE.

---

*On Future Punishment.*

SIR,

A question of high importance has long been agitated by Christians, particularly by that class who are I believe the general readers of the Repository. It is of no less importance than the future destiny of the human dead. And as I fear very erroneous and unscriptural notions are entertained by the great bulk of Christians, and doubt and perplexity by some others, if you will allow me to occupy a page or two of your valuable Miscellany, I will examine the subject, and endeavour to shew what appears to me the true meaning of the scriptures. But it will probably be discussed to most advantage by laying down one or two preliminary observations. First, That as it is a doctrine of revelation contained in the Christian scriptures alone, we must refer to them, and them only, for all authority in support of any opinion we undertake to defend.

Second, Although it is readily allowed, that all figurative texts may be fairly interpreted in doubtful cases by such as are acknowledged to be plain, it cannot be admitted, that texts not figurative shall be made so, and referred for explanation not to plain texts of scripture, but to inferences and

deductions said to be drawn from thence.

On the subject of the future destiny of man, there is one point, and one only, on which all seem willing to agree, which is that the reward of the righteous will be immortality and everlasting happiness: here we are all satisfied with the plain language of scripture, and it is only when applied to punishment that some are so anxious to explain it away as figurative.

On the punishment of the wicked there seem to prevail three opinions: the 1st, that the wicked will be punished with endless torments. The 2nd, that their punishment will be only temporary and remedial, and that finally they will be restored to endless happiness. The 3rd, that the wicked will be utterly destroyed by the second death, and that therefore their punishment will be everlasting.\*

Let us now enquire into the evidence adduced in support of these several opinions; for so much do they differ from each other, that but one of them can be true.

If the voice of majorities is to determine the question, the first must be the true opinion: but here let it be observed, that neither numbers nor antiquity can avail any thing, unless it can be proved to be the plain and positive declaration of the Christian Scriptures; for a doctrine so shocking in itself, and so blasphemous against the divine character and perfections, should not be admitted on any evidence short

---

\* Whenever the words everlasting and eternal are used in this letter, they are intended to mean endless.

of direct and miraculous communication from God. But however men may have deceived themselves, I must be permitted to doubt, whether any rational creature ever did seriously believe, at the same time, in the infinite benevolence of the Deity and in the endless torments of sinners. The fact is, that men have thought little about it in the point of view in which it is here placed; and when it is recollected how many ages it has been made one of the prime articles of the orthodox creed, and the source of so lucrative a trade to the apostate church, for which their purgatory was introduced into the drama, is it to be wondered at that without enquiry, when men have taken it for granted, and parents have taught their children and perpetuated the belief, that the wicked would be burnt everlastingly in hell fire, with the devil and his angels, that it should have become the popular creed? This is all the foundation on which it is built; for I shall hereafter shew it is no doctrine of the New Testament.

As it is to be hoped in this enlightened period there is no rational Christian who believes in this doctrine, it will not be necessary here to enlarge upon it; as my business chiefly lies with the second class of Christians who are generally called Universalists, who avow their belief that the punishment of the wicked will be long and severe, but remedial and corrective, and that when they have been sufficiently punished for their crimes here, they will be admitted to the enjoyment of everlasting happiness. In support of this opinion I have sought in vain for any scriptural evidence. I

have a small tract\* on this subject now lying before me, written by a most excellent man, who has evinced the zeal and labours of an apostle; and as he has given a summary of all the material arguments in support of this doctrine, I shall for the sake of brevity cite from it such passages as seem suited to my purpose. "Those (says he) who contend that future punishment will be corrective, don't pretend to a knowledge of its limits; they suppose the subject involved in such awful obscurity, that the impenitent sinner has every thing to fear; and in contending that it will be corrective, they mean that it will produce the moral improvement of the punished." To these suppositions I have nothing to say; they are supported by no evidence, they are suppositions only!

Again—"It is not now contended (says he) that the final restitution of all mankind is so clearly revealed in the Scriptures, as to be capable of being supported otherwise than by inference and deduction, nor that it ought to be maintained as a leading or fundamental doctrine of Christianity; it is presumed to be a fair deduction from the character and known perfections of God, and from various declarations in the sacred writings; and that it is capable of being supported by just reasoning and fair inference, and on this ground its advocates are willing to rest it." And if this be its best ground, like all other structures without a foundation, it must, I suspect, fall.

If the scriptures had not contained positive declarations of the

---

\* *Wright on Future Punishment.*

punishment of sinners, these suppositions, inferences and deductions, would have done as well as any others, and would have been entitled to attention, but as they do clearly contain such, these can weigh nothing in the argument. But the advocates of this doctrine come forward in a concluding paragraph, and boldly avow—"That it is of no consequence to their leading arguments in how literal a sense the words perish, perdition, destruction, death, are applied to future punishment." This is taking a most unwarrantable licence with the sacred writings; for if the plainest language may be deemed figurative, and figurative language plain, it is making them a complete nose of wax, that may be moulded into any form that best pleases the fancy of the artist; rendering them so vague and uncertain that they may be made to prove or disprove any thing; thereby producing complete confusion and the most alarming consequences. To apply arguments, by evidence from the New Testament, against the advocates of this doctrine is useless; for they have conceded the point that their hypothesis is incapable of being supported from it except by inference and deduction: finding their weakness here they seem to take their strong ground in the character and perfections of the Deity, and in further support of this they add a popular and imposing argument, that even the omniscience of God is scarcely able to draw the line of distinction between the best of the wicked and the worst of the good. So imperceptible are the shades, that to punish the one with the loss of life, and give the other

immortality and happiness would be injustice!

But here the advocates of this doctrine do not appear better fortified than by revelation; for unless they can prove that the scripture doctrine contended for by their opponents, is inconsistent with the divine perfections, is it not a most unwarrantable presumption to arraign the wisdom of God in the plan of his divine government, and to suppose they can frame one more consistent with his benevolence? Contemplating the plan of providence in the works of nature, we plainly perceive, through the whole, a gradation of privilege; whether we examine the vegetable, the animal or the intellectual creation, life is appointed to each individual for different periods, from one moment to one hundred years and upwards, according to its species; this is seen in the acorn, from that which falls from the oak and is devoured by the animal waiting beneath it, to that which is sown and produces the full grown tree, which becomes the ornament of the forest, remaining for centuries to the utmost period of its appointed duration; we see it in our own species, from the infant that dies in the birth, to the man that lives fourscore years and upwards. The appointment of these different periods of life may be justly entitled privileges; but as it is manifest that the benevolent author of nature has afforded to each individual a large preponderance of enjoyment during his existence, whether it be short or long, shall we, weak and ignorant as we are, presume to arraign either the wisdom or justice of the plan of his divine government? In the pro-



mise of reward to the righteous, the scriptures every where annex it to character: this life is said to be our state of probation, (and with Paley I believe this is our wisest view of it) and during its progress it is our duty to form our character from the example and precepts of our great Master; the precept of our Lord, which he tells us is the first and great commandment, is "that we love the Lord our God with all our heart, our mind and strength," that is, that we should feel such a high reverence for God, as the Creator, Governor, Preserver and Disposer of all things, in whom we live and move and have our being, as to fix on our minds his constant presence and agency, in all the events of life, so as to refer every thing to him—which is living in habitual devotion—seeing God in every thing and seeing every thing in God. This as I understand the precept is forming the Christian character to which the reward is promised, and because such characters alone are fitted for that state which is prepared and promised to the righteous. Now between such a character as this, and the best of the wicked, who have not God in all their thoughts, instead of nice shades of difference, there seems a broad distinction; but let it be remembered, that whilst the divine Being has given life and immortality to the one, he has afforded to the other a large balance of enjoyment during his life, and therefore has been guilty of no injustice to any. The reason of this diversity of privilege in the divine plan we may know hereafter, but cannot know now; it is hid in the same obscurity as the introduction of

all other apparent evil, but we can discover enough to rest satisfied that God is infinitely powerful, wise and good.

The advocates for the third opinion contend, that they have embraced it upon what appears to them the plain language of the New Testament, which is, that the righteous will go into life everlasting, and the wicked into everlasting punishment. What this punishment will be, the scriptures have explained in such a variety of passages through the whole of the New Testament, that it may be justly questioned, whether there be any truth more clearly or repeatedly declared, or more forcibly inculcated, than that the punishment of the wicked will be loss of life, death, utter perdition, everlasting destruction, the second death. This, when contrasted with immortality and everlasting life, seems as plain and strong as language can possibly make it.

Whilst we live in obedience to the plain precepts of the gospel, which are, supreme love to God, and an affectionate regard to the welfare and happiness of all our fellow-creatures, we shall certainly receive the promised reward, and this speculative difference of opinion will be of little consequence to us. But as far as my observation goes, the belief of universal restoration has a practical tendency to lessen the restraints to vice, and to slacken our endeavours and watchfulness to guard against habitual trespasses, and from its popularity is I fear an encreasing evil. It is this view of the subject which has induced me to offer these sentiments to my fellow-Christians, through the means of your valuable Mis-



cellany, and if it be the means of correcting one erroneous opinion, I shall rejoice as not having laboured in vain. Let us not then flatter and deceive ourselves with a vain philosophy, for the Christian scriptures have plainly declared, and it is a solemn and awful declaration! that the wages of sin is DEATH, ETERNAL DEATH; but the gift of God is ETERNAL LIFE, promised to the righteous through Jesus Christ our Lord.

J. S.

—  
*Society for Conversion of the  
Jews.*

SIR,

In a report lately published by the London Society for the Conversion of the Jews, we have various extracts from letters received from Germany, to which they appear to give undoubting credit; and from one of these I copy the following, which they call an “*authentic fact.*”

“About ten years ago a particular party arose among the Jews in Poland, which has also many followers in some parts of Germany, and chiefly in Bohemia, and they even asserted that a branch of their association was already in Palestine. I have made acquaintance with a leader of this party, who *believed in Jesus as the Saviour of the world*, and sincerely revered him.”

Now Mr. Editor, though the writer of this account seems entirely unmindful of the inference which naturally arises from it,—can we call these men who acknowledge Jesus as the *Saviour of the world* other, or less than *Christians*? though held perhaps in his opinion as undeserving of that name, because they do not add many other mysterious and

complicated articles, to the simple profession of their faith.

Some of your readers have doubtless noticed this account, who are able to form more probable conjectures than myself, with respect to the hopes for the speedy conversion of the Jews to rational Christianity which may be founded upon it.

I remain, Sir,

Your obliged humble servant,

M. H.

—  
*Quaker Doctrine of the Trinity.*

SIR,

The intent of my last communication (p. 373—376) was to remove the erroneous impression A. B's. defective statement (p. 307) of the belief of the early Quakers was calculated to make on such of your readers as were not better informed. The object of this is to lay before them a brief, but plain and comprehensive “*Confession of Faith,*” which was drawn up and “presented to the parliament” in the year 1693, on behalf of the Society of Friends for the express purpose of clearing them from the imputation of having imbibed “some Socinian notions.” What these notions were I cannot precisely determine, but it is obvious enough from this document, that the real sentiments of its authors were not incompatible with the pure doctrine of Unitarianism, that there is only one living and true God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; for otherwise this confession of faith which was signed by above thirty members of the Society, of whom George Whitehead, an eminent minister among them, was one, is nothing to the purpose for which it was presented to the legislature.

The charges this confession was intended to ~~repel~~ related to the person of Christ, and especially to what has been called his miraculous conception. Of these, if the principal accusation was, that they rejected this tenet, their confession of faith must have shewn it to be groundless, for in common with many learned and unlearned Unitarians before and since that time, they believed the narratives in the introduction to Matthew's and Luke's gospels to be authentic parts of the evangelical history. But how far, they deemed this tenet an indispensable article of Christian faith, or what degree of importance they attached to it, does not I believe appear either in this confession, or elsewhere in their writings. Without questioning the authenticity or truth of the narratives they seem, supposing these to be genuine, to have generally followed the wise example of the apostles and of the sacred writers, none of whom again mention or allude to the subject, much less have they insisted upon its importance or connected it with any article of faith.

This silence is very natural, supposing the fact to be true, and the narratives of it authentic, if the sacred writers deemed it unimportant; as it is also, if those narratives are spurious. But incessantly as those writers inculcate the reception of such facts and doctrines, as they considered necessary to be believed by Christian converts, their uniform silence on this subject is not I think to be otherwise satisfactorily accounted for. That all the existing *N. S. S.* contain these narratives is admitted, and it is in my mind not very material whether they

are supposed to be authentic, or not, provided no greater stress is laid on them, as containing an article of Christian faith, than Jesus Christ and his apostles have enjoined. To insist upon more than this, as essential, is unwise, if not unchristian. It is to encumber the faith of the gospel with an unnecessary article, whether true, or not, and palpably to obstruct its reception amongst men. To represent the verity and credibility of Christianity, as standing upon no better evidence than such a fact as this, is to expose it, I will not say to insuperable difficulties, but to objections of serious import, to many upright and considerate minds, and to such objections as cannot be urged with any effect against its fundamental doctrines, as taught by Jesus Christ, and confirmed by the testimony of his apostles.

The following confession of faith is strictly and properly Unitarian. Many persons who have zealously and ably maintained that doctrine, would I believe object to no part of it; and with a slight exception or two I suppose it would be conformable to the belief of most Unitarian Christians. On the other hand, I am persuaded no real Trinitarian could possibly esteem it a satisfactory exposition of his faith. Sewel gives it verbatim as follows, but without the address to either of the houses of parliament. It was probably presented to both. The reader will notice how expressly it purports to have been written in the name and on behalf of the Society of Friends, although the address and signature are not given. Its authors say, —

“Be it known to all, that we sincerely believe and confess, 1. That Jesus

of Nazareth, who was born of the Virgin Mary, is the true *Messiah*, the very Christ, the son of the living God, to whom all the prophets gave witness: And that we do highly value his death, sufferings, works, offices, and merits for the redemption of mankind, together with his laws, doctrine and ministry. II. That this very Christ of God, who is the Lamb of God, that takes away the sins of the world, was slain, was dead, and is alive, and lives for ever in his divine eternal glory, dominion and power with the Father. III. That the holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, are of divine authority, as being given by inspiration of God. IV. And that magistracy, or civil government, is God's ordinance, the good ends thereof being for the punishment of evil doers, and praise of them that do well." *Sewel's History of the Quakers*. p. 649.

"By this and the like writings," adds Sewel, "the eyes of many that were at the helm [of government] began to be more opened; and even among the bishops were some that inclined to moderation; for the king endeavoured as much as he could to promote the most moderate among the Churchmen to those high dignities; and prejudice, which had blinded many in respect to the Quakers, began to abate more and more."\*

When the reigning monarch manifested such a noble spirit in the

---

\* It should have been said in p. 376, that George Keith was soon afterwards ordained, instead of saying he "had recently been ordained." An erroneous date in the margin of the page in Sewel's history, where the circumstance is mentioned, led me into the mistake. He was ordained by the Bishop of London, and Burnet, with whom Keith was a fellow student at Aberdeen, says he "was reconciled to the church, and is now [in the year 1700] in holy orders among us." History of his own times, Vol. ii. p. 144. The Bishop says "reconciled," but Keith never was before in communion with the Church of England. In the early part of his life, and till he joined the Quakers, he was of the Kirk of Scotland.

selection of bishops and ministers of state, it is no wonder that some of the former were inclined to moderation. Fettered as the king was in some measure by the intolerant spirit of the times, he bestowed honours and dignities, wealth and power, "as much as he could," on "the most moderate" and deserving. No persecuting bigot, known to be such, could look for promotion at his hands, and thus did he even incline high Churchmen to toleration. This was wise, just, politic, and worthy of the king of a free people, the father of the glorious revolution.

It was surely more to these causes than to the efficacy of such writings as the above, that the eyes of ministers and bishops were opened to their true interest, and that they saw with increasing clearness, the advantages of justice and toleration. Had the king been disposed to countenance and reward an intolerant zeal against those who could not for conscience's sake receive the dogmas of the church as gospel truths, they would soon have discovered that the above confession of faith afforded no evidence whatever that the persons who drew it up were free from "Socinian notions," but much presumptive evidence to the contrary. For what is its amount? Is there any recognition in it of the doctrine of three co-eternal and co-equal persons in the unity of essence? Nothing of the kind. Without saying how far it agrees, or wherein it differs, I will enable your readers to compare it with the opinions of Socinus on the most important points to which it relates.

"It is my judgment that Christ was a man, Rom. y. 15. conceived and

formed in the womb of the Virgin, without the intervention of a man, by the power of the divine spirit. Matt. i. 20. 23. Luke i. 35. and that being thus born, he was at first capable of suffering and mortal, 2 Cor. xiii. 4. till having discharged here on earth the duty assigned him by God, he afterwards ascended into heaven, and became immortal, and no longer liable to sufferings. Rom vi. 9. The divine sonship of CHRIST can be referred to his nature only so far as it relates to this, that CHRIST was formed in the womb of the Virgin without the instrumentality of a man, by the divine power. For the angel foretold to the Virgin of whom he was born, that on this account he should be called the Son of God, Luke i. 35. and of consequence his own and only begotten Son; as no other person ever was the Son of God in the same way, by the immediate origin of his being.

"But Jesus is thus styled, *principally* because he is the person whom his name indicates him to be, namely CHRIST. Jesus is a name applicable to him merely as a man; but CHRIST is the name that points out the great eminence and excellence of character conferred on him by God; for the word God is every where to be understood after it, as if it had been expressly written THE CHRIST or GOD. This eminence arose from his being the King of God's people. Kings were appointed over his people, and anointed by a divine ordinance; therefore they were called the *anointed* of God, or his CHRISTs, for this is the import of the word Christ. This name which was in some sense applicable to them, was applicable to Jesus in the most proper and absolute sense, and had a force when given to him, not belonging to it when bestowed on them. For Jesus was, in the highest, truest, and most peculiar sense, the King of God's people."

"As to the opinion commonly received, that CHRIST is the only begotten of God, because he and no one besides him was begotten of the divine substance, I regard it as a mere human invention, i.e. not by any means agreeable to the sacred Scriptures, which make no mention of any generation from the substance of God himself, and as entirely repugnant to sound reason, which abhors the thought of God's begetting from his own substance like corruptible animals; or that the individual and simple essence of God should be divided or

multiplied, or, that remaining entire and numerically one, it should be common to many.

"To this let it be added, that the Scripture plainly explains the true and divine filiation of Christ, as we just now shewed, when we spoke of his conception in the womb of the Virgin; and expressly uses as synonymous the phrases "Jesus was the Christ," and "Jesus was the Son of God. Matt. xvi. 16. Mark viii. 29. Luke ix. 20. Matt. xxvi. 63. Mark xiv. 61. Luke xxii. 67. 69. John xx. 31. Hence it appears because JESUS was not the King of the people of God, and so the CHRIST in the highest and most absolute sense, till after he rose from the dead, that it was said he was constituted the Son of God by his resurrection from the dead, and was then begotten by God when God raised him from the dead." Rom. i. 4. Acts xiii. 33. Soc. Opera. tom. i. p. 654. Or, Memoirs of the Life, &c. of F. Socinus, by Joshua Toulmin. P. 178—181.

For the sake of brevity, I wave giving your readers the just ideas of this celebrated author respecting the scriptural designation of CHRIST as *the Lamb of God*; but I would recommend A. B. to consider them seriously, and carefully to compare his sentiments as above given, with the foregoing confession of faith. If A. B. should favour your readers with such a comparison, I hope he will not travel out of the record, or give us any Trinitarian notions he may happen to have adopted, instead of the doctrines of the early Quakers. But if he can, let him shew in what particulars the above, or any other equally well-authenticated profession of primitive Quakerism, approaches nearer to the recognized doctrine of the Trinity than the extracts I have adduced from the writings of a man, who in the estimation of William Penn, had "*few many things*," respecting the Christian doctrine, "*a clearer prospect than most of his contemporaries*." Fully con-



curing in this opinion, yet resolved to call no man master upon earth, with regard to matters of faith, I am sincerely your's,

PHILEMON.

*Mr. Wright to Mr. Jennings on Free Communion.*

*Wisbeach, Oct. 5, 1813.*

SIR,

We happily live in an age when Christians can differ in opinion without censuring and condemning each other, when they can oppose each other's views and sentiments without any interruption of friendship and brotherly love. The unreserved avowal of what each person thinks right, and its being opposed with equal freedom and firmness by those who think differently, cannot fail to promote the knowledge of truth: so far as he who asserts, and he who contradicts, proceed with candour and Christian charity moral improvement must be advanced. Hence I argue, that in a Christian church, where free communion is admitted, Christian knowledge and moral improvement will be more rapidly promoted than in a society where uniformity of opinion and religious practice is rigidly maintained. From a knowledge of my views respecting free communion, *Mr. Strephon* proposed a question for my solution, (p. 31.) which supposed a case not likely to occur in any dissenting congregation. To this question I replied, (p. 252) with that caution which the difficulty involved in the supposed case appeared to make necessary, yet with that freedom which every lover of truth ought to exercise. On my reply to *Mr. Strephon* you have made some remarks

(p. 591); to your remarks I now answer.

In the first place, permit me to say, you have not attempted to remove the principal ground of my reasoning and conclusions: viz. that, at the Lord's supper, *the table is the Lord's*, that Jesus is the only master, and has not delegated his authority to us. This you surely must grant; but if you grant it, how can you deny the conclusion, that no Christian, nor society of Christians, has a right to exercise authority over *that* table, or dominion over those who would come to it, to say who shall and who shall not be guests at it? Do not those who assume such authority invade the prerogative of their great Master, by exercising dominion at his table as if it was their own? Such persons ought to shew who gave them such authority, what warrant they have for the exercise of it, who made them more than guests at the Master's table, who appointed them to choose or refuse others who offer to be guests. I solicit your attention to these things as they materially affect the whole question about free communion.

Instead of answering my questions, "Have we a right to withdraw from the Lord's table because they [unbelievers] are there?" "If we esteem it a privilege should we neglect it because some may abuse it?" You refer me to 2 Cor. vi. 14—16. In which passage Paul makes no mention of the Lord's supper, nor do his words appear to have any reference to it: he is exhorting Christians to keep themselves pure from heathen idolatry, and not to connect themselves by marriage, or in any other intimate way, with



heathen idolaters, that they might avoid their pollutions : he is giving direction to them as individuals, not a rule of discipline respecting the Lord's table to be observed by them as a church. This passage therefore is not at all to your purpose. I suppose you will admit that Judas was an unworthy partaker of the Lord's supper, and that Jesus knew him to be such ; yet he did not use his authority to prevent his partaking of it at its first institution, nor direct his other apostles not to partake of it with him.

Instead of shewing that we have a right, *authoritatively* to exclude any one from the Lord's table which is what you should have done, you merely object to my reference to the parable of the tares, and refer me to two other passages. I admit that the field mentioned in the parable is the world ; for Jesus so explained it ; and that the parable forbids every species of persecution : but is it not a species of persecution to exclude persons from any Christian privilege which they think themselves qualified to enjoy, merely because *you* think them improper persons to partake of such privilege ? Surely you will admit that in Christian churches, however strait their communion, some tares will grow among the wheat ; this appears to have been the case in the primitive churches : and so far the parable will be found applicable to churches, which are all planted in the field, the world. This will justify my reference to and application of it to the case in hand. Matt. xviii. 15-18, is not at all to your purpose, for our Lord does not in that passage give directions

about excluding persons from the supper which was not then instituted ; his disciples could not understand him to refer to an institution of which at the time they had not heard. The passage has no relation to matters of faith, it speaks solely of trespasses committed by one brother against another. Nor does Jesus in this place give rules to the church respecting its proceedings as a church ; but simply to his disciples as individuals respecting the manner in which they should proceed in order to convince those who trespass against them of the impropriety of their conduct. Nothing is said in the passage of the relation in which the offender should be placed with respect to the church if he could not be convinced of his fault ; but it is simply said " let him be unto *thee* [the injured person] as an heathen man and a publican." It is clear this passage can have nothing to do with the point in hand. In 1 Cor. Chap. v. the apostle is speaking of the case of the incestuous person, one who was notoriously immoral ; of course the language he uses is not to be applied to a case essentially different, that of a person who is supposed to be sceptical, or erroneous in judgment, for a man may be such and not be a wicked person. Besides, Paul does not mention the Lord's supper anywhere in the chapter, nor say any thing about putting persons from the Lord's supper ; but exhorts Christians not to associate with, to entertain at their tables, or be entertained by, professors of the gospel who were evidently immoral characters. It seems to me the passages you

have quoted militate neither against the premises, nor the conclusions, in my former letter.

I think both unbelievers, and immoral persons, if they shew a disposition to frequent the Lord's table, (and it is highly improbable the former ever will) may be deterred by faithful remonstrance, without any assumption of authority: should this fail in some rare case, it will not be an evil equal to invading the prerogative of Christ, and violating the law of liberty.

Respectfully yours,  
R. WRIGHT.

*Vindication of the Dialogue on the Scriptures in Reply to Mr. Sturch.*

SIR,

I could ill spare time to write, nor could you conveniently insert, such an answer to Mr. Sturch's animadversions (p. 297—300) on my Dialogue, (p. 103—107) as I would willingly lay before the public. I trust however to your well-known liberality of sentiment, and love of fair investigation, for the insertion of the following comments on Mr. S—'s paper. And, in the first place, let me remark that in one instance at least Mr. S. has misconstrued my meaning; I think I might have said overlooked the more obvious interpretation, to introduce one better suited to his own purpose; that he has attached to a single, isolated passage, a sense, which, though as such, it may bear, yet as it relates to the general tenour of the whole, it cannot bear. When, for instance, he represents me as "coaxing" my supposed friend to place a blind implicit faith in the scriptures, he would,

if he had read with more attention, or written with more impartiality, have said, that I was "coaxing" him to read and judge for himself; to discard all prejudices, as well those which oppose a belief in holy writ, as those which favour it. He would have said that I was urging this friend to make that very manful use of his understanding, which Mr. S. himself recommends; and he might, if he had chosen, have added, that I was doing all this, under a firm conviction that whoever enters upon the investigation of scripture truths fairly, patiently, and humbly, must become a firm believer in them.\* To stir him up then to this investigation was my leading object in the appeal I made to a much-loved companion, and to effect this end, if it were possible, I represented to him the extreme folly of entering into with greater interest, and examining with greater zeal, subjects confessedly of a temporal nature than he had ever felt for those, of which the least that we can say is this, viz. that there is a preponderating evidence in favour of their having a strict relation to, and intimate connexion with, a future state. But if my friend resolutely persisted, (as in spite of all my representations he seemed disposed to do) in declining such examination, I was, I confess, desirous that he should hold to the safer side; that he should rather blindly believe, than blindly disbelieve; one of which two things all must do, who will not take the trouble of exa-

\* Hume, if Dr. Percival may be relied on, is no instance to the contrary, for, says the Doctor, he, (Hume) confessed that he had never read the New Testament through. See *Percival's Evidence*.

mining for themselves. I was desirous, I say, that my friend should rather blindly believe, than blindly disbelieve, and that for the following reason :

That, supposing all systems of religion and morality (the scriptures included) to carry with them equal evidence of being true, then is it the part of wisdom to act in conformity with that, which threatens or promises the most, for it is that, from which we shall have most to suffer or enjoy, if it should prove true. The scriptures therefore, as of all known systems they promise the highest rewards to our obedience, and threaten the severest punishment to our disobedience, would, if they possessed only equal evidence with others, have a prevailing claim to the obedience of rational and provident creatures. But the truth is, that they possess much more evidence in their favour, than has ever belonged to any other moral or religious code received amongst men. I should rather say that they alone possess any evidence which deserves to be respected, or to be considered as establishing an authority of general force and universal application. For, adopting any other system of conduct, what assurance has any living man, that he is right, or safe? It will be answered, I am aware, the assurance of his reason ; the conviction of his understanding. But if the assurance of his reason be a proof that he is right, then may two men holding diametrically opposite opinions in religion and morals, but each equally convinced of the propriety of those he has adopted, be both right at the same time. If conviction of being right, be a sure evidence that we are so, then may

all the jarring speculative theorists in the world be right at the same time. Right reason must decide, says the disciple of philosophy. But what is right reason ; where to be found ; what the standard by which to try her ? Rational enquiry, it is affirmed, brings us to the truth. I ask what evidence we can ever have that it has brought us there. Evidence which proves to our neighbour the very contrary of what it proves to us, should ever be distrusted. Now the scriptures have at least some evidence of affording a certain rule of right conduct, for they have some evidence (evidence which infidelity has never been able to overthrow, though she may be dissatisfied with it) that they come from God. What then is it the part of wisdom to do, in a case, where, amidst a host of uncertainties, one only system appears with any shew of paramount authority ; any evidence of super-human origin ; any shadow of proof that it is exclusively framed for general adoption, and universal obligation ; any distinguishing test in its favour, which may not also (as reason has done) decide in favour of a hundred other systems, and give (as reason does) the same assurance of safety, to men professing the most opposite tenets ? What, I say, is the part which wisdom should choose under circumstances such as these ? Must she not adopt and act on the scripture ordinances, either till she can overthrow the evidence in favour of their divine origin, or else bring forward some other system with as strong, or stronger evidence in favour of its having such an origin ? The human mind, does, it is true, as Mr. Sturch says, come from God,

as also does the human body ; but nobody will therefore say that the human body is perfect. The human mind, be it granted, is a spark, a very dim spark, of the eternal mind ; but is it therefore to be regarded as affording a sure criterion of right ; and this, notwithstanding that it has, at different times, formed and adopted, and is still continually forming and adopting, creeds as different from each other as light from dark ?

Extol human reason never so much, it may still be affirmed of it, that as it is a judge whose decisions continually vary, as it operates in different minds, establishing in one what it rejects in another, so, it is impossible that it should ever afford any such criterion of right as can deserve our confidence, and trusting to it alone, we must for ever wander in the dark. But conscience, it will be said perhaps, is able to give us all the necessary light ; conscience, a monitor placed in our breasts by God himself ; evermore pointing out to us what is morally right, what wrong ; disposing us to the practice of one, dissuading us from the practice of the other.\* Now, that we have within us a certain faculty, approving and rewarding with self-complacency certain acts ; disapproving of and reproaching us for others, I am very willing to allow. But then that this faculty does of itself, and uniformly, point out, or approve, exactly those actions

which are morally right, and only those, whilst it as uniformly disapproves of those which are morally wrong, this I deny. For the consciences of a Turk and a Christian approve the most opposite things in the world, and it is obviously impossible that both should approve only those actions which are morally right. But, it may be said that Turks or Christians neither of them afford fair instances of what the natural conscience would dictate or approve, for that both are the slaves of unnatural habit, shackled by prejudice, and brought up under the tyranny of forms and faith, which men have devised and imposed on their fellow men. And truly, the natural conscience, whatever it is, must necessarily exist most perfectly in those men who are nearest a state of nature ; and if it be a perfect guide to any body, it must be so to them. Let us enquire then what is the fact. But, surely, sir, it cannot be necessary to examine this question ; a question which almost all accounts of almost all savages decide against them.\* It cannot be necessary to waste either my own time, or the reader's, in labouring to prove, that, though savages may possess some of the sterner virtues, yet, neither the love, practice, nor knowledge of pure morality dwell with them, or that they, and with them all other sorts and descriptions of men, not Christians, are far, very far, from having reached

---

\* This internal monitor which, enlightened by revelation, goads the Christian murderer in his most secret privacy, embitters also the death-bed of a North American Indian with the reflection that he has failed to wash out an injury received with the blood of the offender.

---

\* I refer the reader to Dr. Clarke's Account of the Circassians, Dr. Robertson's History of the native Americans, and various accounts of the African negroes, the Tartars, the Arabs, and the Egyptians, who, though not all perhaps *strictly* savages, are much nearer a state of nature than ourselves.



that moral standard to which we have attained. From all this I would infer, Sir, that as neither reason nor the natural conscience affords any certain guide to moral rectitude, or true religion, nor gives us any credible evidence that we practise them, nor even appear to constitute an authority of universal and paramount obligation; so, if there exist a rule of conduct affording any foreign evidence that it is and does all this, then is it the duty of rational beings to adopt it, and none other ought to have any weight; for there is none other whose evidence may not be adduced to prove equally the truth of opposing systems, and so give to every man, (for every man must be his own judge in that case) an independent standard or rule of right conduct peculiar to himself, or possessed by him in common with a few others. The crime of those who have had "the gospel preached unto them," and yet obey not its precepts, is exactly this therefore;—that they act upon a rule of conduct which is obviously imperfect, and entirely without credible evidence that it is right, (for it gives the same assurance of rectitude and safety to them supporting diametrically opposite systems) when they might adopt one which has some respectable external evidence, (evidence never overturned) that it is a perfect rule of moral and religious conduct, and comes from God himself. Far be it from me to suppose, that with heathens, conscience, whatever it dictates, is not the only guide that they are expected to obey. St. Paul decides this question by saying, *these having not the law, are*

a law unto themselves.\* This, however, has nothing to do with the present question, and affords no proof that conscience is a sure guide to moral and religious good, or one which it is safe to trust to when a better is at hand.

[To be concluded in our next.]

---

## JOHN MILTON.

*Unus Patronus bonæ causæ satis est.*

EPISCOPIUS.

No. XXXV.

*Sabbath.*

It is not the formal duty of worship, or the sitting still, that keeps the holy rest of sabbath; but whosoever doth most according to charity, whether he works or works not, he breaks the holy rest of sabbath least.

---

No. XXXVI.

*Schism.*

Schism is a rent or division in the church, when it comes to the separating of congregations; and may also happen to a true church as well as to a false; yet in the true needs not tend to the breaking of communion, if they can agree in the right administration of that wherein they communicate, keeping their other opinions to themselves, not being destructive to faith. The Pharisees and Sadducees were two sects, yet both met together in their common worship of God at Jerusalem. But here the Papist will angrily demand, What! Are Lutherans, Calvinists, Anabaptists, Socinians, Arminians, no heretics? I answer, *All these may have some errors,*

---

\* Rom. II. 14.

*but are no heretics.* Heresy is in the will and choice professedly against Scripture; error is against the will, in misunderstanding the Scripture, after all sincere endeavours to understand it rightly: hence it was said well by one of the ancients, *Err I may, but a heretic I will not be.* It is a human frailty to err, and no man is infallible here on earth. But so long as all these profess to set the word of God only before them as the rule of faith and obedience, and use all diligence and sincerity of heart, by reading, by learning, by study, by prayer for illumination of the Holy Spirit, to understand the rule and obey it, they have done what man can do: God will assuredly pardon them, as he did the friends of Job, good and pious men, tho' much mistaken, as there it appears, in some points of doctrine. But some will say, with Christians it is otherwise, whom God hath promised by his spirit to teach all things. True, all things absolutely necessary to salvation; but the hottest disputes among Protestants, calmly and charitably inquired into, will be found less than such.

The Lutheran holds consubstantiation; an error indeed, but not mortal. The Calvinist is taxed with predestination, and to make God the author of sin; not with any dishonourable thought of God, but it may be over-zealously asserting his absolute power, not without plea of Scripture. The Anabaptist is accused of denying infants their right to baptism; again they say, they deny nothing but what the Scripture denies them. The Arian and Socinian are charged to dispute against the Trinity: they affirm to believe the

Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, according to Scripture, and the apostolic creed; as for terms of Trinity, Triniunity, Co-essentiality, Tripersonality, and the like, they reject them as scholastic notions, not to be found in Scripture, which by a general Protestant maxim is plain and perspicuous abundantly to explain its own meaning, in the properest words, belonging to so high a matter, and so necessary to be known; a mystery indeed in their sophistic subtleties, but in Scripture a plain doctrine. Their other opinions are of less moment: They dispute the satisfaction of Christ, or rather the word *satisfaction*, as not scriptural: but they acknowledge him both God and their Saviour. The *Arminian*, lastly, is condemned for setting up free will against free grace; but the imputation he disclaims in all his writings, and grounds himself largely upon Scripture only. It cannot be denied that the authors or late revivers of all these sects or opinions were learned, worthy, zealous and religious men, as appears by their lives written, and the same of their many eminent and learned followers, perfect and powerful in the Scriptures, holy and unblameable in their lives: and it cannot be imagined that God would desert such painful and zealous labourers in his church, and oftentimes great sufferers for their conscience, to damnable errors and a reprobate sense, who had so often implored the assistance of his Spirit; but rather having made no man infallible, that he hath pardoned their errors, and accepts their pious endeavours, sincerely searching all things according to the rule of Scripture, with such guidance

and direction, as they can obtain of God by prayer. What Protestant then, who himself maintains the same principles, and disavows all implicit faith, would persecute and not rather charitably tolerate such men as these, unless he mean to abjure the principles of his own religion? If it asked, how far they should be tolerated? I answer, doubtless equally, as being all Protestants; that is, on all occasions to give account of their faith, either by arguing, preaching in their several assemblies, public writing and the freedom of printing. For if the *French* and *Polonian* Protestants enjoy all this liberty among Papists, much more may a Protestant justly expect it among Protestants; and yet sometimes here among us, the one persecutes the other upon every slight pretence.

No. XXXVII.

*Self Confidence.*

Glad therefore of such an able assistant, however at much distance, I resolved at length to put off into this wild and calumnious world. For God, it seems, intended to prove me, whether I durst alone take up a rightful cause against a world of disesteem, and found I durst.

No. XXXVIII.

*Truth.*

Truth indeed came once into the world with her divine Master, and was a perfect shape, most glorious to look on; but when he ascended, and his Apostles after him were laid asleep, then strait arose a wicked race of deceivers, who, as that story goes of the E-

gyptian Typhon, with his conspirators, how they dealt with the good Osiris, took the virgin Truth, hewed her lovely form into a thousand pieces, and scattered them to the four winds. From that time, ever since, the sad friends of Truth, such as durst appear, imitating the careful search that Isis made for the mangled body of Osiris, went up and down, gathering up limb by limb still as they could find them. We have not yet found them all, Lords and Commons, nor ever shall do, till her Master's second coming: he shall bring together every joint and member, and shall mould them into an immortal feature of loveliness and perfection. Suffer not these licensing prohibitions to stand at every place of opportunity, forbidding and disturbing them that continue seeking, that continue to do our obsequies to the torn body of our martyr'd saint.

No. XXXIX.

*Toleration.*

The Gospel commands us to tolerate one another, though of various opinions, and hath promised a good and happy event thereof; *Phil. iii. 15. Let us, therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded; and if in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you.* And we are bid, *1 Thess. v. 21. Prove all things, and hold fast that which is good.* St. Paul judged that not only to tolerate, but to examine and prove all things, was no danger to our holding fast of that which is good. How shall we prove all things, which includes all opinions at least founded on Scripture, unless we not only to-

erate them, but patiently hear them and seriously read them? If he who thinks himself in the truth, professes to have learnt it, not by implicit faith, but by attentive study of the Scriptures and full persuasion of heart, with what equity can he refuse to hear or read him, who demonstrates to have gained his knowledge by the same way? Is it a fair course to assert truth by arrogating to himself the only freedom of speech, and stopping the mouths of others equally gifted? ——— There is no learned man but will confess he hath much profited by reading controversies, his senses awaked, his judgment sharpened, and the truth which he holds more firmly established. If then it be profitable for him to read, why should it not at least be tolerable and free for his adversaries to write?

#### No. XL.

##### *Not born a Translator.*

I could have added that eloquent and right Christian discourse, written by *Erasmus* on this argument, not disagreeing in effect from *Bucer*. But this I hope will be enough to excuse me with the meer *Englishman*, to be no forger of new and loose opinions. Others may read him in his own phrase on the first to the *Corinthians*, and ease me who never could delight in long citations, much less in whole translations: whether it be natural disposition or education in me, or that my mother bore me a speaker of what God made mine own, and not a translator.

*Latinus in egypto sub nocte*

*and considered it to be*

*at noon, his embassy*

#### No. XL.

##### *Usurpations of Kings.*

It must needs seem strange, where men accustom themselves to ponder and contemplate things in their first original and institution, that kings, who, as all other officers of the public, were at first chosen and installed only by consent and suffrage of the people, to govern them as free men by laws of their own making, and to be, in consideration of that dignity and riches bestowed upon them, the intrusted servants of the commonwealth, should, notwithstanding, grow up to that dishonest encroachment, as to esteem themselves masters both of that great trust which they serve, and of the people that betruſted them, counting what they ought to do, both in discharge of their public duty, and for the great reward of honour and revenue which they receive, as done all of meer grace and favour; as if their power over us were by nature, and from themselves, or that God had sold us into their hands. Indeed, if the race of kings were eminently the best of men, as the breed at *Tutbury* is of horses, it would in reason then be their part only to command, our's only to obey. But kings by generation no way excelling others, and most commonly not being the wisest or worthiest by far of whom they claim to have the governing; that we should yield them subjection to our own ruin, or hold of them the right of our common safety, and our natural freedom by meer gift from the superfluity of their royal grace and beneficence, we may be sure was never the intention of God, whose ways are just and



equal: never the intent of nature, whose works are also regular; never of any people not wholly barbarous, whom prudence, or no more but human sense would have better guided when they first created kings, than so to nullify and tread to dirt the rest of mankind, by exalting one person and his lineage, without other merit looked after, but the mere contingency of a begetting, into an absolute and unaccountable dominion over them and their posterity.

## No. XLII.

*Wives.*

Bera and others say that divorce was granted, not for men, but to release afflicted wives. Palpably uxorious! Who can be ignorant that woman was created for man, and not man for woman? and that a husband may be injured as insufferably in marriage as a wife? What an injury is it after wedlock not to be beloved, what to be slighted, what to be contended with in point of house-rule, who shall be the head; and not for any parity of wisdom, for that were something reasonable, but out of a female pride? *I suffer not, saith St. Paul, the woman to usurp authority over the man.* If the apostle could not suffer it, into what mould is he mortified that can? Solomon saith that a bad wife is to her husband as rottenness to his bones, a continual dropping. *Better dwell in the corner of the house-top, or in the wilderness, than with such a one. Whoso hideth her, hideth the wind, and one of the four mischiefs that the earth cannot bear.* If the spirit

of God wrote such aggravations as these, and (as may be guest by these similitudes) counsels the man rather to divorce than to live with such a colleague; and yet on the other side expresses nothing of the wife's sufferings with a bad husband: Is it not most likely that God in his law had more pity towards man thus wedlocked, than towards the woman that was created for another? The same spirit relates to us the course which the Medes and Persians took by occasion of *Vashti*, whose meer denial to come at her husband's sending, lost her the being Queen any longer, and set up a wholesome law, *that every man should bear rule in his own house.* And the divine relater shews us not the least sign of disliking what was done; how should he, if Moses long before was nothing less mindful of the honour and pre-eminence due to man!

GLEANINGS; OR, SELECTIONS  
AND REFLECTIONS MADE IN  
A COURSE OF GENERAL READING.

## No. CXXXIX.

*Daniel De Foe an Universalist.*

Daniel De Foe was educated and continued through life in the profession of an orthodox Non-conformist. Nor did he escape the imputation of being even an enemy to religious liberty. It has however been conjectured in the following passage, by Dr. Kippis, that the author of Robinson Crusoe might possibly be disposed to soften the rigors of Calvinism, on one essential point.

“Many fine displays of natural sentiment occur in Robinson Crusoe's man *Friday*, and there is

on which, in reading it, appeared to the present writer particularly striking. It is in the conversation which Crusoe has with *Friday* concerning the devil. *Friday*, being informed by his master that God was stronger than the devil, asks, *if God much strong, much might as the devil, why God not kill the devil, so make him no more wicked?* At this question Crusoe was greatly surprised and embarrassed; but, having recovered himself a little, he answered, that God would at last punish the devil severely; that he is reserved for judgment, and is to be cast into the bottomless pit, to dwell with everlasting fire. Still, however, *Friday* not being satisfied, returns upon his master, repeating his words; *Reserve at last! Me no understand: but why not kill the devil now, not kill great ago?* 'You may as well ask me,' replied Crusoe, 'why God does not kill you and me, when we do wicked things here that offend him; we are preserved to repent and be pardoned.' At this *Friday* mused awhile, and then said, mighty affectionately: *Well, well, that well; so you, I, devil, all wicked, all preserve, repent, God pardon all.* Perhaps it would be going too far to assert, that De Foe intended covertly to insinuate that there might be a more merciful distribution of things, in the final results of Divine Providence than he dared at that time openly to exhibit." *Biog. Brit.* 2d. ed. V. 60 and 75.

#### No. CXL.

##### *Mahometan Calvinism.*

God hath revealed a most excellent discourse; a book con-

formable to itself, and containing repeated admonitions. . . . . This is the direction of God: he will direct thereby whom he pleaseth; and whomsoever God shall cause to err, he shall have no director. Shall he therefore who shall be obliged to screen himself with his face from the severity of the punishment on the day of resurrection, be as he who is secure therefrom? And it shall be said unto the ungodly, Taste that which ye have deserved.

*Koran, (Sale's) V. II. p. 328.*

#### No. CXLI.

##### *A Mourning Mother.*

The lady of a noble Venetian lost her only son, and in consequence became a prey to the most excruciating sorrow. A reverend prelate, to console her, reminded her, among other things, how great must have been the affliction of Abraham, who, nevertheless, without murmuring, obeyed the commands of heaven, and was prepared to sacrifice his beloved, his only son! Ah! holy father, replied the lady, in all the poignant emphasis of grief—God would never have exacted such a sacrifice of a mother!

#### No. CXLII.

##### *Illuminations in Heaven.*

Poets have seen strange sights in Heaven, but none a stranger than that described by Sir Richard Blackmore, viz. an *illumination*! This fine spectacle was exhibited on the creation of man, when, the sacred poet contented himself with fancying the sons of God shouting for joy.

Now when the evening came, or what  
instead  
Of evening there does in its turn suc-  
ceed,

*Glorious Illuminations* made on high  
By all the stars and planets of the sky,  
In just degrees and shining order  
plac'd,  
Spectators charm'd and the bless'd  
dwellings grac'd.

Thro' all th' enlighten'd air swift *Fire-  
works* flew,  
Which with repeated shouts glad che-  
rubs threw.

Comets ascended with their sweeping  
train,

Then fell in starry show'rs and glit-  
tering rain.

In air ten thousand meteors blazing  
hung,

Which from th' eternal battlements  
were flung,

Such universal joy in heav'n they  
shew'd,

Such mirth and triumph did the day  
conclude.

Prince Arthur. B. ii. 4th ed.  
18mo. (1714) pp. 49, 50.

### No. CXLIII.

*Sentiment from Mirabeau.*

Alas, what do we gain by ha-  
ving men. In order to live among  
them must we not practice for-  
bearance! Have they not all  
more of good than bad. Let us  
not exaggerate: if we paint the  
*dangers* that surround us, let us  
not conceal our multiplied plea-  
sures. We talk of our misfortunes  
and forget our felicities. We be-  
hold, it is said, more of vice and  
suffering, than of virtue and en-  
joyment; but this is not true, for  
the world continues and society  
subsists. If there were more of  
evil than of good we should all be  
annihilated.

### No. CXLIV.

*William Penn.*

(From an American Magazine.)

Penn, the founder and legisla-  
tor of the colony of Pennsylvania,  
had both great and amiable qua-  
lities, and was no stranger to the  
essentials of good breeding, though  
he was too stubborn to yield to  
the forms of it. He had, or af-  
fected to have, all the spirit of  
the *Hat*, which availed him  
much as the leader of a people who  
made it part of their religion. We  
are informed that he sat with his  
hat on before Charles II. and the  
king, as a gentle rebuke for his  
ill manners, put off his own. Up-  
on which Penn said to him,  
"Friend Charles, why dost thou  
not keep on thy hat?" The king  
answered, "It is the custom of  
this place that never above *one*  
person should be covered at a  
time."

### No. CXLV.

*Consolation for the Afflicted.*

A poor Dervise, whose feet  
were naked for want of shoes,  
made a pilgrimage to Mecca,  
cursing his unhappy fate and ac-  
cusing heaven of cruelty. When  
he arrived at the gate of the grand  
mosque of Coufa, he perceived  
a poor man who had by some ac-  
cident lost both his feet. The  
sight of a man more unfortunate  
than himself afforded him con-  
solation, and convinced him that  
the distress was greater to be  
without feet than without shoes.

## BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

*Mr. Jones's Vindication of the Common Greek Text in Acts, xx. 28.*

The reply made by Dr. Lloyd does more credit to his pen as a scholar than to his candour as an enquirer after truth. The only question in which the public are concerned respects the purity of the common text in Acts. xx. 28: and this I will proceed to establish to the confusion of Griesbach and Dr. Lloyd.

First, The authority of versions and manuscripts, though denied by Dr. L. greatly preponderates in favour of *του Θεου*. For the Arabic version reads *Lord God*. The author of the Syriac was a believer in the divinity of Christ; and he seems to have inserted the term corresponding to *Dominus* as an interpretation of *του Θεου*. This is no more than what every critic would have done under the influence of the same bias. Of the Æthiopic, Griesbach says, "*Æthiops habet vocabulum, quo semper utitur sive Θεος in Græca veritate legatur, sive κυριος. Neutri igitur lectioni, si solus spectetur, favet.*" What is the reader to understand by this assertion? Assuredly, that in the Æthiopic version a word is used which, like *Lord* in English, or *κυριος* in Greek, applies to Jesus Christ, as well as to God. This, Wakefield asserts to be infamously false." Such a charge against a critic of so grave and honoured a name ought either not to have been made, or to be justified. Dr. L. takes it for granted that Mr. W. is mis-

taken: and holds him forth to scorn and censure as no critic. It is time that Wakefield should be vindicated, and the disgrace transferred to Griesbach. The original term, in the Æthiopic version, is *YGZY BAHER*. Ludolph. in p. 286 of his *Lexicon*, explains this to mean, *Deus ter optimus ter maximus*; and then adds, *Cui (i. e. deo), soli hoc nomen tribuitur*. It is a compound word explained by the Æthiopians to mean *Lord of regions*. Walton under the Hebrew *אגז* *agaz* interprets the same word as meaning, "*Dominus universæ regionis*;" and then subjoins *Soli Deo tribuitur*. Thus is Mr. Wakefield vindicated, and Griesbach dishonoured by one of the grossest misrepresentations that can occur in the whole compass of biblical criticism. Dr. Lloyd may affect not to be implicated in this vindication; but he cannot by such affectation blind his readers; and if he were candid, he would acknowledge his error and kiss the rod. I do not indeed adopt Mr. W's. interpretation of the verse. He is, I think, mistaken, but his mistake can be accounted for without supposing in him a defect of judgment, or a want of skill in his art. The supposition is harsh and ungenerous; and would be condemned by all candid and competent judges. Luke, who wrote the Acts, was undoubtedly a Jew; and as such, though he wrote in Greek, thought in Hebrew. Mr. W. might suppose, as Michaelis did, that he was a Gen-



tile, or at least a *Hellenistic Jew*, i. e. a Jew born and bred in a Gentile country; and being accustomed to the language and phraseology of Greece, he, or the apostle Paul, whose address to the Gentile converts he relates, might insensibly use an idiom sanctioned by the purest Greek writers. The Editor of the *Monthly Repository* shewed me an eminent biblical critic who, before the days of Wakefield, has given the very same interpretation and justifies the rendering of *αἵμα* or sanguis, by *son*, on the authority of Homer and Virgil.

Secondly, The authority of *manuscripts* greatly preponderates in favour of *τοῦ Θεοῦ*, over *τοῦ κυρίου*. This Dr. Lloyd denies, but it is to no purpose to contradict a fact. Some manuscripts, and the Vulgate, it is allowed, read *τοῦ Θεοῦ*. And here we should remember Orisbach's own words; "Itaque legendum erit vel *κυρίου*, vel *κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ*. Posterior lectio habetur in 47 græcis libris, hoc est in majore codicum adhuc collatorum parte." These forty-seven manuscripts then sanction *τοῦ Θεοῦ* as the genuine reading; and as they evidently apply the words to God, they militate against *τοῦ κυρίου*, as intended for Christ. But let us suppose that the ancient authorities are nearly balanced. I will still prove from other considerations the genuine reading to be *τοῦ Θεοῦ*.

1. No such reading as *ἐκκλησία τοῦ κυρίου* occurs in any other part of the N. T. The presumption then is that it is not the true reading in this place. On the other hand, the phrase *ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ* was most familiar to the apostle Paul: and the

frequency and uniformity with which it occurs, shew that in the apostolic age it had in its application to the assemblies of Christians acquired something similar to the invariable and fixed use of a proper name. Add to this, that, in the context, the writer uses the expressions, "the gospel of the grace of God," "the counsel of God," "the kingdom of God." The mere impulse of association would therefore have led him here to add, "the church of God" in preference to "the church of the Lord," especially as the former phrase was most familiar to him. And the latter not at all.

2d. The apostolic writers, and after them the more early fathers, employed the phrase "Church of God," to denote the Catholic believers, in opposition to the *heretics* or assemblies of *worldly men*. I repeat the following instance from my *Sequel*. "As God," says Origen, "who sent Jesus, having defeated all the artifices of demons, has so ordered it that the gospel of Jesus, should prevail every where for reforming mankind; and that there should be every where teachers governed by law, different from the churches of superstitious, intemperate and unrighteous men. For such are the manners of most of those who belong to the churches of the cities. But the churches of God instructed by Christ, compared with the churches of the people among whom they live, are as lights in the world. And who is there that must not acknowledge that the worst of those who are in the church, and are inferior to the rest, are better than most of those who are in the churches of the people. For instance, the

church of God at Athens is quiet, mild and well-behaved, being desirous to approve itself to God, who is over all. But the church of the Athenians is turbulent, and by no means comparable to the church of God there. The same you must also acknowledge of the church of God at Corinth, and the church of the people of the Corinthians; as you must also allow of the church of God at Alexandria, and the church of the people of the Alexandrians. Every one who is candid and diligently attends to these things with a mind open to conviction will admire him who formed this design, and has accomplished it, that there should be every where churches of God, dwelling with the churches of the people in every city: and if you observe the senate of the church of God, and the senate in every city, you will find some senators of the church worthy to govern in the city of God all over the world, if there were such a thing. And on the other hand, you will find that the senators of cities have nothing in their behaviour to render them worthy of the distinction allotted them. And if you compare the presidents of the churches of God with the presidents of the people in the cities, you will find the senators and governors of the churches, though some may be inferior to others who are most perfect; nevertheless you will find them to excel in virtue the senators and governors of the cities." In this and similar passages, "the church of God" means a people devoted to God by superior virtue in opposition to other men. The apostle uses the phrase with the same point of contrast in the disputed

verse, as he evidently alludes to the Gnostic impostors calling them wolves who wished to devour the flock. Read *ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ κυρίου* and the contrast is quite destroyed.

3. The reading of *τοῦ κυρίου* is intended to solve a difficulty which can be solved in another and better way. I expressed my belief that a noun intended to limit the object of a verb cannot be made the subject of another in the same sentence. Instances however may occur of this construction though not justified by the common use of language. Thus *τοῦ Θεοῦ* repeated and changed cannot naturally, much less necessarily, be taken as the agent to *περιεποιήσατο*; nor could the reader think of such a thing, unless he were driven on this expedient by the absence of an appropriate nominative case. But the expedient is not requisite here; as in speaking and writing it is usual with all men to omit the leading subject of discourse if it were notorious from the context who that subject might be. Thus "Feed the church of God, which *he*—he who under God is the principal subject of my preaching—he on whose death I insist in opposition to the deceivers that deny his death,—secured with his blood." Examples of this omission are not unfrequent in the N. T. Thus, "Beloved, now we are the children of God: and it doth not yet appear what we shall be. But we know that when *he* appears we shall be like unto him." 1 John iii. 2. If we interpret this passage by the strict rules of grammar, *he* must be taken for God, the only antecedent before mentioned. But it evidently means

*Jesus.* And this is a case exactly in point. Again, "In this we know the love of God, because he laid down his life for us." 1 John iii. 16. The common translation has *of God* in italics; because *του Θεου* is not in many copies of the original. Some authorities however have it, and I doubt not but that *την αγαπην του Θεου* came from the hands of the apostle. The *love* mentioned is assuredly the love of God the Father; and it is thus referred to him in many parallel passages, See John iii. 16. Rom. v. 8. viii. 32. 1 John iv. 9. If then the passage can be explained on this principle, all argument for *του κυριου* falls like dead weight to the ground.

4. Lastly. The reading of *του κυριου*, if false, can easily be accounted for; as it is but a wrong interpretation dictated by a mistaken notion of Christ. The authors of all the versions and manuscripts were believers in his divinity: and as they were disposed to wrest every passage in defence of that doctrine, they wrote *κυριου* in explanation of *Θεου* on the margin of their copies; which in time crept into the text: and this will account for the reading of *Θεου και κυριου*. In their discourses or apologies they also quoted the passage with this explanation; and the quotation became in time considered an *authentic reading*. On the other hand, the reading of *του Θεου*, if not genuine, implies the most improbable violence. For it would be then a *direct and deliberate forgery*, and such a forgery as no one would attempt; because if it passed for the genuine reading, it would afford but a remote and

doubtful argument for the divinity of Christ. Which reading then is the more improbable, that which is the dictate of fraud, or of prejudice? We daily see the effects of the latter in the versions and interpretations of many good, but mistaken men. Whereas, those of the former seldom occur.—Through every age the jealousies and animosities of different sects, the respect which all parties paid to the scriptures as they were delivered by Christ and his apostles; the great variety of copies, and the difficulty of producing uniformity precluded the successful attempt at forgery among any class of Christians. These causes have guarded the Greek text with scrupulous accuracy; nor is there a passage in the N. T. with the exception of the introductory chapters in Matthew and Luke, and the three witnesses in John, that betrays the hand of fraud.

These arguments when known and examined will for ever settle the genuineness of the common Greek reading, and dissipate the rubbish which Griesbach has heaped together under the appearance of learning.

JOHN JONES:

*Dr. Lloyd's Translation of the principal and most essential part of Griesbach's note on Acts xx. 28.*

SIR,

If no one of your learned correspondents should have furnished you with a complete translation of Griesbach's note on Acts xx. 28. a part of it which I now send, and which, perhaps, will be found faithfully rendered, is at your service.

The first portion of the learned critic's note is occupied in giving a summary of the authorities for the different readings of the text, as deduced from M.SS. from Versions, and from the Fathers. To none would it be of the least use to copy the numerous abbreviations which he employs, while the revision of the proof, as well as the printing, would occasion no small perplexity. To fill up those abbreviations would be a task to which my time and resources render me inadequate. And the unlearned reader would derive little benefit from the performance. The learned theologian cannot be without the original. The critic's review of the evidence, which forms the greater and more important half of the note in question, will, probably, be found to answer every valuable purpose, although I frankly confess that the difficulty of rendering it completely intelligible to the English reader is far more formidable than I suspected when I took the liberty of recommending its appearance in your excellent Magazine.

C. LL.

N. B. The various readings which Griesbach has thought deserving of any notice, are *του θεου του κυριου, του κυριου και θεου, του θεου και κυριου, του κυριου θεου, and του χριστου*. He scarcely deigns to consider the three last, because they are nearly without authority.—TRANSLATOR.

“That the reader may himself judge of the character of the manuscripts which contain the reading *θεου*, let him run over the margin of Wetstein's edition, in the Acts of the Apostles, from the beginning to the end, and observe the readings of those M.SS. as there furnished. But if he has it not in his power to peruse that edition, I will here

present to his attention some things which I have observed on reviewing, with this intention, all that medley of various readings.

I. Codex 4,\* written so late as the 15th century, contains an immense number of various, and even singular readings, partly valuable, and partly to be rejected without hesitation: as, for example, Acts ix. 20. xi. 3, &c. &c. Compare also Rom. xiv. 17. xvi. 13. 2 Cor. ii. 17. 1 Thess. iv. 15. Therefore, this copy, when alone, or when agreeing with others of small merit, is of no importance.

II. Codex 7. is seldom quoted;† so that it appears to be either supported by an assemblage of other M.SS. or possessed of additions altogether peculiar to itself;‡ for example, Acts xxi. 16. xxii. 20, 23, &c. &c.

III. Codex 12 and 22 are to be accounted nearly as not collated; and for that reason they are to be looked upon as of no authority. Codex 22, as far as I can judge, from the few readings of it which have come to my knowledge, is near of kin to Codex 4, and Codex 37.§ This copy alone has *θεος*, God, in James iv. 15. instead of *κυριος*, Lord.

IV. Codex 25 is to be considered in the number of the better, though not of the best M.SS. See Wetstein at Acts v. 24. xi. 21,

\* This is the manner in which the different copies of the original are distinguished, according to a table given at the beginning of each volume of Griesbach's edition of the Greek Testament.—Translator.

† i. e. probably, is seldom referred to, by Wetstein, on any occasion.—Trans.

‡ These are the reasons why it is seldom noticed by Wetstein.—Trans.

§ See No. 1. above, and No. V. below.—Trans.



&c. &c. It seldom or never agrees with the M.SS. which, in this place, read *θεου*, but belongs to another family.\*

V. Codex 37 is every where interpolated by glosses and absurd interpretations, of which that should be especially compared with our present text, which is read at Acts xiii. 41. in this copy and among the scholia of Matthæi's copy *d*; thus, *οτι ο θεος σταυρωται και αποθνησκει*, *God is crucified and dies*. Besides, respecting this copy 37, compare Wets. at Acts ii. 24, xii. 20, &c. &c, and in the Epistles of Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 29, &c. &c.

VI. Codex 64 and 65, which are those of Vienna, very seldom furnish a reading of better note, if the same be not found in a great many other M.SS.

VII. The Upsal Codex, 68, sometimes, to be sure, agrees with the best copies, as may be seen even from my selection of various readings in this work; but when it differs from these in the Acts, as in this place, it coincides with the second edition of the works of Theophylact, containing a text and commentary of the Acts, which has been published by Finettus, and which I am accustomed to refer to under the designation of *Theoph. 2*. From these things it is easy to judge of the character, age and country of this Upsal copy. If any one should wish to weigh more accurately the value of the readings

which are either peculiar to this manuscript, or common to it and a few others only, may consult in Aurivillius, who published the Upsal variations, the following places, Acts ix. 24. xii. 13, &c. &c.

VIII. All the other M.SS. which have, or appear to have, *θεου*, that is to say, 16. 23. 39. 46. 56. nay, and even 4. 7. 22. and 37. are related to one another by a close affinity. Consult Wets. at Acts xi. 28. xii. 25, &c. &c. All that can be said of this whole family of M.SS. is, merely that it does not always differ from the good readings of the few copies. But readings to be found in this set alone, if some belonging to Codex 16 be excepted, are of very little value.

From all these things it clearly appears that *θεου* is not supported by even one good MS. which, from its antiquity, or its intrinsic excellence, can be complimented with the title of a competent and uncorrupted witness. It is not found, except in modern copies, and those either to be altogether despised, or miserably interpolated, at least in many places. Nor yet is it capable of supporting itself by the authority of versions. For no translation has *θεου*, except the modern Vulgate, which the more ancient Latin M.SS. contradict, and the Philoxenian Syriac, which was done in the sixth century only, and even this itself furnishes *κυριου* in the margin. And, lastly, no certain indications of the reading *θεου* can be traced in the Fathers before Epiphanius (who, even in the MS. copy belonging to the library of the University of Jena, has *θεου* at both

\* The manuscripts are divided into three families, as it is expressed, as they severally proceeded from the revisions or editions, as they are called, of the West, of Alexandria, and of Constantinople.

the places above cited,\*) and Ambrose. I cannot, therefore, understand how, in consistency with the laws of criticism, the reading *Θεου*, destitute as it is of all proper authority, can be defended.

Nor can an enlightened judge be satisfied with the reading *Χριστου*, which the Syriac,† with its follower, the Erpenian Arabic version, and a very few of the fathers furnish. For it is found in no Greek copy, but is a gloss, intended to explain the sense of the ambiguous word *κυριου*; because, if the authors of the gloss‡ had found *Θεου* in their Greek copies, the phrase *του υιου του Θεου* would have appeared to them, without the shadow of a doubt, far more suitable, as an interpretation of that word, than the word *Χριστου*.

Therefore we shall be obliged to read either *κυριου*, or *κυριου και Θεου*. The latter reading is found in 47 Greek M.SS. that is, in the greater part of the copies that have been yet collated. But 1. Not one of the most ancient copies is found in this multitude. For Codex G. although in capital letters, yet in the opinion of Montfaulcon, was not written before the ninth century. 2. Not one of the most excellent copies, and but scarcely one here and there of the others which exhibit in many places some good and ancient readings, such as 26. 27. 29. 31. and Matthæi's 1. reads *κυριου*, *και Θεου*. 3. No version supports this reading, except the Polyglott Arabic,|| that sink of the most

recent and abominable readings, and the Slavonic version, made in the ninth century, from copies of the Constantinople edition, *recensio*. 4. This reading has been met with in the writings of not one of the fathers, whether Greek or Latin, Theophylact alone excepted; while the second and third editions, however, by Finettus, of the commentaries on the Acts, attributed to him, contradict even this exception. 5. This reading was manifestly fabricated out of two readings of different M.SS. From the same source came *κυριου Θεου*, without the copulative found in Cod. 3. and *Θεου κυριου*, inverting the order of the words which is read in Cod. 7.\*

---

fact, *του κυριου Θεου*, as Griesbach had observed before.—*Trans.*

\* The translator presumes to differ entirely from the learned critic in this account of the irreption of these readings into the M.SS. It is inevitable, and would be proved, if necessary, by numerous examples, that the Librarii, transcribers, frequently *orthodoxised*. Of this, proofs are to be met with even in this celebrated note of Griesbach. They could not resist the opportunity of adding *Θεου* to *κυριου*, which would give him who shed his *own blood* one of the highest and most appropriate titles of the Supreme being. They could have no motive of adequate force to insert *κυριου*, if their copies had *Θεου*, unless it should be *after Θεου*, which has not been done but by one copyist. I am prepared to shew that, in that situation, it might have related to Jesus Christ, in contradistinction from *του Θεου*, contrary to the laboured, but futile deduction of Dr. Middleton, in his work on the Greek Article, otherwise highly valuable; and, if that should be made out, the incongruity of ascribing *blood* to the Almighty would have been avoided, if the transcribers, good souls, felt any anxiety on that head. But of this there is not the least indication, as they all but one inserted

---

\* In the former part of this note. *Trans.*

† The Peschito. *Trans.*

‡ That is, the Syriac translators and the fathers. *Trans.*

|| The Arabic of the Polyglott has, in

Now since all these things are so, I cannot help preferring κυριου to all the other readings. (1.) The most ancient copies; copies proceeding from different families; the most excellent copies, and such as seldom or never agree in any reading without producing the approbation of the most skilful critics; the copies which merit these various characters read κυριος. See, for example, Acts ii. 13. 17. iii. 11. &c. &c. (2.) The ancient Versions, whether made from the Alexandrian or Western recension, confirm the same reading. And (3.) the fathers, in sufficient number, and of sufficient antiquity, both Greek and Latin, concur. In the whole of the Acts of the Apostles I have followed the same witnesses as in this place support κυριου, if they were found to agree in their testimony. Wherefore, I should not have been consistent with myself, if, while relying on their authority, I had determined otherwise than I have done.

But it may be objected, 1st, that κυριου crept in from the version of the Seventy, in which

κυριου before Θεου, if κυριου be the insertion, which I deny. Had they been puzzled by the attribution of blood to the Almighty, how was it possible that they should have gone to magnify the difficulty, by the introduction of κυριου in such a conjunction with Θεου as increases the force of the epithet a thousand fold. But, on the supposition that they orthodoxized, some would substitute Θεος, at first, perhaps, as a gloss, for κυριος, and at length as a part of the text; and some would add it to κυριος with the copulative, till the whole variation was completed. If Θεος had been the reading of the autograph, the present variety cannot be accounted for on any rational principle.

εκκλησια του κυριου very often occurs, whence this expression was familiar to the book-writers; and, while they were careless what they were doing, dropped from their pen. I answer: θεου more probably crept in, either from a parallel place, 1 Pet. v. 2, ποιμανατε το εν υμιν ποιμνιον του θεου, επισκοπουντες, κ. τ. λ., or from the epistles of Paul, in which εκκλησια του θεου, the church of God, occurs eleven times, εκκλησια του χριστου, the church of Christ, but once only, and εκκλησια του κυριου, the church of the Lord, not once. The book-makers, therefore, who copied the M. SS. of the N. T., caught up a form of expression exceedingly familiar to them, both from their own reading and from the public recitation of it. 2ndly, in a speech delivered by Paul, that reading appears to be worthy of preference, which is more agreeable to the apostle's manner of speaking in other places, and that is, as we have seen, εκκλησια του θεου, the church of God. I answer: the substance of this speech was not committed to writing by Paul himself, but by Luke, who is accustomed to employ εκκλησια, the church, simply, without any addition. There is no propriety, therefore, in appealing to the style of Paul in this question. Nay, in this very speech, the Father is always so distinguished from the Son, that the former is invariably called Θεος, God, and the latter κυριος, Lord; v. 19, 21, 24, 25, 27, 32, 35. The same distinction ought, therefore, to be observed in v. 28. 3rdly. The more unusual, difficult, harsh, and apparently false reading, of which description is that which ascribes αιμα, blood,

668 *On the Use of Vocal and Instrumental Music in Public Worship.*

του θεου, *to God*, ought to be preferred to all others.\* I answer: this canon of criticism is to be understood of a difficult and unusual reading which is supported by the authority at least of some grave and ancient witnesses. For, a reading, clearly destitute of competent witnesses, can by no means be defended on the ground of its difficulty merely. Besides, in that age in which the copies now remaining were transcribed, the form of expression in discussion was neither altogether unusual, nor did it seem at that time harsh or false to most Catholics. These, on the contrary, took delight in dainty morsels of this nature, and frequently used them as an indubitable token, and, as it were, a pledge of their orthodoxy. If then it had been written in express terms, 'θεος δια του ιδιου αιματος περιεποιησατε την εκκλησιαν, *God with his own blood purchased the church*, the ancient theologians, in their controversies with heretics of various descriptions concerning the natures and person of Christ, would, without doubt, have appealed again and again to so remarkable a text. But so far were they from using this weapon in demolishing their adversaries, that on the contrary, the more ancient fathers, and, among them, even Athanasius himself against Apollinaris, deny that αιμα θεου, *the blood of God*, is to be found in the holy scriptures. 4thly. It may be objected, that the copies which have κυριου και θεου do in a manner

confirm the reading of θεου.† It is answered as often as two readings are exhibited in conjunction, that, which appears alone in the greater number of the more ancient and more excellent copies, is to be considered as preferable to that which is not found alone except in a few records, and those more recent and of less value.—5thly. The Latin book-writers probably set down DNI, domini, instead of DEI; and from such Latin copies those Greek M.SS. which have κυριου were, perhaps, corrupted. Answer: The more ancient Latin books favour the reading Domini, and the more modern ones only favour the reading, Dei. Besides, I trust that no critic of the present age will give credit to the exploded fable of the Greek copies latinizing.‡

*On the use of Vocal and Instrumental Music in Public Worship. Part II.*

(Continued from p. 466.)

7. Tertullian (a Carthaginian writer who flourished at the end of the second and the beginning of the third century,) is our next authority. He affords us very considerable room to believe, that in his time and country singing was employed in the public worship of the Christians. “There

† This is a curious argument, as if they do not also confirm the reading κυριου. Indeed, they confirm little or nothing in the question. *Trans.*

‡ Probably we should except from this observation the copy, D, of Theodore Beza, the Cambridgeman of Dr. Kipling, which copy seems to latinize. See Appendix to Dr. Middleton on the Greek Article. *Trans.*

\* This is an approved canon of criticism which Griesbach has adopted in the preface to his edition. *Trans.*



is among us," he says "at this day, a sister who has obtained the gift of revelation, which she experiences by a spiritual ecstasis, in the church, during the solemnities of the Lord's day. She converses with angels, and sometimes also with the Lord;" "and while the scriptures are read, or the psalms sung, or the discourses delivered, or the prayers offered, materials for her visions are supplied by them."\*—This passage decisively proves that devotional singing was employed among the social religious exercises of the Christians; but it does not appear certain, whether Tertullian refers solely to their public worship, properly so called, or includes the religious exercises during their agapæ or love feasts. If the latter, the singing alluded to might have been that which we know, from another passage, was employed during the agapæ: but the natural meaning of the above quotation, is decidedly in favour of the supposition that Tertullian refers to singing in public worship; and I think this supported by the circumstance, that he understood Pliny as stating (in the passage already quoted in § ii. p. 461.) that the Christians in Asia Minor sang their hymn in praise of Christ. The only difficulty is, that when he is expressly speaking of the public worship of the Christians,† he does not mention singing: but neither does he the reading of the scriptures; and he is not, like Justin Martyr, giving a regular detail of the distinct parts and manner of their public worship.

At the conclusion of Tertullian's account of their agapæ,† we find that "*whoever was able* was called out into the middle, to sing a psalm to God, from the Holy Scriptures, or of his own composing." This is, I believe, the only intimation we have of the *nature* of the social singing among the Carthaginian Christians, in Tertullian's time; and we seem to have ground to infer from it, that their public devotional singing was similar to that which (if it really were singing) was practised among the Christians of whom Pliny speaks; it was performed by a single individual in the presence of his fellow Christians. (See p. 462.)

There are, as far as I can find, only two other passages in Tertullian's works referring to singing, which are quoted in King's Primitive Church, P. II. ch. i. § 4, 6. These clearly prove that singing was common among the Carthaginian Christians in his time, in their more private exercises of devotion; but they do not at all affect our present inquiry.

It may be observed that we have no reason to suppose Tertullian acquainted with the constitution and discipline of the European or Asiatic churches; and it is clear, that we derive no information from him, quite decisive as to the *practice* of the Carthaginian Christians on the subject of instrumental music with their devotional singing, and no information whatever as to their *opinions* respecting it.—I see, however, no reason to suppose that they did employ it with their devotional singing.

\* De anima, c. ix. p. 270. Par. 1675.

† Apology, c. 39.

† Or as Ld. King erroneously supposes, of the Lord's supper. Apol. c. xxxix. p. 32.

8. Our next evidence is Origen (A. D. 184—253), one of the most truly eminent among the fathers for abilities and virtues. He must have been well acquainted with the practice of the Alexandrian, and of the Grecian and Asiatic churches. Though too late to be of very great importance in our inquiry, what he says connected with the subject must at least be interesting, and I feel disappointed at my inability to add any thing to the passage quoted in King's *Primitive Church*, (ch. i. § 5), or even to ascertain its full import, as I have no access to the work of Origen's in which that passage occurs. Origen there represents it as impossible, without the aid of the divine spirit, to sing (*ψαλλει*) with good modulation or in good time, or harmoniously to praise (*ὑμνησαι*) the Father by Christ. This passage (which is quoted from the *Treatise De Oratione*, § vi. p. 7.) if *ψαλλω* had not yet lost its appropriate signification, (see p. 464, note †) affords a presumptive proof that the Christians in Origen's time, in the countries where he lived, employed instrumental music with their devotional singing; but I imagine that it particularly refers to their more private exercises of devotion.

Such, Sir, is all the original evidence I can collect from any quarter respecting the practice of the Christians of the first two centuries immediately succeeding the death of Christ; and I think it will be allowed on all sides to afford no guide as to the practice and directions of the apostles. It affords, I admit, no corroboration to the conclusions I drew from my examination of the New Tes-

tament; nor, on the other hand, does it in any way oppose them. —The fact appears to be, that (though what we know respecting the practice and general directions of the apostles, may afford us some guidance as to the conduct of public worship,) too little is known to enable us to form an authoritative system of regulations on the subject; that they left the matter as they found it, to be determined by circumstances which are continually varying, according to the manners and customs of the age, the degree of mental culture, &c. and that all we have to do, is to take care that our practice is accordant with the principles of the human mind, and with the spiritual nature of Christian worship. The worship must have nothing in it to fetter the mind to feelings inconsistent with the latter; nor must it be so remote from the former, as to have nothing accordant with the actual state of humanity, and to be fit only for minds which have reached the highest states of refinement both of intellect and of affection.

From the data which I have collected, few conclusions of a positive nature can be securely drawn, but the following inferences appear to myself tolerably satisfactory.

1. During those periods in which persecution was most prevalent among the Roman, Grecian, and Asiatic Christians, singing seldom if ever formed a part of their public worship.

2. During the same periods, the arts would be little cultivated among them; and instrumental music would, from the same cause, naturally fall into disuse. The circumstances of the Christians as

a persecuted people would be aided in producing this effect by the licentious use which was made of music in the public spectacles and religious rites of the heathens.

3. Among the Alexandrian Christians in the latter part of the 2d century, singing was very common in their more private devotional exercises, and probably also in their public worship; and the use of instrumental music in the former (at least) appears not to have been regarded by them as blameworthy, because sanctioned by the practice of the pious psalmist. As this argument equally holds with respect to their singing in social worship, it may be inferred that whatever were their *practice*, their *principles* did not oppose the use of it there also.\*

4. As far as we can collect respecting the singing of the African Christians in the second century, it did not resemble our congregational singing, but was performed by a single individual, or at most by a part only of the congregation.

5. That we have no means of

---

\* What really was their practice I cannot absolutely decide to my own satisfaction. The argument in favour of their employing instrumental music in public worship, I have already stated (see p. 464.); on the other hand it may be supposed that Clemens would scarcely think it necessary to justify the employment of it in their devotional singing at social entertainments by referring to the example of David, if it had been commonly employed in the public worship of the church. It is a point of some difficulty, but as appears to me of no great importance. I apprehend that we are as good judges of the propriety of the practice as Clemens; and that we are at least as favourably situated for knowing what was the practice of the apostles.

coming to any general conclusion respecting the practice and opinions of the Christians in the age succeeding the apostolic, as to the employment of instrumental and vocal music in devotional exercises; nor consequently to any conclusion whatever, except from the scriptures, respecting the practice and opinions of the apostles themselves. There is nothing (as far as I can discover,) in the contemporary records of the first two centuries, which can invalidate the conclusions formerly drawn from an examination of the N. T. (See p. 127.)

While examining Burney's *History of Music* and Bingham's *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, I made some memoranda, a few of which it may be desirable to add here, as illustrative of the progress of devotional music, and others as opposing my own views of the subject.

Burney says (vol. ii. p. 9), "Eusebius tells us that a regular choir and method of singing the service were first introduced, and hymns used in the church, at Antioch, the capital of Syria, during the time of Constantine (A. D. 306—337), and that St. Ambrose who had long resided there, had his melodies thence." —It is not, however, to be inferred from this passage (even if correctly stated by Burney), that singing had not been previously employed at all in the public worship of the Christian church. It was one of the *charges* made against Paul of Samosata (A. D. 270.) "that he abolished the Psalms which were wont to be sung to the honour of our Lord Jesus Christ, as novel, and composed by modern authors; and

that he appointed women to sing psalms in honour of himself, in the midst of the church, on the great day of the passover."—I suppose this was originally said in the same way as it now sometimes is, that such a one sings to his own praise and glory.

(Burney, p. 10.) The council of Laodicea (A. D. 314 or 319.) forbade all to sing in the church, except the singing canons.

(Burney, p. 25.) "After the most diligent inquiry concerning the time when instrumental music had admission into the ecclesiastical services, there is reason to conclude, that before the reign of Constantine, as the converts to the Christian religion were subject to frequent persecution and disturbance in their devotions, the use of instruments could hardly have been allowed, and by all that can be collected from the writings of the primitive Christians, they seem never to have been admitted."

(Burney, p. 26.) Eusebius (who died A. D. 340) states in his commentary on the 92d psalm, that the Christians when they meet, sing to the name of the Lord, not only with the voice, but upon an instrument of ten strings, and upon the cithera. (P. 27.) The harp and psaltery, *as being the most grave and majestic instruments of the time*, were preferred to all others.

(Burney, p. 25.) The music of the first five or six ages of the church, consisted in a plain and simple chant of unisons and octaves. *Music in parts was not introduced for many ages after the establishment of Christianity.*

Bingham (Works, vol. i. p. 665.) says, "that the most ancient and general practice, till the way

of alternate psalmody was brought into the church was *for the whole assembly to join together*, the women and children, united with one mouth and one mind, in singing psalms and praises to God;" but he gives little or no proof of his assertion. The writers of the Romish church say that this custom was not in use before Ambrose (who died 397); and Bingham thinks it necessary to assert the contrary; but his proof amounts to nothing. Chrysostom, indeed, (who however lived after Ambrose,) says, when comparing the times of the apostles with his own, "they all sang in common" (*ἐπεψαλον παντες κοινη*); but this can prove nothing (even if C. can fairly be adduced as an evidence,) as to the practice of the age succeeding the apostolic. The fact appears to me to be, that the earliest singing in public worship among the primitive Christians was strictly speaking solo singing; that the next step was for the people at large to join in the last verse (which method we are certain continued to be practised in the 4th century); and that though at first any one who was able and willing sang these solos, by degrees the singing was confined to persons regularly appointed to undertake it. In the third century the plan of singing in alternate choirs was introduced at Antioch, and soon found its way into the West. I am not aware that any clear instance of what may be properly called congregational singing can be adduced before the fourth century. This was the last and best stage of the progress.

(Bingham, p. 669.) A mode of worship so likely to be abused (and I may add so often abused)



as public singing, must frequently have afforded to the pious fathers room for doubt as to its expediency, and displeasure on account of supposed innovations. They complained of the theatrical nature of the airs, the too great nicety of the singing, &c.; and "Isidore of Pelusium (at the beginning of the 5th century,) brings the charge of these abuses more especially against women; and goes so far as to say, that though the apostle" (I do not know where,) "had allowed them to sing in the church, yet the perverse and licentious use they made of this liberty was a sufficient reason why they should be totally debarred from it."

(Bingham, p. 118.). "From the first and apostolic age, *singing was always a part of divine service*, in which the whole body of the church joined together; which is a thing so evident, that though Cabassutius denies it, and in his spite to the reformed church-

es, where it is generally practised, calls it only a protestant whim, yet Cardinal Bona (*Rerum Liturg. lib. i. c. xxv. 19. It. de Div. Psalm, c. xvii.*) has more than once not only confessed, but solidly proved it to have been the primitive practice." If the Cardinal's proofs are not stronger than the Protestant's, they are worth nothing. Bingham's sweeping assertion at the beginning shews that his statements are not to be received without examination. (See § 3. p. 463.)

I propose to conclude this long protracted discussion (and I hope briefly) in another letter; in which it is my intention to consider the grounds of the employment of music, vocal and instrumental, in public worship, and to examine the objections which are urged against the latter in particular.

I am, Sir,

Yours sincerely,

L. C.

## REVIEW.

"Still pleas'd to praise, yet not afraid to blame.—POPE.

**ART. I.** *A Course of Lectures, containing a Description and Systematic Arrangement of the several Branches of Divinity:* accompanied with an Account both of the principal Authors, and of the Progress, which has been made at different Periods, in Theological Learning. By Herbert Marsh, D. D. F. R. S. Margaret Professor of Divinity. Part III. On the Interpretation of the Bible. Cambridge. VOL. VIII. 4 s

bridge, printed: Sold in London by Rivingtons. 1813. 8vo. pp. 117.

After an interval of three\* years, we are happy to perceive that the Margaret Professor resumes those official and literary labours by which he at once maintains his own reputation, and assists the progress of others in the most important of all the sciences. In

\* Mon. Rep. Vol. IV, and VI.

speaking of this third part \* of his Lectures, the language which we shall employ, will be, with little reserve, that of commendation. We should have been better pleased had Dr. Marsh made no references to the controversy in which he is engaged respecting the Bible Society, and had he spared one or two undignified allusions to the danger, real or supposed, of the established church.† These however are trifling blemishes in a work of so much excellence: nor have they prevented us from warmly admiring the solid and vigorous judgment, the correct and extensive information, the perspicuous style and method which generally characterize the pamphlet.

The thirteenth lecture points out the relation which the interpretation of the Bible bears to the criticism of it, states the nature and the causes of the difficulty of biblical interpretation, and, professing to correct some erroneous notions on this matter, represents the sense in which scripture is its own interpreter, is clear and satisfactory, and sufficient for salvation.

In the fourteenth the professor treats of words, regarded as signs to the reader of what was thought by the writer: he considers the kind and degree of difficulty attending the discovery of the original meaning of them; and he directs us to the sources of intelligence in respect of the words of the Hebrew Bible and the Greek Testament, v. g. the Chaldee, Sy-

riac and Arabic versions, the Septuagint translation and the Latin Vulgate. A few observations are added upon "our own authorized version," to the revision of which this lecturer is a friend, and on the necessity of interpreting from the original scriptures.

Rules are laid down in the fifteenth lecture for the interpretation of words. In the first place, we must inquire what notion is [or was] affixed to any word under our review, by the persons in general who speak [or spake] the language? Further, 2dly, We must ascertain what was the particular application of such words, by attention to the particular situation of the persons to whom they were immediately addressed. Thirdly, The words of an author must be so explained as not to make them inconsistent with his known character, his known sentiments, his known situation and the known circumstances of the subject on which he wrote. The consequences of neglecting these rules, are delineated with great force and correctness: an excellent comparison is instituted between the interpreter who explains the Bible by the aid of reason and learning and the interpreter who aspires to the possession of higher means, and claims to be inspired. It is attempted to prove that there is an important practical difference between the terms *does not err* and *cannot err*: and some valuable remarks are subjoined on the necessity of theological learning and the causes of its neglect.

The general heads of the sixteenth lecture are—Of the literal and figurative use of words; and of the foundation of this distinc-

\* Meaning here the "portion of lectures given and published at the same period."

† Pp. 77, 86.

tion in the origin and formation of language.—Consequences of interpreting words *literally*, when they are used *figuratively*.—Necessity of arranging the words in genealogical order. Most of Dr. Marsh's illustrations and observations, in discussing these topics, bespeak the accurate philosopher, scholar and divine.

Of lecture the seventeenth the main subject is *allegory*. The relation which it has to *metaphor*, is largely explained and very well illustrated. Merited censures are passed on the practice of interpreting the scriptures allegorically. It is proved that this custom can derive no support from the language of Paul in Gal. iv. 24 : its origin and progress are traced ; and the evil of it as aiding the cause of infidelity, is powerfully exposed.

In the last lecture this topic is pursued at some length. Here, again, we meet with an excellent specimen of scripture criticism—on 2 Cor. iii. 6. From allegorical the Professor advances to treat of typical interpretation. This, he observes, is warranted to a certain extent by the sacred writers themselves : “and,” he adds, “if we transgress the limits, which they have prescribed, we shall be in perpetual danger of taking things for what they were not designed to be.” Having adduced a striking example of the abuse which may be made of this kind of interpretation, he concludes the third part of his lectures by announcing his purpose of next directing the attention of his auditors and readers to the interpretation of prophecy. On a subject so important, yet so curious and so difficult, we shall be particular.

ly happy in receiving instruction from such a teacher.

We shall now apply ourselves to the agreeable, yet, within our limits, not very easy, task of selecting a few passages from this pamphlet.

The following remark of Dr. Marsh's, in recommendation of Biblical criticism, are intrinsically valuable, and not a little pertinent to the present condition and estimate of the study of divinity : (3)

“The Bible must be examined by the same laws of criticism which are applied to other writings of antiquity : and every man, who is set apart for the ministry, should consider it as his bounden duty to study with especial care that *primary* branch of theology, the criticism of the Bible. It is a branch, which gives nutriment and life to all the other branches : and *these* will become more or less vigorous, in proportion as *that* branch either flourishes or decays. By cultivating the criticism of the Bible, we acquire a habit of calm and impartial investigation, which will enable us to enter with greater advantage on the other departments of theology ; we learn to discriminate between objects apparently alike, but really distinct ; we learn to sharpen our judgments and correct our imaginations ; we learn to think for ourselves without blindly trusting to bare assertion, which may deceive, but can never convince ; and, while we fortify our faith against the shafts of infidelity, we become proof against the seductions of ignorance and fanaticism. Such are the advantages resulting to an *interpreter* of the Bible from a previous acquaintance with the criticism of the Bible ; advantages unknown to the mere theological empiric, who regards them as useless for no other reason than because he has never learnt to comprehend them.

We shall next lay before our readers the sentiments of the Margaret Professor on *our authorized version*. He says (35),

“—When we consider the immense accession which has been made (since the age of James the First), both to our critical and to our philological

apparatus; when we consider, that the whole mass of literature, commencing with the London Polyglot, and continued to Griesbach's Greek Testament was collected *subsequently* to that period: when we consider that the most important sources of intelligence for the *interpretation* of the original scriptures were *likewise* opened after that period, we cannot possibly pretend that our authorized version does not require *amendment*."

Reasoning in the same accurate and conclusive manner, he appeals to a notorious fact (41.):

"—we know, that the English version, which had been authorized by Queen Elizabeth, was exchanged for *another* version, authorized by James the First. We have therefore a precedent in our own church, for following the advice of Archbishop Newcome,\* and *again* revising by authority our English version."

We would fain persuade ourselves that these intimations will not be lost on our author's ecclesiastical superiors. A revision and improvement of the received version of the scriptures, would be a most happy consequence of Dr. Marsh's Lectures, and a valuable collateral effect of the discussions carrying on between biblists and anti-biblists.

Although there is little, if any, novelty, yet there is much strength in this writer's observation on the scope of the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians (49):

"The question *there* decided is very different from any question which now agitates the religious world. for no man would *now* suppose, that the best Christians are they, who have been Jews. Yet how seldom do we find an interpreter of St. Paul, who keeps in view the subject and circumstances of *that* controversy, on which St. Paul himself was writing. Men interpret

his Epistles, as if he were a writer of the *present* age: and passages, relating solely to the question at issue between *Jewish* and *Heathen* converts, are so explained, as if the apostle had been sitting in judgment, to decide between *Calvin* and *Arminius*."

Let us be indulged in one more quotation: it regards a topic which has often occupied our thoughts and is deeply interesting to our feelings (56, &c.).

"—As soon as men have persuaded themselves that in points of doctrine they *cannot* err, they will think it an *imperious duty* to prevent the growth of all *other* opinions on a subject so important as *religion*. Should argument therefore fail, the importance of the *end* will be supposed to justify the worst of means. But the intolerance, thus produced by an imaginary exemption from error, is far from being confined to the church of *Rome*. The same intolerance is produced in every man who imagines that he interprets the scriptures under the especial guidance of the Holy Spirit. It makes no difference, in this respect, whether such especial guidance is supposed to be vouchsafed to a *general council* or to an *individual in his private apartment*. The result in either case is the same. In either case, the persons who believe themselves so *gifted*, will conclude, that they *cannot* err. In either case, they will deem it impious to tolerate what the spirit, as *they* imagine, has condemned. And hence we may justly infer, that the same inquisitorial power, which has been exercised by the church of *Rome*, would be exercised by *others*, who set up similar pretensions, if the means of employing that power were once at their command."

This statement, we fear, is more than speculatively true: we dread any claim, whether avowed or implied, to theological infallibility, by whomever it be made.

We cannot acquiesce in Dr. M's. opinion as to the expediency of confessions of faith (19, 20). History and observation teach us that they fail of answering any rational or worthy end: they are

---

\* To whose Historical View of the English Biblical Translations, &c. Professor Marsh had referred in page 35.



a snare to the weak, a cover for the indolent and a serious embarrassment to generous and inquiring minds.

For the most part, we agree with him in what he says of types and typical interpretation (112, &c.) Yet we doubt whether his definition of a type, as an intended—a divinely intended—resemblance of something future, be really sanctioned by a single passage of the scriptures.

If his views of this subject be correct, types are of the nature of prophecies; and we may therefore expect that they will be more largely and satisfactorily considered in some of the Professor's succeeding lectures. We would earnestly hope that no engagements, of a different description, may long detain him from the duties of his office: but we, at the same time, wish that he might even yet find leisure for again appearing in the character under which he is known to the public most honourably and most usefully—as THE ANNOTATOR ON MICHAELIS!

ART. II. *Essays on the Language of Scripture*; with Additions and Corrections. In two volumes. By John Simpson. Bath, printed. Sold in London, by Egerton, and by Johnson and Co. 1812. 8vo. Vol. i. pp. 496. Vol. ii. pp. 380.

(Continued from p. 609.)

We have already perceived how Mr. Simpson reasons, and what he thinks, concerning the duration of the future punishment of the wicked: and if there are those who pronounce his opinion upon this subject heretical and anti-

scriptural, he shares the reproach together with the late Dr. Hartley and Bishop Newton; not to mention other celebrated and estimable names. But the inquiries of the learned essayist appear more valuable as they rectify some hasty statements or erroneous arguments of his contemporaries and predecessors than as they establish any positive deduction. For instance, we cordially agree with him that the mere use of the terms *αιων* and *αιωνιος*, determines nothing on the one side or the other (17); if they sometimes import unlimited, they as frequently describe limited\* existence; and the meaning of them must usually be decided by the context.

Of a great evil spirit, the perpetual, inveterate enemy of God and man, we can know nothing but from the evidence of sense or from that of revelation. To the former no one will appeal, who is in possession of his faculties. The question must therefore be tried by the standard of the scriptures; and Mr. Simpson's second Essay, which is an attempt to explain those expressions in the Old and New Testament that are supposed to bear upon the subject, will be eagerly read by men who have a taste for these investigations. But persons of this class, will, probably, not be the last to lament

\* Two examples of the acceptation of the word *αιων* in Sect. 59 of Demosthenes de coronâ, may not be undeserving of notice: τὸ μελλόντος *αιωνος* evidently signifies there the next age or posterity; and *παντα τον αιωνα* denotes all past time as well as the present. The serviet æternum of Horace (Epist. I. x. 41), will occur to the classical reader; it may illustrate 1 Cor. viii. 13.

that he has discussed the topic, in some measure, though at no great length, with references to natural religion, and has considered what proofs reason affords of the existence of such a being.

Mr. S. argues that the common notions of *the devil* or *satan*, are contradictory to natural and revealed religion, and inconsistent with each other, and that the meaning of the words under his review, is, in scripture itself, pointed out to be *adversary*. His rules of interpretation are abstractedly good; yet some of them seem to be framed with a specific view to the purpose of this essay.

Among the contradictions of the popular notions of the evil spirit to the language of scripture, the following is entitled to particular regard (106).

"It is generally imagined," observes our author, "that the devil will be the inflicter of the future punishment of the wicked. Yet Christ says to the wicked, Matt. xxv. 41, 'Go into the fire for the age prepared for the devil and his angels;' that is, for *their* punishment, if it be taken literally. Is it probable, then, that the devil will be the punisher of others? On the contrary, Jesus tell us that *his angels* shall inflict that future punishment on the wicked, Matt. xiii. 39 to 42; to which he himself will sentence and condemn them. He repeats this, Matt. xiii. 49, 50."

Whether the two last of the three texts cited by Mr. Simpson, be not appropriated to the destruction of Jerusalem, is at least doubtful; if *that* be the event to which they refer, the Roman armies were the predicted *angels*, or messengers, of the Son of man.

The writer of these Essays subjoins to his quotation of 1 Cor.

vii. 5\* [lest *Satan* tempt you on account of *your incontinence*] the sentence, "Incontinence, unruly passion, is pointed out as the tempter." Now, surely, the apostle himself has discriminated, in the clearest manner, between *Satan* and *incontinence*! We take the signification of the passage to be, 'there is danger lest, by reason of your want of self-control, the tempter (whether a supernatural or a human adversary) gain a readier and greater advantage over you.'

Upon Zechar. iii. 2. "And the Lord said unto Satan, the Lord rebuke thee, O Satan," Mr. Simpson† produces the reasoning of Barker,‡ who looks upon the scene there recorded as a prophetic vision. The essayist does not seem to have been aware that Blayney,§ a more unexceptionable authority, held the same opinion; he delivers it as the most probable sentiment, that "by Satan, or the adversary, is here meant the adversaries of the Jewish nation in a body, or perhaps some leading person among them, Sanballat for instance, who strenuously opposed the rebuilding of the temple, and of course the restoration of the service of the sanctuary, and the re-establishment of Joshua in the exercise of his sacerdotal ministry."

The phrase *delivered to Satan*, does not necessarily mean *delivered to bodily disease*.¶ We acquiesce in the reasoning of a cor-

\* P. 113. † 125.

‡ In his *Inquiry into the Scripture meaning of the word Satan*, &c.

§ Translation of Zech. Not. in loc.

¶ 113, 132.

respondent,\* on 1 Cor. v. 3. The key to that passage, and to 1 Tim. i. 20. (132), is Acts xxvi. 18. *If to turn men from the power of Satan unto God*, consists in bringing them within the Christian church, to *deliver them over*, from God, to *Satan*, is to eject them from that church, either for a time or permanently. In other words, it is *excommunication*; it is to disclaim religious fellowship with the offending party and to treat him “as an heathen man and a publican.” Matt. xviii. 17.

Our readers will not wonder that Mr. Simpson views the third chapter of Genesis as an allegorical narrative: in his explanation of it they will meet with many pertinent and instructive observations. Admitting, however, what is most probable, that “Moses collected the historical part of the Pentateuch from several books” (166), we see not how it follows that “this account of our first parents, being in the earliest part of the history, would, of course, be figurative.” The fact of its supreme antiquity, might not prevent it from being literally true: and as such it has been interpreted with great ingenuity, though, we conceive, not with complete success, by Dr. Lardner.†

According to Mr. S. (201), the connexion of Rom. v. 12—19, in which the apostle uses *εἰ γάρ*, *for if*, in ver. 15 and 17, “is expressive of indecision” upon the point of all men dying on account of the sin of their first parent. This formulary of argument, is

very familiar to Paul, especially in the present epistle: and, though it frequently introduces a *conditional* proposition, in a number of instances it stands at the head of declarations of acknowledged facts or truths; as in Rom. v. 16. vi. 5. xi. 15, 21, 24. xv. 27. Therefore it is not *necessarily* “expressive of indecision.”

Commenting upon John xiv. 30 (222), our author interprets *the prince of this world* as meant “of the rulers of that part of the world, who came in the person of their emissaries that very evening, headed by Judas, to take Jesus, and to bring him before them in their judicial capacity.” To this interpretation we cordially subscribe. It must be extended to John xii. 31, which a correspondent in the *Monthly Repository*,‡ understands, after Wakefield, of Jesus himself: the 6th and 8th verses of the second chapter of the former of the epistles to the Corinthians, are almost equally decisive against *this* exposition of the words. To the same effect, perhaps, is Coloss. ii. 15.

After an examination of numerous passages and a statement and consideration of objections, Mr. S. is of opinion (159) that scripture affords no proof of “the proper personality, or real existence of such a being as Satan, or the Devil, is generally supposed to be.” He says, in conclusion, (237) “The notion that any adversary to piety and virtue, or that any cruel and malicious being, will be employed to execute the awful denunciations of God against sinners in the future world, is di-

\* M. Rep. Vol. V. 555.

† Works, Vol. xi. 227—253.

‡ Vol. vii. 173.

rectly contrary to the express declarations of Jesus." While he admits that, from the manner in which the words *σαταν*, *διαβολος*, *κ. τ. λ.* are used, a general belief of the actual existence of an evil spirit evidently seems to have prevailed, he understands all these terms figuratively, "of an allegorical person, not a real one."

Notwithstanding the care and labour which he has bestowed upon the subject, it is still involved, we think, in some obscurity; and although, we are persuaded that *diabolical agency* does not form an article of *revelation*, we want the same conviction of its having been disbelieved by our Lord and his apostles which we possess of their having taught the doctrines of pardon and immortality.\*

The title of this writer's third essay is, in substance, "a view of the different significations of two words in the Old Testament and of one in the New Testament which, in our English bibles, are rendered *heaven*." In distinct sections he assigns the several meanings of the term, as follow; the air or atmosphere, in which are the clouds; the expanse beyond the atmosphere, in which are the sun, the moon and stars; the atmosphere and the whole visible universe beyond it; the supposed peculiar residence of God, and of angels, beyond the visible expanse; a cloud and fire on Mount Sinai; God; the inhabitants of heaven, or a personifica-

tion of the firmament; the Jewish nation. In other sections he points out the signification of the term *heaven*, *heavens*, with different combinations. Of the inferences which he deduces from the whole view the most important is that in the scriptures, "the place in which the righteous shall dwell after their resurrection, is never spoken of." (304)

We confess that we occasionally differ from Mr. S. respecting the arrangement of some of the texts which he has enumerated in this essay. With his characteristic modesty, he intimates (299) the possibility of such a difference of opinion. Nor are we certain that he has not needlessly added to the number of his sections. On the whole, this like every part of his communications, will materially assist students in the scriptures, at the same time that it reflects credit on the industry and talents of the author.

The fourth essay is an inquiry into the meaning of those words in the Old and New Testament which are equivalent with the English terms *angel*, *archangel*, &c.: and into the nature of intelligent angels. It is learned and often judicious and satisfactory. But the chief distinction of it is the author's endeavour to shew that intelligent angels or messengers of God are human beings (393, &c.) who have departed out of this life. This point he argues from considerations to which we shall soon advert. And he then discusses, but, in our humble judgment, does not refute, the objections to his position. If an angel appeared *in the form of a man*, this would be a sufficient reason for the term *man* being

---

\* A Jew would learn from the beginning of the book of Job that *Satan* could not act without God's permission and controul: nor would even a divine commission exempt of necessity, those invested with it, from certain ancient errors.



sometimes applied to him: and, though it is granted that some human beings have appeared to men, after their departure from this life, as divine messengers, a general and important doctrine, nevertheless, must not be erected upon a few solitary instances. What advantage, too, we ask, would be obtained by the establishment of Mr. Simpson's hypothesis? On either supposition, the communications first referred to, must have been *miraculous*. Let our readers then say if it be more likely that these communications were made by the medium of men *after their departure from this life* than by that of beings who rank higher than ourselves in the scale of existence? Besides, Samuel, Moses and Elijah are never called *angels* (416).

We are much happier when we can agree with this meritorious writer than in expressing our dissent from any of his conclusions. On Ps. lxxviii. 25, [Man did eat *angels'* food] he criticises very accurately by simply producing the Hebrew word; and he well renders the clause *the bread of the mighty* (365). Rosenmüller and Geddes might have been quoted in behalf of the correction.

There are many other remarks in this essay which claim our approbation; while there are some in which we cannot acquiesce. But, altogether, we earnestly recommend it to the notice of theological students and inquirers. On the subject of angels, as on that of an evil spirit (and both arise out of the language of the records of revealed religion, instead of being parts of revealed religion), further light will perhaps be known

by a continued investigation of scriptural phraseology.

Mr. Simpson has done much towards this object. His memory is not dishonoured when we add that, aided by his services, future critics may possibly do more. In both the cases which we have mentioned, it appears to ourselves that the parties who write or speak of them in the Old and the New Testament, were convinced of the real, personal existence of these descriptions of beings. Even if they frequently employ the terms in question allegorically, such an application of them seems to denote that this was not their primary meaning, but that the figurative must have been erected on a literal signification.

In the fifth essay, which is not very happily placed, Mr. Simpson examines into the meaning of John vi. 62, 63, and of Exodus vi. 3. The former of these passages [What and if ye shall see the Son of man, &c.] he thus points and translates (349). "*Nevertheless, when ye shall see the Son of man rise up where he was before, YE WILL KNOW THAT\* he is the spirit that giveth life.*" His paraphrase is as follows: "when ye shall perceive that the Son of man is risen from the dead to life again, ye will know that he shall have power to give everlasting life to those who believe in and obey him." The other text [I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac and unto Jacob by the name of God Almighty, but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them] our author renders and interprets

---

\* These words Mr. S. supplies by conjecture.

in this manner : " I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by *the name* of God Almighty; but by my name (or *title*) Jehovah I was not known (or *distinguished, or distinguishingly manifested*) to them." " That is, when I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, I did not then appropriate the name *Jehovah* as my *distinctive* title from false gods and as the God of my people; but I appropriated the appellation *God Almighty* to these purposes, under the *Abrahamic dispensation*' (455).

We acknowledge ourselves not a little pleased with these specimens of the writer's critical skill and ingenuity. At the same time, we regard John i. 18, iii. 13. as disclosing the sense of vi. 62.

The sixth essay, which should have preceded all the others, is an excellent sketch of the different modes in which the Hebrews express a great degree and the superlative degree of a quality. Here Mr. S. treads, for the most part, on stable ground: and, his subject being now a peculiarity, grammatical and rhetorical, of language, this application of his learning and judgment, will be satisfactory to nearly all his readers. For the sections into which this useful paper is divided, we refer to the essay itself: a few remarks which occurred to us during the perusal of it, shall be put down in their order.

Our Essayist (465) interprets Is. liii. 4, [smitten of God] as importing *greatly afflicted*. The accuracy of the interpretation, is dubious: for the prophet's meaning seems to be that the Jews of our Saviour's age, would look

upon his sufferings as a judicial punishment, inflicted upon him *by God*, for his blasphemy and imposture.

466. In Mark xi. 22, πιστις θεου may signify *the faith which has God for its object*.

To the examples under Section xi (476) may be added Matt. xv. 4. [θανατω τελευτω]. In its general form, it is a Hebraism: and Newcome has well rendered it, "let him surely die."

(486.) We doubt as to Mr. Simpson's explanation of Gen. xii. 2. [Thou shalt be a blessing—i.e. *very blessed*] He considers it as an instance of an abstract substantive being used to denote a high degree. We submit that the genuine meaning of the word in this passage, is fixed by Gen. xviii. 18, and that Abraham here receives a promise of his being made *a blessing* to his posterity and to mankind. But, in the room of the above text, we shall place under this section Ezek. ii. 7, for the literal translation of which the reader may consult the margin of the English Bible.

491, 492. In the catalogue of texts under Sect. xxiii. we should class Num. xxvii. 21. and all those passages where the memorable words URIM and THUMMIN are found. The judgment so denominated, was, according to Dr. Samuel Chandler,\* the judgment or determination "of LIGHTS and PERFECTIONS, i.e." says he, "perfectly clear, precise and full; the plural number being frequently used, in the oriental languages, to denote the excellency and perfection of any thing."

\* Life of David, Vol. i. 8.

ART. III. *Dr. Watts no Socinian.*

A Refutation of the Testimony of Dr. Lardner, as brought forward in the Rev. T. Belsham's *Memoirs of the late Rev. Theophilus Lindsey*, "That Dr. Watts's last sentiments were completely Unitarian." In a Series of Letters to the Rev. Joseph Smith, of Manchester. By Samuel Palmer. 8vo. 1s. 6d. Conder. 1813.

This is a piece of greater promise than performance. To the unequivocal testimony of Dr. Lardner, [see the present Vol. p. 532. &c.] Mr. Palmer opposes only presumptions, and those not always weighty. It is necessary to the support of Mr. Palmer's hypothesis that he should make good the charge of "imbecility," which he rather unexpectedly retorts upon Dr. Lardner. The fact seems to be undisputed that Dr. Watts was at the last no Trinitarian, in the common acceptation of that term; but to what degree he departed from the standard of orthodoxy cannot be ascertained. Dr. Lardner might think that he went farther than he actually did, though we cannot lightly esteem Lardner's judgment. The extracts from Watts's last printed works on which Mr. Palmer chiefly rests his "Refutation," are scarcely to the purpose; for passages sounding quite as orthodox might, we believe, be quoted from the works of the older acknowledged "Socinians." To us it appears probable that Dr. Watts intended to bring out his "new thoughts" by degrees; that his last printed works were written some time before their publication, and did not express his last opinions; and that the unpublished, destroyed M.SS. of the Doctor's, some of which

Lardner says he had seen, did shew him to have become COMPLETELY UNITARIAN.

By the term *Unitarian*, however, Dr. Lardner probably meant only an anti-Trinitarian, who at the same time was not an Arian. There is "ambiguity" in the term; but is there less in that of "Socinian," which Mr. Palmer adopts? A "Socinian" is surely one who holds the faith of Socinus, with regard to Jesus Christ, which the modern Unitarian does not hold, which Mr. Lindsey has called *idolatrous*. The "indwelling scheme," which Mr. Palmer appears to favour, is, in our judgment, nearer to Socinianism than any other scheme now professed. Why then does Mr. P., at the very time that he objects to the term *Unitarian*, so largely use another which is equally objectionable, to say the least, and which he knows is offensive to the persons to whom it is applied! Except, indeed, in this case of Mr. Palmer, we scarcely know an instance of a modern writer using the disowned appellation — *Socinian* — with any other view than that of reproach.

*Unitarian* is not the only ambiguous term in theology: *atonement*, *human depravity*, *divine influences*, and similar expressions, from which Mr. Palmer infers Dr. Watts's *orthodoxy*, are quite as equivocal: and we fancy we have known divines who by the copious use of them in public have obtained a reputation for "soundness," while in reality they have held none of the doctrines couched under these heads in the usually accepted sense of the popular creeds, confessions and catechisms.

## INTELLIGENCE.

*The Epistle from the Yearly Meeting, held in London, by Adjournments, from the 19<sup>th</sup> of the Fifth Month, to the 29<sup>th</sup> of the same, inclusive, 1815, to the Quarterly and Monthly Meetings of Friends, in Great Britain, Ireland, and elsewhere.*

DEAR FRIENDS,

We have had cause, at this time, to acknowledge the condescension of our Heavenly Father, who is still pleased to own with his presence these our annual assemblies. Under this influence, our hearts have been united, and we have been animated to crave the assistance of his Holy Spirit, that we may be enabled to serve him with faithfulness, and to uphold with Christian simplicity our various religious testimonies. And we believe, that the constraining love of the gospel calls upon us to salute our dear brethren with the invitation, "O ! taste and see that the Lord is good."—Ps. xxxiv. 8.

In the course of the usual proceedings of this meeting, we have received from the several quarterly and other meetings of which it is constituted, an account of the state of our religious Society. Whilst we lament that many amongst us are still too much engrossed with the fading enjoyments of this life, and are refusing to follow our holy Pattern in the path of self-denial, we wish they may not be deprived of that encouragement to turn into the right way which often results from the faithful admonitions of those who have known the benefits of greater circumspection. Though, from a sense of their own weakness, some of the rightly concerned among us may be ready to shrink from the performance of this duty, we would remind them, that by thus evincing their love to their friends, they will receive additional strength themselves; and that such acts of dedication will contribute to their own advancement in the Christian course.

We desire, dear friends, that such of you as often meet in small companies for the solemn purpose of worship, may

not relax in your diligence. Your situation will at times appear discouraging; but although you may be seldom assisted by the company and travail of your brethren, never forget that you are under the continued notice of the Lord; and that his tender regard extends to all those who wait upon him in reverence and humility. Many who have been alike circumstanced, can acknowledge that they have known their strength renewed, and their confidence in divine support increased, by a due attendance of their meetings for religious worship. Your situation, though trying to yourselves, is important. If with faithfulness and integrity you perform your Christian duties, your example will prevail with others who have been too negligent of the concerns of a future life, and by your consistent conduct the truth which we profess will be exalted—the name of the Lord glorified.

Our minds have been affected, at this time, by the recent decease of many with whom we have been associated in religious labour, and whose memory is precious. We feel the loss of these; yet we can with thankfulness acknowledge, we have been comforted in reflecting, that the Almighty Power which was their support, and which has preserved us since we were first gathered to be a people, is unchangeably the same. We sympathise also with those who are in the decline of life, in whose hearts such afflictive deprivations may, in their solicitude for the welfare of the church, excite many discouraging feelings. To you, our elder brethren and sisters, we offer the salutation of our cordial love. We desire that you may partake of our comfort, in observing the conduct of many, who are now in the vigour of health and strength, and who, in various ways, are giving proofs of their attachment to that cause, the prosperity of which has been your greatest joy. We doubt not that your endeavours to stand approved in the sight of God, have met his gracious acceptance; and that your example and labours in the Lord's service, have animated many of these your younger brethren to follow you, as you have been endeavouring to follow Christ. Let us likewise entreat you, dear friends,



who are of less religious experience, but who have entered upon the active scenes of life, not to retard your Christian progress, by any unwillingness to make an entire surrender of your hearts to the disposal of Infinite Wisdom. The Lord is a rich rewarder of all his faithful followers; and happy will it be for you, should you be permitted to see many days, to reflect, at the close of life, that you have been devoted to the promotion of his cause.

The amount of sufferings brought in this year, is upwards of fifteen thousand four hundred and seventy pounds; a small proportion of this sum has been taken for military purposes—but the greater part was incurred in the support of our ancient Christian testimony against tithes, and other demands of an ecclesiastical nature.

We have received an epistle from our friends in Ireland, and one from each of the Yearly Meetings on the Continent of America, except that of Carolina. In consequence of large emigrations from other parts of the United States, five quarterly meetings of friends resident on the Western side of the Alleghany mountains, have been detached from the Yearly Meeting of Maryland, and formed into a separate one. Under the influence of that love by which we are united as brethren, we have addressed an epistle to those who are intending to meet on that important occasion, in the eighth month next, in the State of Ohio. From the epistles and other communications from America, we find that our friends, besides being attentive to the concerns of our own Society, are still pursuing their engagements for the welfare of the African and the Indian race. But the war in which that country and this are now sorrowfully involved, has presented great obstacles to their efforts towards civilizing the Indians; and is likely, for a time, to suspend in some parts their successful exertions in that important and interesting cause.

When we consider the continuance and extension of war, we cannot but deeply feel, on account of the desolations and numerous evils which are its inseparable attendants: and we earnestly intreat all our members, so to abide within the limitations of truth, as in no degree to violate our Christian testimony in this respect for the sake of gain. Let us keep out of even the spirit of contest; and strive for the attainment of a de-

pendance upon Him, whose kingdom is not of this world.

Amongst the numerous benevolent undertakings which now interest the minds of our countrymen, we contemplate, with much satisfaction, the general circulation of the Holy Scriptures. Our sense of that inestimable treasure has been frequently acknowledged; and we feel ourselves engaged, to call the attention of such of our members as may be employed in this salutary work, to the supreme importance of giving heed to that Divine Word, to which the scriptures bear testimony. This Word is Christ; the "Bread of Life," and the "Light of men;" that "Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." If we are earnest to obey the teachings of this unerring guide, we shall be led to cry to the Lord, that he would preserve us from self-exaltation, from attributing to ourselves or others that honour which is due to him alone. We should be on our guard lest we should mistake our proper sphere of usefulness, or suffer any pursuit, however laudable in itself, to divert us from our true allotment of labour in the church. This watchfulness unto prayer can alone ensure our growth in religious experience, and our establishment in every good word and work.

"Finally, brethren, Farewell! Be perfect." Let this attainment be the principal object in view: then will you be of good comfort, and of one mind; you will live in peace one with one another, and "the God of love and peace" will be with you.

Signed in and on behalf of the Meeting, by JOHN WILKINSON,  
Clerk to the Meeting this Year.

*Letter from the Unitarian Dissenters, Plymouth, to Mr. Wm. Smith.*

*To William Smith, Esq.*

SIR,

The congregation of Unitarian dissenters, meeting at Plymouth, find themselves called upon by a sense of obligation to address you in a letter of thanks for the service which they conceive you have rendered the cause of freedom and of truth by obtaining the repeal of the Penal Laws which were in force against the description of worshippers to which they belong.

We scarcely know whether we have

most reason to congratulate you, Sir, to whose mind the victory you have gained over the bigotry and the ignorance of our ancestors must furnish a most gratifying reflection; or ourselves, on the encouragement which fair discussion and an honest declaration of truth have received; or the great body of professing Christians, who owe to you a spiritual blessing whose value time cannot destroy: but we are sure that we ought to congratulate our country and our government, because, through your agency, a blot has been wiped off our national character, and a public act of our legislature has declared that it is the duty of every Christian to search the scriptures, to enquire for himself, and to avow the result, whatever it may be, of his serious enquiry after "the truth as it is in Jesus."

Though your late successful attempt to promote the interests of true religion demands our especial thanks, because you have removed out of our path that "fear of man which bringeth a snare," even to serious and upright minds; we beg, sir, also to acknowledge the repeated obligations under which we have lain to you, as well in the character of Chairman to the Committee of the Three Denominations, as of the enlightened and the steady friend of Civil and Religious Liberty in the House of Commons—and we pray the Almighty to recompence you with what will be to you the sweetest reward, the conviction that as a man and a Christian you have done your duty.

Signed by the Minister and Members of the Unitarian Congregation, Plymouth.

### Manchester Quarterly Meeting.

The autumnal Quarterly Meeting of Ministers, generally denominated Presbyterian, in Manchester and its vicinity, was held at Plat, near Manchester, at the chapel of the Rev. Mr. Whitelegg. The Rev. J. Holland introduced the service, *vice* the Rev. J. Bealey, whose recent death is a subject of deep regret in this neighbourhood; and the Rev. Mr. Aspland preached from 2 Cor. x. 7. The meeting was gratified to hear that Mr. Aspland intends to publish the sermon. About twenty ministers and thirty lay gentlemen returned to Manchester to dinner, and spent the afternoon in a manner suitable to the objects of the association,

and highly gratifying to the gentlemen present. Among other appropriate sentiments, the health of Wm. Smith, Esq. M. P. for Norwich, was drunk, and the following resolution unanimously passed:

Resolved, That the thanks of this Association, consisting both of ministers and laymen, in the neighbourhood of Manchester, be given to Wm. Smith, Esq. one of the representatives in parliament for the city of Norwich, for his unwearied and successful exertions in procuring the repeal of the several statutes directed against those who impugn the doctrine of the Trinity, and for the encouragement which his success affords us to hope, that the time is not far distant, when, all penal laws in reference to religious opinions being abolished, the word toleration and the spirit of intolerance shall become equally obsolete.

The Christmas quarterly meeting will be held at the Unitarian chapel in Mosely Street, Manchester. Mr. Robberds will introduce the service, and Mr. Allard will be the preacher.

W. J.

### Oldbury Double Lecture.

On Tuesday, Sept. 14, 1813, was holden at Oldbury, in Shropshire, the Annual Meeting of Dissenting Ministers which is distinguished by the name of "The Oldbury Double Lecture." The Rev. Timothy Davis, of Coventry, prayed. The first sermon was preached by the Rev. — Small of Coseley, from Phil. i. 27. last clause. "That ye stand fast in one spirit, with one mind, striving together for the faith of the gospel." The second discourse, delivered by the Rev. James Hews Bransby, of Dudley was grounded on 1 Thess. ii. 13. "For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but (as it is in truth) the word of God." The service, in which singing of psalms had its proportional share, was closed with prayer by the last preacher. The audience was respectable and attentive. The sermons were replete with just and liberal sentiments, clothed in strong and pointed language and adapted to the original design of the meeting, which was instituted with reference to the case of the ministers ejected by the Act of Uniformity in 1662, and gives a fit oc-

casion to bring up to view, with a more general or direct reference to it, the principles of a Protestant dissent.

In the afternoon when twelve ministers were present, on the motion of the Rev. Benjamin Carpenter, of Stourbridge, seconded by the Rev. James Scott, of Cradley,

It was unanimously resolved, That the sincere and heartfelt thanks of this meeting be presented to William Smith, Esq. for his late successful exertion in procuring the repeal of the Laws against the impugnors of the doctrine of the Trinity, and for his long-continued, well-directed zeal in favour of universal religious liberty.

The excellent Mr. Job Orton, speaking of this Anniversary of the Bartholomew sufferers, in a letter to the Rev. Samuel Palmer, says: "I persuaded some ministers whom I could be free with, when they preached this Lecture to keep in view the intention of it, and they did so, much to the pleasure and edification of the hearers."\* The respectable gentleman to whom this was observed, and who has stamped a permanent honour on his own name by being the memorialist of those worthies, in the year 1804; being in the neighbourhood, was invited to preach at this service: and it is recollected by the writer of this, that the appropriate discourse, which Mr. Palmer delivered on the occasion, excited an interest and afforded a general and peculiar satisfaction, which verified the justness and weight of Mr. Orton's opinion on the propriety and utility of preachers, at this annual association, keeping in view the design, with which it originated. Mr. Palmer's pertinent and impressive discourse, it is apprehended, was the same that afterwards appeared from the press, as prepared to be preached, at the desire of the Committee for establishing a GENERAL UNION of the independent churches; under the title of "Bartholomew Day commemorated." From some cause, which is not explained in the preface, the delivery of it from the pulpit was prevented. Many it is to be hoped, have been instructed and edified by the perusal of "the natural and sensible reflections" on the history of

Paul's persecutions, of which the discourse consists.†

Oct. 18, 1813

*Ordination of the Rev. Henry Turner, at Bradford.*

On Wednesday, Sept. 22, a meeting of the associated ministers of the Presbyterian denomination in the West Riding of Yorkshire, with other friends from a distance, was held at Bradford, for the purpose of recommending to the Divine blessing the connection recently entered into between the congregation (late under the pastoral care of the Rev. John Dean,) and Mr. Henry Turner, late of the Manchester College, York. The service was introduced by the Rev. Thomas Jervis, with an appropriate prayer, and the reading of the scriptures; after which Joseph Dawson, Esq. of Royds Hall, announced in the name of the congregation, the choice which they had lately made of Mr. Turner for their pastor, and, after having paid a handsome tribute to the memory of his grandfather, and adverted to his descent from, and more or less remote connection with, other eminent ministers, very delicately hinted at this among other motives, which should influence his young friend to a faithful discharge of the office which he had undertaken. As it appeared consistent with the strictest propriety, that a religious connection of this nature should commence with a public religious service, the congregation requested, on this occasion, the prayers and advices of their neighbouring friends: in which request he did not doubt that their young minister most heartily concurred; but as it was obvious, that they would comply with this request the more cordially, and unite in recommending him and his labours to the Divine blessing with greater propriety, if they were first acquainted with his views in entering on the Christian ministry, he trusted that he would not object, in signifying his concurrence, to explain these views; without, however, by any means tying himself down to any particular set of religious opinions, but maintaining for himself, as he exhorted him always to do, that liberty wherewith Christ hath made all men free.

\* Letters to Dissenting Ministers. Vol. II. p. 148.

† See Monthly Repository, Vol. III. (for 1808,) p. 45.

Mr. Turner, in a modest but manly address, stated his cordial concurrence in the request of the congregation, explained his views in becoming a minister of Christ, expressed his full conviction of the divine original and authority of the Christian religion, his purpose to make the unbiassed examination of those scriptures which contain its history and doctrines the business of his life, and his full determination to declare without disguise the results of his enquiries, and to make these results the foundation both of his public and private instructions. He particularly expressed his intention to devote himself to the especial service of the young and of the poor, and concluded by repeating his earnest request for the prayers and advices of his older friends.

In compliance with this united request, the Rev John Holland of Bolton, in an animated, affectionate prayer, recommended both the congregation and their young minister to the Divine blessing.

The Rev. Charles Wellbeloved then particularly addressed to the congregation a series of important advices, by which it is sincerely hoped that other congregations may have an opportunity of profiting, as they were extremely well calculated to correct many abuses which have by degrees insinuated themselves into those societies which have assumed to themselves the name of rational. His observations upon the *half-day* Christians of the present age, and the natural tendency of their practice to sap the foundations of practical Christianity, were particularly worthy of attention.

The service concluded with an address to the Minister from his Father, the

Rev. William Turner of Newcastle; who took occasion, from the circumstance of his having himself stood in the same interesting situation, upwards of thirty years ago, in that immediate neighbourhood † and in the presence of some of the same persons (particularly of the worthy friend who conducted the business of this day on the part of the congregation), to refer his son to the excellent advice which he then received from his father, of which having given a short epitome and recommended the whole to his frequent serious attention he proceeded to enlarge on the importance of the character of a minister of Christ, and the many weighty obligations which it included, expressed his particular satisfaction in the purpose which his son had just expressed of particularly devoting his attention to the young and the poor, and concluded by expressing his hearty concurrence in the recommendation which they had lately heard of both minister and people to the Divine protection and blessing.

On the whole, the service was interesting and impressive; and it is hoped was so managed as to be kept entirely free from the objections usually made to the office of ordination, as presuming to invest with a character and powers not previously possessed; being in fact nothing more than a friendly congratulation, in the presence of God, with a minister and his people on the commencement of their religious connection.

Perhaps the order would have been more natural, if the advice to the minister had immediately followed his address, that to the congregation had succeeded, and the general prayer for both minister and people had concluded the service.

V. E.

## MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR

### *The Christian's Survey of the Political World.*

Providence has showered down its blessings upon us in a most plentiful supply of every thing, which the ground produces, and thanksgivings on this account are commanded from every congregation of the two sects established by law in the united kingdom. The act of government in this

case agrees with the spontaneous thanks from every congregation of the sects not established by law; and indeed, where is the Christian, who will not rejoice, that his brethren, o

† At Pudsey, Sept. 25, 1782.



whatever sect they may be, are united at least in this act of returning thanks to the giver of all good for his undeserved bounty. In the case of thanksgivings for victories over enemies, there may be a pause in the Christian mind, a doubt whether such a service is acceptable to the Father of all, who does not see with our eyes, nor vary as we do in marking out first one, and then another, by the name of enemy. It is said as we do: for here the common language is used; but Christians have no enemies, for whose good they will not pray, for whose salvation they are not interested.

The great supply of wheat has not been unaccompanied however with some circumstances, which require animadversion. A great deal of unmerited obloquy has been thrown out upon a class of men, without whose aid we should be put to very great inconvenience in the preparation of our food, and the bakers have been stigmatised, as keeping up the price of bread beyond what the state of the case required. We hope that none of our readers have been led away by these idle prejudices: and we think it our duty to warn those persons particularly, who are respectable for worth and piety, from entertaining them. Such persons often from want of due consideration do great injury to their own minds and the minds of the more ignorant and less worthy. The baker comes in contact, if we may so express it, with more men than any other trade. All almost are consumers of bread: and the class therefore of those, who prepare it for us, must be very numerous. But is there anything in the occupation of this large class, which renders it more likely to be fraudulent, to be rapacious, to be exorbitant than any other class? There is great labour and some skill requisite in carrying on the business; and, if we judge from the wealth in this compared with that of many other classes, there is no reason to imagine that their gains are by any means beyond what such labour and skill have a right to expect. How idle then, or rather how wicked it is to excite a cry against a class of men, without whom we cannot well exist, and for which it is not, *prima facie*, likely, that there should be any foundation.

But if it is not the baker, then it is the miller, and now our prejudices are excited against another class of our brethren, employed in a most useful occupation, and one in fact, which had a great effect in the destruction of slavery. It was formerly the business of the lowest slaves to grind the corn for the use of the family, and very hard labour it was; so much so that the greatest threat against a higher slave for negligence in his duty was that of sending him to the mills. Windmills were invented, and the labour of a hundred slaves was performed by machinery, and the inspection of a single man. Since that we have had water mills, and mills moved by steam, yet in spite of this experience there have been attempts to bring us back to the labour of former times, and to introduce again the handmill amongst us. Futile attempt! Wherever the handmill appears, a few days trial will settle the question: for the poor, who are to employ themselves with it free of expence, will soon find that the labour and time taken up in grinding imperfectly far outweighs the price, demanded by the miller, for returning to them a much better article. The miller like the baker has a right to a fair profit for his labour and skill, and capital employed: and, besides, he depends on the supply of water or on the wind for the exercise of his trade; and it may happen, that at the end of a most plentiful harvest, a large district may for some time have no supply from their mills from a drought and continuance of calm weather. It is the interest of the miller to grind as fast as he can, and any one may see that, when there is wind, he is not idle.

It is easy to excite clamour, and each class may find fault with its neighbour: but surely equal justice is required, and if one class is thus abused, let the others take their share also in this mutual contumely. The fact is, that all men, engaged in labour, in trade, in any exchange whatever, naturally wish to get as good a price as they can for their commodity. The landholder lets his land as high as he can; in consequence the farmer must endeavour to get as high a price as he can for his corn; the miller for grinding it; the baker for baking it; and all must lay on higher prices in case of greater taxes than if

there were none. But there are natural checks to all these different occupiers. If the landholder is too rapacious, he gets bad tenants, and his land is injured; the growers of corn being spread over a large extent of country, the open markets are a mutual check upon them; and the same may be said of the miller; and to the baker there is the competition, which arises from the profits of trade, and which brings them down to the level, that is suited to the advantage of the trader and the public. But with respect to the baker a check is introduced by the legislature, which in the peculiar case of bread, fixes a maximum according to the state of the corn markets and the flour, beyond which the bread cannot be sold. On the wisdom of this maximum many doubts have arisen, and the question will probably engage the attention of parliament at its ensuing session, when some alteration may be expected to take place in the corn laws. At a meeting of the common council of the city of London, the subject was taken into consideration, which led to the formation of a committee for the farther examination of it. We cannot expect that all the laws on the settling of the price of bread by authority, should be set aside; though we confess that that seems to be the best policy: yet, if so much cannot be done without fear of disadvantage, counties and cities might be encouraged to try the experiment of leaving for a time the price of bread to itself, and then it will be seen, whether any laws on this subject are necessary. In the mean time, we cannot but consider the stigmas, thrown out against the baker, as unworthy of any man of education, and much more of any man, who aspires to the name of Christian.

The Catholics of Ireland are continuing their efforts for emancipation, and many meetings have been holden on the subject, so that it is likely to undergo another discussion in the house of Commons. In the mean time the agitation of the question is productive of great good. Dr. Milner, a very high churchman, has written very warmly in defence of the church, and full of fears on the evident relaxation of principle on the part of the catholic laity, many of whom differ in his opinion very little from protestants. In this he seems to be perfectly right; for just as the Bible society is bringing

together Christians of different denominations, softening their animosities, and leading them nearer to their only Lord, so the emancipation of the Catholics would be a great blow to the influence of the clergy and of the papacy, would bring the catholics and protestants nearer to each other, and teach them that the Christian religion is a very different thing from what the priests on both sides represent it to them. They would in short be guided more by common sense and their bibles, than by the nonsense of the priest and his articles.

Several debates have taken place at the India House on the raising of the salary of the directors, which ended in the appointment of a committee for a fuller investigation of the subject. The government of the company is now vested in the hands of very wealthy merchants, to whom the salary is of very little consequence; the honour of the patronage, attached to the station, far outweighs any pecuniary recompence that can be bestowed on them. Hence many in the company are fearful that, if the salary should be raised so as to become an object to the younger sons of the nobility, and those who are looking for places from the minister, the present system would be completely shaken, and a very different set of men would be introduced into the direction. There is much good sense in this latter argument, particularly as from the circumstances of the company there is already so great a tendency to bring it into the ordinary routine of government.

Improvements in the natural world must not pass unnoticed by us, especially as they frequently have no small influence on the morals of a people. When we read the Spectator, we are astonished at the outrages, so frequently committed at night by men of that rank in life, which would now be ashamed of such conduct. The introduction of lamps tended in a great degree to correct this evil. A farther improvement has taken place, by which the lamp will diffuse a steady light during the whole night, without fear of its being impaired. This is done by means of the gas from coal, which is conveyed from the manufactory by means of pipes to the lamps in every direction. The experiment is tried in the parish of St. Margaret's, Westminster, and preparations are making for a similar one in the parish of Shore-

itch, and from the very manifest superiority of the gas over the oil lamps, there is great reason to believe, that all London will be in a short time lighted in the same manner, and of course the example will be followed in the country towns. Not only will the streets be in this manner lighted, but even private houses may partake of the benefit of the stream of gas, that passes by them, and in the same manner as water is now carried to any part of the house so may hereafter the material of flame. There was a time, when the greatest philosopher would have been puzzled at the question of supplying a whole town with water up to the tops of the houses, and within a very few years the idea of conveying the materials of flame would in the same manner have been termed visionary. But greater things than these may be expected in a future generation, which will have gotten rid of all our stupid and idle prejudices in favour of war and its miserable heroism, and be devoted to better pursuits, in the improvement of the moral qualities of men, and the rendering of the earth serviceable to his comforts, not to his destruction.

Wonderful is the change in the history of Continental affairs, and at this very moment of writing, sanguine expectations are entertained that he, who so short time ago held in his hands we might almost say the balance of Europe, is driven by the confederated powers back from the Elbe to the Rhine. That he will give up his wonted sway without some violent struggles for its preservation is not to be expected, and a dreadful battle must therefore probably have been fought to determine, what shall be the future condition of France and its dependent kings. This reverse in the affairs of Napoleon might teach men not to depend too much on his own strength. How different is the state of this great hero and warrior, from what it was, when he reviewed his troops last year on the banks of the Niemen, and saw himself at the head of an army not to be equalled perhaps in the history of ancient and modern times. His fate seems to have been sealed at Moscow, though, from the greatness of his talents and the physical resiliency of his dominions, he might still have retained, though not his former splendour, yet a deci-

ded superiority in the affairs of Europe. France furnished him with a new army. He had the advantage over the confederated armies of Russia and Prussia at first, but the desertion of Austria from him has overthrown his plans, and he is now like a lion caught in the toils.

Bonaparte is now said to have found Dresden no longer tenable. He has marched towards Leipsick, and collected his troops towards him, with the view it is supposed to retreat towards the Rhine. To do this will be a very arduous task; for the confederates will press upon him in every direction. The Bohemian army can follow without apprehension from any thing in its rear, as a fresh army marched from Russia has advanced so far as to set it at liberty for any future operation. The confederates are now therefore numerically far superior to the French, and in cavalry and artillery their preponderance is still more decisive. We are to add to this, that Buonaparte can now depend on the French only that are with him. The tide of victory no longer setting in his favour, Bavaria is watching the favourable moment to desert his cause, and Wirtemberg cannot be expected to remain more faithful. Public opinion was also changed, so that a formidable corps is forming every where, which will materially obstruct the progress of his troops, and cut them off if they are found detached in small numbers from the main body. Nothing then but too great rashness on the part of the allies can save him from destruction. His fate depends it almost seems on the battle, which by this time probably has been fought, and from which should he be successful, he can only expect to secure his retreat to his own proper dominions.

The alliance between France and Austria having been broken at such a critical time has afforded sufficient room for altercation with the pen, and no small quantity of discussion on this subject has been given to the public through the means of the Parisian press. Few people will bestow much time on this mass of papers, which affords only another instance of the little dependence to be placed on worldly politics. The alliance cemented by a marriage, and strengthened by every consideration which pen and parchment could give, was broken,



as naturally might be expected, when the circumstances were so much changed in one of the parties, and the other expected to derive so much greater advantage by forsaking than by standing by his falling friend. That Buonaparte was really deceived in this diplomatic negotiation, we cannot imagine. He must soon have seen, that Austria was not to be depended upon, and we are therefore the more surprised, that he should continue the war against such tremendous odds. But he had before beaten them all in the field, and he relied too much upon his good fortune, not recollecting that it had forsaken him at Moscow, and carried away with her those troops with which he was accustomed to victory.

The effect of this new situation of affairs in France is not known. All the wishes of Buonaparte were complied with by his obsequious senate, to whom they were made known by the Empress herself in person. This was done with great pomp and ceremony, and the result was a new conscription of between two and three hundred thousand men to supply the wants of their great sovereign. To vote them was an easy matter, to bring them into the field is a more arduous task, and little support can be derived from the vote in the present crisis. It remains to be seen, whether the French will continue steady to their hero, should he be driven beyond the Rhine, and stand in need of such support; and much depends on the conduct of the confederates should they be masters of the field of battle. Thus after twenty years bloody fighting, the same confederate powers, that met together in Saxony for the partitioning France, may again make the experiment, and meet with similar success. But should they act in such a manner, as to offer peace on such terms as will still leave to the French people their territory, a new dynasty may be introduced into that kingdom, and sovereigns and people, having learned more wisdom from their late calamities, may understand how to command and how to obey upon principles which become men instructed by reason, and enlightened by revelation.

To add to the misfortunes of Buonaparte, and to lower that pride, which displayed itself in his boasts and threats

against this country, the British standard is unfurled on his own territory. He, who so long threatened our coast with invasion, and vaunted that he would drive the British legions from Spain into the sea, must foam with rage on hearing that they have beaten his armies driven them from the Pyrenees, and are now encamped on the soil of France, to take advantage of his new disasters. The fall of St. Sebastian was a prelude to this great event, and has secured the entrance into France: but Pampluna is not yet fallen; and the French are still in great force in Catalonia. Bayonne is a fortress of such strength, that Lord Wellington, who is within a few miles of it, may not think it advisable to advance far into France till it is subdued; and this may be a work of time and difficulty. The invasion, however, of itself, has a tendency to distract the councils of Paris, and, at any rate, will shew the state of public opinion, and on the defeat of Buonaparte give it an opportunity of displaying itself with greater effect.

From the American continent nothing of great importance has transpired. From Buenos Ayres intelligence is reported to have arrived, which affords us far greater satisfaction than any to be derived from bloodshed, as it announces a victory over prejudice, and a prospect of moral improvement in a people, long kept in Egyptian darkness. One of their chief men has declared himself hostile to the celibacy of the clergy, and this may lead to a reform of their ecclesiastical establishment: and they are desirous that the advantages of the Lancasterian plan of education should be introduced amongst them. Deputies from that part of the world are said to be in this country, charged among other things, to procure information and assistance on this latter subject; and it will be real glory to England if it should thus be the means of adding to the moral improvement of mankind. We hope that both the Bible and the Lancasterian societies will take advantage of this opening to an alliance between the two countries, on such beneficial principles. Let us communicate to them all the instruction we can; and the man, enveloped in the chains of mere sordid self interest, needs not doubt that his expenditure will be returned to him with all the advantages he can desire.

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

In our next Number, we expect to be able to give some Biographical Account of Obadiah, the Rev J. Bealey and the Rev. J. Simpson (of Bath), lately deceased.

Various articles of Review are lying by us, waiting for admission.

The Resolutions of the Southern Unitarian Society are received: we submit to this Society that they may render their communications more acceptable by transmitting them free of expence: we should not make this suggestion public, if private remonstrance had not been in vain.