

THE  
**Monthly Repository,**  
&c.

No. CXLII.]

OCTOBER, 1817.

[Vol. XII.

**BIOGRAPHY.**

*Memoir of the late Rev. John Prior  
Estlin, LL.D.*

**T**HE Dissenting congregations have to lament the loss of a faithful servant of the churches, in the person of Dr. Estlin, of Bristol, of whom a short memorial cannot but be acceptable.

JOHN PRIOR ESTLIN was born at Hinckley, in Leicestershire, April 9th, 1747. He received his school education under the auspices of his maternal uncle, the Rev. John Prior, Vicar of Ashby de la Zouch; and his earliest views in life seemed to be directed to the Church of England, towards which, and its religious services, notwithstanding the wide difference with regard to doctrinal points in the sentiments he afterwards entertained, he always felt a certain degree of respect and affection. From school, where he imbibed a taste for classical literature, he was, however, sent by his father to the Dissenting Academy of Warrington, where he was entered in the year 1764; and the course of studies he there went through determined his choice towards a different persuasion. The divinity chair of this seminary was filled at that time by the Rev. Dr. Aikin, for whose character he ever entertained the highest respect and affection; and whose sentiments in morals and religion he for the most part adopted. Having finished his academical course with credit to himself and satisfaction to his tutors, he was invited to the congregation of Lewin's Mead, Bristol, as colleague to the Rev. Thomas Wright, in the room of the Rev. William Richards, and he entered on his ministerial services in January 1771. With this congregation, a numerous, respectable and affectionate one, he continued till those who had sat as children under his early ministry, had themselves become heads of fa-

milies, or, perhaps, had left those families to fill up their places in the religious assemblies; and Dr. Estlin often spoke with much feeling of the numerous friends he had followed to the grave during his ministration, always adding with energy, that he should ever bless God for the circumstance, that he had not known an instance of a person who regularly attended the worship of God in that place, who had not hope in his death, and of whom he had not the brightest hopes. In his funeral sermon on the death of his co-pastor, in the year 1797, he says, "Two hundred times have I already been called to the discharge of a similar melancholy duty." Soon after settling at Bristol, Dr. Estlin opened a school, which became a very flourishing one, and many of his pupils did credit to themselves and to their tutor by their proficiency in classical learning, which they exhibited when entered in the Universities, to which many of them were removed. Dr. Estlin treated his pupils with great liberality; and their sense of the happy hours they had spent under his tuition was expressed by an annual meeting, which was held on his birth-day, by the gentlemen who had been under his care, at which the Dr. was always a delighted and delighting guest. At one of these meetings they presented him with the degree of Doctor of Laws, which they had procured for him without his knowledge from the University of Glasgow. It was usual with Dr. Estlin, on these occasions, to address his former pupils in a short speech, and that which he delivered on his last birth-day, when he completed his seventieth year, which conveyed an intimation that this might probably be their last meeting, was peculiarly impressive. His school and congregation did not, however, so

engage the active mind of Dr. Estlin, as to prevent his giving to the world several publications, all of them relative to those topics of religion and morals which were the favourite subjects of his investigation. A list of these is subjoined; they testify that he approved himself the watchful and affectionate defender of the truths he professed to teach, and that the powers of his mind were engaged with sincerity and fervour in the duties of his profession. His style was elegant, clear and flowing, rather turned to pathos than to dry argumentation; his delivery in the pulpit animated, solemn and affectionate. He was fond of preaching, and never spared himself when any occasions called him forth. Dr. Estlin's religious opinions were what is called Unitarian, though, with his usual candour, he thought it wrong to restrict that term to those who hold the simple humanity of Christ. He always invited discussion, and though in the confidence of a sanguine disposition (perhaps the best disposition for happiness) he made no doubt of the prevalence of the opinions he held, and *that* in a very short time over the whole Christian world, and the consequent overthrow of all error, he always shewed the utmost candour to those of a different persuasion; the fervour of his religious feelings never led him to bigotry, nor his liberality to scepticism. He approved of forms of prayer, and published in 1814, a volume of such forms, great part of which is taken from the Liturgy of the Church of England, for the mode of whose services, though not for its doctrines, he seems to have retained his early predilections. Dr. Estlin also embraced with great ardour a doctrine so congenial to his temper as the consoling one of Universal Restitution, or the final salvation of all mankind; led to it as well by the benevolent tendencies of his own mind as by the earnest and reiterated arguments of a dear and beloved friend, who bore that all-consoling doctrine the nearest to his heart. The characteristics of Dr. Estlin's mind were an amiable frankness and simplicity of heart, with a kind and sociable disposition, which made him, even when years pressed upon him, always acceptable in the society of the young and active. With openness of heart

he never refused his purse to any claim of distress, or useful project to which subscriptions were solicited; and the money he thus disbursed, if put together, would be found to amount to no inconsiderable portion of his income. In the domestic circle, his kindness, his candour, his hospitality, his cheerful piety, the writer of this memoir has often experienced. In truth, in his behaviour to his family principle was not called into action, temper was sufficient. Though fond of his children, he was not apt to indulge that anxiety which saddens the domestic circle, and perhaps often defeats its own purposes; he lived to see his family grown up, and some of them settled in respectable professions. For some years past Dr. Estlin had experienced a decay of sight, and he had often said that after threescore and ten a preacher ought to be *emeritus*. He therefore resigned his situation at Lewin's Mead, where he preached his farewell sermon the 22nd of June, 1817. This respectable society shewed their regard for the services of their minister by very substantial expressions of their esteem and affection, having presented him with a handsome sum of money upon his retiring from his ministerial duties. Dr. Estlin being thus exonerated from all professional duty, having also given up his school, went for the summer to Southerndown, in Glamorganshire, a retired place by the sea side, where he had usually spent his vacations, and where he had amused himself by building a cottage. His health seemed to be declining, yet there appeared nothing immediately alarming. On Sunday, the 10th of August, he performed the morning and afternoon services to his family and a few neighbours assembled in his house: the subject of his sermon was the resurrection. He appeared better that day than usual, but retiring soon after into his chamber, he was seized with a sudden effusion of blood from his lungs; the affectionate partner of his life ran to him; he grew faint, leaned his head upon her bosom, and without a sigh expired. Dr. Estlin's remains were conveyed, attended by his sorrowing family, to Bristol, and interred in the burying ground belonging to Lewin's Mead Chapel, on the 23rd. They were attended to the grave by

more than one hundred and twenty gentlemen on foot, the carriages of many of them following. The burial service was performed by the Rev. Dr. Carpenter, his successor in the pastoral office; and on the next Sunday an affecting and consolatory sermon was preached by his old friend the Rev. James Manning, of Exeter. The chapel was hung with black, and the whole congregation put on mourning. Dr. Estlin was twice married; first to Miss Coates, of Bristol, by whom he had one son who died before him, but who has left a family; in the second instance to Miss Bishop, of Bristol, who, with six children, survives to cherish and do honour to his memory.

The writer of this memoir could have enlarged upon feelings the result of private friendship, but has preferred touching upon no topics which are not equally interesting to all who knew the subject of it. A. L. B.

Stoke Newington,

September 22nd, 1817.

List of Dr. Estlin's Publications.

The Causes of the Inefficacy of Public Instruction considered, in a Sermon preached at the Ordination of the Rev. David Jardine, Bath. 1790.

Evidences of Revealed Religion, and particularly Christianity, stated with reference to a Pamphlet called the Age of Reason. 1796.

The Nature and Causes of Atheism. To which are added, Remarks on a Work called *Origine de tous les cultes, ou Religion universelle.* Par Dupuis. 1797.

An Apology for the Sabbath. 1801.

The Union of Wisdom and Integrity recommended, in a Discourse delivered before the Unitarian Society in the West of England. 1801.

Sermons designed chiefly as a Preservative from Infidelity and Religious Indifference. 1802.

Discourses on Universal Restitution. 1813.

The General Prayer Book; containing Forms of Prayer on principles common to all Christians, for Religious Societies, for Families, and for Individuals. Chiefly selected from the Scriptures, the Book of Common Prayer, and the Writings of various Authors. 1814.

General Instructions in the Doctrines and Duties of Religion, altered from "Practical Instructions." 3rd Edition. 1815.

A Unitarian Christian's Statement and Defence of his Principles, with reference particularly to the Charges of the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of St. David's; with Notes. 1815.

A Sermon on Persecution, with Extracts from the Rev. Clement Perrot's Report of the Persecutions of the French Protestants. 1816.

Dr. Estlin had also prepared for publication two volumes of Lectures on Moral Philosophy, which he had been accustomed to deliver to his pupils and family on Sunday evenings, and to which many of them may probably trace impressions the most favourable to the formation of a virtuous character. These will speedily be given to the world, although they have not received his last corrections.

---

## ORIGINAL LETTERS.

---

From Messrs. Palmer and Muir.

[Communicated by Mr. Rutt.]

Clapton, Sept. 29th, 1817.

SIR,

I HOPE I shall not be judged too fond of a favourite theme if I offer you a few more letters, which have come in my way since those were sent, which you inserted pp. 203 and 261. There are still surviving among your readers, some who knew the writers, and a few more, who feel an interest in their story.

The First letter refers to a circumstance, very unpleasant at the time,

from the effects to which Mr. Palmer alludes; though I am persuaded, after having referred to what I then wrote to Mr. Muir, that Mr. Palmer did nothing unworthy of his general proper spirit and high integrity.

The Third and Fourth letters are copies, taken for me soon after the originals arrived. The Fourth was written to a gentleman of Scotland, who took the most affectionate interest in all Mr. Muir's concerns. I hope he is still living, though I have not seen him for more than twenty years. *The picture of Dr. Price,*

which was the print by Holloway, I well remember to have seen adorning the chimney-piece of the room where Mr. Muir was detained in Newgate.

The Fifth letter is the original, communicated to me, I believe, by that gentleman, of Mr. Muir's two friends, to whom it is directed. Your readers, by referring to the former pages of this volume, may preserve the connexion of the letters, and perhaps find them explaining each other.

J. T. RUTT.

—  
*Letter I.*

*Stanislaus Hulk, Feb. 7th, 1794.*

DEAR SIR,

I have received another affecting testimony of your sympathy, and your concern for the liberties of your country, outraged in my person. Every situation has its peculiar consolations; mine are not wanting; the greatest of all, possibly, the approbation and regard of such men as yourself. I will do nothing to forfeit them. I petitioned the King for justice, I petition the House of Commons as the constitutional guardian of the rights and liberties of the subject, and as the overseer of the criminal courts. In this I do what I think right. My views are very limited, and I may be wrong; but I think it every thing to bring on public discussion as often as possible. I am sorry that my friend Muir sees differently, as it would be better if we drew together. I am still more sorry that my Scotch friends should reprobate the measure with such freeness. But I am sure that my petitions might be signed by any man of honour and my principles.

I have been indiscreet in revealing a sentence of Mr. Vaughan's letter, where I thought I was in perfect safety. This gives me great pain. Make up matters between us by bringing him and Mr.—— to dinner.

Farewell, dear Citizen: in behalf of such men easy are the sufferings of your obliged,  
T. F. PALMER.

*Mr. Rutt.*

—  
*Letter II.*

*Surprize, Spithead, Mar. 12th, 1794.*

MY DEAR SIR,

No one is more entitled to a letter from me than yourself, for I have not experienced more kindness from my

near relations. I know and I esteem the motive. Every day I will endeavour to become more worthy of it.

The signal for sailing is flying: two days are the limits, I apprehend, of our stay. At present nothing can be more uncomfortable than our situation; it is so damp and unwholesome that the health of us all is affected: but I know that it will not last long; and I have very good reasons for believing, that our situation at B. B. will be infinitely better than we have been taught to expect.

The doctor (Thompson) who goes out with us is a very intelligent man, and a free settler, Mr. Boston, remarkably so. They have both a turn for Natural History and Chemistry. In these pursuits I mean to amuse myself, for in spite of the benevolence and good sense of our friend—I am not Quixote enough to attempt reformation in religion or politics under a military government, with a halter round my neck.

You will indulge me with a letter by every opportunity, and with the Cambridge Intelligencer of our friend Flower. The letter you sent me was from my most esteemed and excellent friend, Mr. Turner, of Newcastle. He tells me that he has desired Mr. Johnson to transmit me a token of his friendship. Possibly there will not be time to get this now; but I should be glad to have it by the first opportunity, together with Dunn's Atlas, if that honest man Mr. Johnson, dare trust another.

Farewell, dear Sir: from your obliged and affectionate

T. F. PALMER.

*Mr. Rutt.*

—  
*Letter III.*

*Sydney, New South Wales,*

*Dec. 12th, 1794.*

DEAR SIR,

The gentleman who delivers this letter and packet is Mr. White, Principal Surgeon to the establishment of New South Wales. Tell my friends that I am greatly obliged to him, more indeed than I can estimate, for daring to countenance and to take by the hand, in the region of despotism, an oppressed man accused of the crime of murder. He has given me a cottage and four acres of land.

His kindness to me in the situation

that I arrived here in, will plead in his favour to all the good and worthy; but did they know his general character they would not want my feeble testimony to his worth. His loss will be felt far and wide, but by none more than myself, to whom it was his constant study to render every service. Though planted in the land of lawless power and rigorous discipline, he has sentiments of liberty not uncongenial with your own.

I am, dear Sir, your most obedient and affectionate servant,

THOMAS FYSHE PALMER.

—, Esq.

Letter IV.

Sydney, 13th Dec. 1794.

MY DEAREST FRIEND,

FOR by that name I shall always address you, I am perfectly well: I am pleased with my situation, as much as a person can be who is for ever separated from all they loved, and from all they respected. But I feel no regret, for in the cause of the people I consider my life and my happiness as things of no value. I can only write you a few lines; I have been constantly occupied in preparing the evidence in exculpation, and the defence of Messrs. Palmer and Skirving. That affair will make a noise in Europe.

Skirving, Palmer and myself, now live in the utmost harmony. From our society Margarott is expelled. Would you believe it? We have been employed in celebrating the anniversary of the first convention, which met upon the 11th December, 1792. Last night we all supped in the Secretary's house [Skirving's], this night in Palmer's, and to-morrow in mine, over the water, in a small farm I purchased for £30 sterling. You see we still have some little enjoyments. Of our treatment here I cannot speak too highly. Gratitude will for ever bind me to the officers, civil and military. I shudder to ask the vain question, What news? I avert my eyes from my friends. Their remembrance is the only idea which disturbs the repose of my tomb; for so I must call this situation of privation from all that was dear to me. Remember me earnestly and affectionately to them all, to Lindsay, Shields, Dr. Hamilton, Bell, Higginson, Maxwell, Dyer, Brand Hollis, Joyce, Dr. Disney.

Tell Dr. Disney I gave away his Works at Rio Janeiro to an excellent man, whom I am proud to call my friend, my affectionate friend, the Abbot of St. Antonio. In the magnificent library of that monastery, the picture of Dr. Price, given me by ———, is suspended. To that library I likewise presented the Memoirs of Mr. Hollis, the gift of that excellent man Mr. B. Hollis. As a small matter of curiosity, I send you some Latin addresses I received from the good fathers. They may gratify my friends; they may convince them that liberality of sentiment is confined to no soil and to no climate. I shall always with tender respect think upon *Raymont Binnafort*: the happiest, the most peaceful evenings of my life were spent in his apartments. You must send him copies of my trial, of my engraved picture, and of every thing relating to me. This from you he requests. The address is easy; to him at the Monastery of St. Antonio, at Rio Janeiro. I have a neat little house here. I have another two miles distant at the farm across the water. A servant of a friend, who has a taste for drawing, has sketched the landscape; I have sent it to my mother; you may see it.

I pray to Almighty God that all has succeeded with you, that you are firmly settled: but, indeed, my dear Moffatt, even in writing to you I feel pain, for I dread, but cannot know the storms which at this moment may be blasting individuals and desolating our country. I have not a moment's time to write. Tell all my friends I have been entirely occupied in drawing the papers in Palmer's and in Skirving's case. This must be my apology.

The sincerest wishes of my heart attend Mrs. Moffatt. Do you remember Mrs. Thomson? She has acted to me in every respect during the voyage as a sister; she begs leave to testify to Mrs. M. her esteem.

Remember me to Lord Lauderdale, Messrs. Maitland, Grey, Sheridan, Thomson. I fondly trust that they enjoy the confidence of the people, and no longer vote in the *minority*. Write me long and fully; send me the newspapers, pamphlets, &c. &c. Annexed to this letter I will send you a list of the articles I may want. When

any money is transmitted, cause a considerable part of it to be laid out at the Cape or at Rio Janeiro in rum, tobacco, sugar, &c. &c. which are invaluable, and the only medium of exchange. We bought some rum at Rio for 18*d.* the gallon, and can sell it for 30*s.* Our friends can easily find some person at the Cape, at Batavia, to take the charge of this, with every ship for the port, and will write to R. Binnafort, at Rio Janeiro. Be extremely attentive to this circumstance, as it is of the highest moment. Our mercantile friends can easily settle this. Let them likewise, upon consideration, settle it at Rio, as our friend the Abbot may be recalled to Portugal, of which he had some idea. In a country like this, where money is really of no value, and rum every thing, you must perceive the necessity of my having a constant supply by every vessel. For a goat I would pay, in money, £10 sterling: now, for less than eight gallons of spirits, at 18*d.* the gallon, I can make the same purchase. If it is possible, when you settle your correspondence, cause £50 or £60 sterling worth of rum to be purchased at Rio Janeiro, or at the Cape. Tobacco at Rio sells for 3*d.* per lb. here at 3*s.* 6*d.* That, too, is an article to be considered. Now, my dearest friend, I must conclude, but even in closing a letter to you, it is like taking farewell for ever. I pray for every blessing of heaven upon you and your family. No day passes without you living in my thoughts. I open to you my whole soul. Others might smile, but I close this letter in tears.

Yours sincerely and unalterably,  
T. MUIR.

*Mr. Moffatt.*

Letter V.

Sydney, Dec. 18, 1795.

Messrs. — and —.

MY DEAR FRIENDS,

PREVENTED by many reasons from writing to particular persons, whose idea must be familiar to your minds, I beg leave, through your medium, to transmit to them my recollections. They live, they will for ever live in my memory. Their existence is entrusted with every thought, and space and distance render the knot more indissoluble. But why should I con-

sume time, in expressing sentiments of which, if ever I had been devoid, I never would have had any pretensions to their notice. Their reflexions may, perhaps, turn upon me. Tell them I live, live faithful to the cause of freedom, and live in a manner not unworthy of its adherents. Surrounded by successive scenes of manifold affliction, the prospect of life, as it lengthens, darkening, I say, and say in the sincerity of my soul, that the sufferings of individual man ought never to be reckoned in account, if conducive to the sum of general happiness. Let then this end require greater sacrifices, life or years of exile, protracted unto the term of life, these sacrifices I am prepared to offer. Nor is this the effect of enthusiasm. Enthusiasm may dazzle its victim and his spectators in the glare of public exhibition, but in dungeons, in the long years of obscure exile, surrounded by beings who degrade the name of man, it must subside, it must dissipate and leave to the mind a solitary and a fearful void. Let me then repeat, without ostentation, what, upon entering the career of life, I have proclaimed. I have been, I am, and until I sink into the grave, I shall continue to be, the advocate of the oppressed.

Every letter I write, my friends, I consider as a renewal of my oath to the cause of man, and, I hope I do it with a correspondent solemnity.

I wish my letters to reach you, I wish them to afford no handles of persecution or misconstruction against you, and I purposely avoid all political reflexions and all political conjectures.

I pray Almighty God, my good friends, that you enjoy in your persons, your circumstances and your families, his choicest blessings. I again congratulate Mr. and Mrs. —, and let them believe my heart is sincerely attached to them. It is painful for me to begin a letter. It is more painful to conclude. But in these days,—

My dear friends, I am ever yours,  
THOMAS MUIR.

*Mr. —.*

P. S. I cannot help making one observation—you will smile as I do—*I have seen my death announced.*

[Received Mar. 14, 1797.]

## EXTRACTS FROM NEW PUBLICATIONS.

*Letter, written after the Battle of Waterloo, by the Queen of Westphalia to her Father, the King of Wirtemberg. (A Literal Translation.)*

[We extract the following Letter, exhibiting a rare example of conjugal fidelity and affection, from Sir Robert Wilson's recent publication, entitled—"A Sketch of the Military and Political Power of Russia, in the year 1817." 8vo. The gallant Author's name is voucher sufficient for the document. ED.]

"SIRE AND FATHER,  
"YOUR Majesty requested me to descend this morning into your apartment. For the first time in my life I declined the happiness of being in your presence: I knew the subject of the interview; and fearing that my mind might not be sufficiently collected, I have dared to take the liberty of developing the motives of my conduct, and making an appeal to your paternal affection.

"Your Majesty knows the whole truth. Yes, Sire, the Prince Jerome, your son-in-law, my husband and the father of my child, is with me! Yes, Sire! I have withdrawn an instant from the palace of my King, to succour the husband to whom my life is attached. My thoughts have accompanied him to the war—my care has preserved him in a long and painful journey, where his existence was often menaced. My arms have embraced him in his misfortune with more tenderness than even in the time of our prosperity!

"The Prince Jerome is not the husband of my own choice. I received him from your hand, when his house reigned over great kingdoms—when his head wore a crown. Soon the sentiments of my heart cherished and confirmed the bonds which your policy had commanded.

"Marriage and nature impose duties which are not subject to the vicissitudes of fortune: I know their extensive obligations, and I know also how to fulfil them: I was a queen—I am still a wife and a mother! The change of policy among princes, in overthrowing the French empire, has also destroyed the throne, on which your goodness, and the Prince my husband, had seated me. We were obliged to submit to the force of circumstances! The august Maria Louisa

afforded me a great example of resignation; but our situation is dissimilar. Public interest may command sacrifices of permanent duration, or which may cease when the interests of a new policy render other changes inevitable.

"Although chance has elevated us above the generality of mankind, we are much more to be pitied. A variable will controuls our destiny; but there its power ceases—it is impotent against the obligations Providence imposes on us.

"The husband which God and you yourself gave me—the child whom I have borne in my bosom—comprise my existence. I have shared a throne with this husband, I will partake with him exile and misfortune: violence alone shall separate me from him. But, O my King! O my father! I know your heart, your justice, and the excellence of your principles: I know what these principles have been at all times on the subject of those domestic duties which should be respected by the Princes of your House.

"I do not ask your Majesty, from affection for me, to make any change in that system of conduct which has been adopted in conformity with the determinations of the most powerful Princes of Europe; but I throw myself at your feet to implore permission that my husband and myself may remain near your person: but, O my father! if that must not be, let us at least be restored to your favour before we remove to a foreign soil. It is only after having received some proof of your paternal love, that I can feel strength sufficient to appear before you. If we must go this very evening, let us depart with the assurance of your affection and protection in a happier time. Our misfortunes must have a period: policy will not always command in respect to us that which is humiliating, nor delight in the ruin and degradation of so many Princes, acknowledged in former treaties, and who have been allied to the most ancient and illustrious houses of Europe. Is not their blood mingled with ours? Pardon me, my father and my Sovereign! for having thus expressed myself; but condescend, by a single word, to let me know that it has not been received with displeasure."

## MISCELLANEOUS - COMMUNICATIONS.

### *Trinitarian Controversy at Exeter.*

(Concluded from p. 525.)

MR. STOGDON, having been invited by a congregation to settle among them, wished to be ordained when the assembly should meet, in September 1717, before he entered on the pastoral charge. This being known to the orthodox party, so much intolerance was exhibited, that it was deemed desirable, for the sake of peace, to abandon the design; but Messrs. Hallett, Withers, and Peirce, highly appreciating his talents and his character, gave him a written testimonial of their good opinion,—a proceeding which excited the “hot displeasure” of the “sound in faith,” that *they* should venture to speak well of a man so deeply tainted with heresy. Heresy, however, continued to make rapid and “dangerous progress,” and at a meeting summoned by the Orthodox, in January 1718, it was determined that a deputation should be sent to the ministers of Exeter, requesting them to preach “in defence of the eternity of Jesus Christ.” When these ambassadors waited on Mr. Peirce, he told them that he believed in the eternity of Christ; but they answered, that he was required to acknowledge that Christ was *self-existent* and *self-originated*. On which he asked, if they would have him add that he was *unbegotten too*? They replied, that he wanted to entrap them, and that they did not care to reason further.

However, our reformers did so far comply with the wishes of the meeting as to express their belief publicly in the eternity of our Lord; but as they chose to respect the consciences of others, and dealt out no damnation on those who differed from them, they were accused of not *daring* to be “clear, open and strenuous in their opposition.” Mr. Peirce, indeed, went further: he boldly proclaimed *his* right, and the right of all men, to think for themselves in the spirit of unfettered liberty:—

“This liberty let others tamely give up as they please; I do, and will insist upon it for myself, as a reasonable creature, a Christian, a Protestant, and a Dissenter. As I pretend not to impose on others, so nor will I be imposed

upon by others. No king, no parliament, no church, no council, no synod, no minister or body of ministers, shall be acknowledged by me to have any power or rightful authority over me. They may deprive me of my civil liberty, of my estate, or of my life, but *this* liberty, by the grace of God, they never shall deprive me of, to think and speak of the matters of God and of religion only in that manner in which I apprehend they are spoken of in the Holy Scriptures by God himself. Tell me not what Athanasius or Arius—what the Council of Nice or Rimini have said; but what Christ and Peter, and Paul, James and John, have said. *I call no man master upon earth.*” And afterwards most earnestly, most pathetically, does he implore his hearers, “by the mercies of God, and the gentleness of Christ,” to cultivate a spirit of candour and kindness and generous feeling, thus emphatically concluding, “This has been my course, and in the integrity of my heart I recommend it to you all. And now, whether you will hear, or whether you will forbear, I take God,—and now also I take your own consciences, to record, that I have honestly and faithfully delivered my whole soul.”

A temporary calm succeeded; but measures were taken by the Orthodox to make the period of the assembly in the following September, the moment for “purging the church” of the heresies which had been introduced. Unknown to the individuals most nearly concerned, advices were sent to London, and a meeting of ministers was called there to condemn the errors respecting the Trinity, which were making such progress in the West; and it was also determined that a subscription should be required from all the ministers at the Exeter assembly, to the first article of the Church of England. In the mean time (to keep up an appearance of liberality) Mr. Peirce and Mr. Withers were requested to meet Mr. Ball and Mr. Walroud,\* to “consult upon

\* These two ministers, the first of Honiton, the second of Ottery, had afterwards, with five others, the honour of being fixed on to be the immediate instruments of the ejection of the Exeter ministers—a business for which their fiery intolerance well fitted

the subject." The former instantly declared against the anti-christian pretensions of the assembly to dictate in matters of faith; but the latter, after assuring them that *nothing* was intended against those already in the ministry, it was proposed merely to guard against the introduction of "unsound preachers" as candidates, insisted on the necessity of removing the stain and stigma of heresy which attached to the West.

The day previous to the meeting of the assembly, a long discussion took place at a private house in Exeter (where many ministers were collected), in which Mr. Peirce insisted that the

---

them. I have a letter in Mr. Ball's handwriting, from which "the temper of his mind" may be judged. The following verbatim copy may elucidate the foregoing narration.

"Mr. Twogood,

"I hear your Mr. Stogdon is to be ordained at your brother's meeting-house. Doth your brother know what confession of faith is carried about Exon as his, which all the ministers are against? Has any one consulted any of the elder ministers about Bristol? I am not willing my name should be mentioned, because Mr. Stogdon takes me as his enemy, which God is my witness I never was; but must I hold my peace, and see the church overrun with Arianism, to dethrone Christ, and bring in worship of a creature? These things should be considered, or where will faith be, and what a stink will non-conformity end in?"

"Yours, J. BALL."

On one occasion, when Mr. Ball preached from Mr. Peirce's pulpit, he had the good manners to indulge in animadversions which could not but be applied to Mr. P. He introduced a Trinitarian doxology, which had been discarded, and publicly returned thanks to God for the liberty of *so* glorifying him. After the list was published of the seven ministers who recommended and procured the ejection of Mr. Peirce and Mr. Hallett, he said he would have his name put in capitals in the list, and that had he been silent, he should not have died in peace. Mr. Walrond too, was so proud of the distinction, that he says, "he would have the enemies of Christ's Godhead know that he counts it his truest glory, and desires that his name may stand on the list for ever." There indeed it will stand, another monument of human folly, another proof that there are "who GLORY in their shame."

After his exploits at Exeter, Mr. Walrond succeeded in inducing the congregation at Budleigh to discharge their minister, Mr. Beadon (a most exemplary and high-minded man), on a charge of heresy.

VOL. XII.

4 F

right of private judgment is the great principle of dissent, and also contended for the "supremacy of the Father." The liberal ministers proposed that the differences of opinion should be made the subject of friendly and free discussion; but to this the majority objected. To impose a creed is easier than to defend one. Mr. Withers (who had anticipated this debate) read a paper, arguing that the proposal of any test whatever is an encroachment on our common liberty, abhorrent to the spirit of dissent, and which (if allowed) must condemn the Puritans for refusing, and justify their adversaries in imposing the *ex-officio* oaths; that it would be the introduction of a system of encroachment and church-tyranny, which, though satisfied with one test to-day, would require another to-morrow. He then learnedly objected to the test itself. Though his address was candid, conciliatory and convincing, he was several times most rudely interrupted; and then (even in the intercourse of social communion) the friends of truth and free inquiry discovered the malignant spirit which was at work to bring about their overthrow.

The assembly (impatient to manifest their "zeal for the glory of God") met half an hour earlier than usual; and after prayer, Mr. Ball moved, that they should declare against those who denied the divinity of our Saviour.\*

---

\* Richard Baxter's words will hardly be misplaced here:—"Had not the devil turned orthodox, he had not made so many true Christians heretics, as Epiphanius and Austin have enrolled in the black list. Had not the enemy of truth and peace got into the *chair*, and made so pathetic an oration as to inflame the minds of the *lovers of truth* to be *over zealous* for it and to do too much, we might have had truth and peace to this day. Yea, still if he see any man of experience and moderation stand up to reduce men to the ancient simplicity, he presently seems the *most zealous for Christ*, and tells the *unexperienced* leaders of the flocks, that it is in favour of some heresy that such a man speaks; he is plotting a carnal syncretism, and attempting the reconcilment of Christ with Belial; he is tainted with Popery, or Socinianism, or Arminianism, or Calvinism, or whatsoever may make him odious to those he speaks to. O, what the devil hath got by overdoing!"

*Thirty-two Directions for Peace*, xxvii.

The proposal was seconded by a clamorous concurrence of voices. When (after some time) silence was restored, several respectable ministers expressed their wishes that the expediency of so singular a proceeding should be calmly discussed; but no! it had been before determined that the stamp of heresy, of infamy, should be affixed to the obnoxious advocates of civil and religious liberty, and, in consequence, a noisome tumult drowned the reasonable suggestion. Moderation, candour and charity were here successful advocates.

Mr. John Walrond then asked permission to read letters he had received from Mr. William Long and Mr. Benjamin Robinson, of London,\* on the subject of the spreading errors; upon which Mr. Peirce proposed that the representations which had caused the now produced letters, should first be laid before the assembly. This reasonable suggestion obtained no attention; though, after-inquiries made it obvious that the statements sent to London were most unfair and exaggerated, not a detail of facts, but a string of eulogiums on the *candour*, *forbearance* and *tenderness* of the orthodox party, and of equally well-merited accusations against the heterodox. A number of silly stories were introduced respecting the "new notions," and the whole combined was admirably calculated to alarm the timid, and to inflame the intolerant. The London letters were read, and it was immediately determined that all present should declare their faith. It was asked, "if the words of Scripture could be accepted as sufficiently orthodox?" "No! no!" was the immediate decision, they are not express enough for such an occasion as this. Mr. Joseph Hallett (the senior minister) then read his declaration, and

\* The conduct of these London divines was scarcely less illiberal than that of their western co-adjutors. When Mr. Walrond's letter reached town, and had been read at a meeting of ministers, it was proposed, that before any proceedings were grounded on his statements, further inquiry should be made, and Mr. Peirce, in particular, be written to: but this proposition was immediately negatived, they "would not question Mr W.'s veracity!" and they hurried off their anathema without delay.

concluded by saying, that one of the great plagues of the church had been the composing, and then imposing creeds upon others in language of our own. He wished men would have more manners and more humility than to accuse the word of God of imperfection and obscurity, and more wisdom than to endeavour to mend it by their uncharitableness.\*

Various were the declarations made. Mr. Peirce openly avowed his belief in the inferiority of the Son.† Some refused to make any confessions of faith whatever; and one said, "I deny any authority that any man or body of men, or this assembly hath to demand my opinion." However, the scribe recorded, as the general sense of the assembly, "That there is but one living and true God, and that the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are the true God." During the discussions, the wildest extravagancies of ultra-orthodoxy were defended, and one of the high party, when the absurdity of his creed was urged upon him, said, "I leave God to reconcile his own contradictions."

The friends of free inquiry exerted themselves as far as they were able in behalf of truth and charity. Mr. Matthew Huddy preached a sermon ‡ to the assembly, earnestly contending for the right of private judgment, recommending the use of reason in matters of religion, and condemning the spirit of intolerance which had been exerted so banefully and so exten-

\* This language is borrowed from the Preface to Part II. of Baxter's *Saint's Rest*; and I may be excused, I hope, in introducing a passage from the same author—Preface to *Church History*:—"If you know not what to call me, I will tell you. I am a Christian, a mere Christian, of no other religion; and the church that I am of is the Christian church. But you must know of what *sect* or party I am? I am against all sects and dividing parties.

\* \* \* \* \*

"I, and such as I, call ourselves mere Christians, or Catholic Christians against all sects and sectarian names, and haters both of true heresy and schism, and proud, unrighteous hereticating and anathematizing."

† It was a subject of after-regret to Mr. P. that he had not manfully resisted the usurping pretensions of the assembly to question him concerning his faith.

‡ September 9, 1718.

sively. Though this admirable sermon was clamorously railed against, Mr. Isaac Gilling resumed the subject two days after, in a discourse, "On the mischief of rash and uncharitable judging," in which he makes a noble stand against those inquisitors who would dictate creeds and tyrannize over consciences.

About two months after the assembly, the trust of the Exeter congregations applied to their ministers, requiring their professions of faith in the words of the first article of the Church of England, the Sixth Answer of the Assembly's Catechism, or the test agreed upon at the September assembly. Mr. Peirce refused to comply. They urged that he had already subscribed \* (as required by law) when he began to preach, but he candidly told them, he had not lived twenty years longer without some enlightenment of mind, and if *now* he were called on to subscribe, he would on no account comply. They next urged him quietly to lay down his ministry, but this, of course, he refused; telling them, however, that if they chose to dismiss him he should not resist their proceedings.

That the trustees might appear to proceed with some sort of decorum, they called in seven neighbouring ministers to advise with them. These were

John Ball, of Honiton,  
Samuel Hall, of Tiverton,  
John Moore, † of ditto,  
William Horsham, of Topsham,  
John Walrond, of Ottery,  
Josiah Eveleigh, ‡ of Crediton, and  
Joseph Manston, of Lypston,  
who were among the most intemperate of the Trinitarian party. They met

\* When Fox, the martyrologist, was requested to subscribe, he pulled out a Greek Testament from his pocket, declaring that he would subscribe to *that* and to nothing else.

† Mr. Moore afterwards objected to the method adopted for the ejection of Mr. Peirce and Mr. Hallett.

‡ Mr. Eveleigh pretends (in his *Sober Reply*, p. 21) to have felt a wonderful interest in behalf of Mr. Peirce, and says he would have cut off his own right hand to have preserved his usefulness: yet his writings and his conduct breathe a spirit of bigotry and slander, which ill become the pert self-complacency which so constantly intrudes.

in the early part of the following year, though no intimation was given to Mr. Peirce and his colleagues of their having been sent for. These (as was expected or foreknown) jointly agreed, that if a minister adopted Anti-Trinitarian principles, his congregation would be justified in discharging him. A circular to this effect was sent over the county. It was known that at the great meeting of ministers about to be held at Salters' Hall, § the subject of the Exeter controversy was to be discussed; but so impatient were they to manifest their zeal against their "false brethren," that they would not wait for the result. The ministers were therefore called before this tribunal, and questioned and cross-questioned as to their belief. Mr. Peirce was asked, if he would allow "Christ and the Father to be one God." He replied that "if they would refer him to one text which said so, he would own it, but that he would subscribe to no test not expressed in Scripture language; that if they came and authoritatively *required* him to say that *two and three make five*, he would refuse to do so; that the days of blind submission were past, for God had roused a noble spirit in men (when least expected), and that *he* would not basely sacrifice the liberty they were so bravely defending." Mr. Hallett made a similar declaration. Mr. Withers offered Bishop Pearson's explanation of the Trinity, which was not accepted. Mr. Lavington roundly gave his assent to the formulary required. The result was, that the Trustees (though not unanimously) shut out the three ministers from their chapels. Whatever might be the opinion of the majority of the members, the trustees insisted on their right to the sole management of ecclesiastical affairs, and thus their anti-christian proceedings were consummated.||

§ Here too, a similar spirit was manifested; for though it was not possible to get a resolution passed (as was attempted) *obliging* all ministers to express their belief in the Trinity in a form of words to be prescribed, yet the *majority* did agree that a congregation may require a minister to prove to them the soundness of his orthodoxy. A great number of ministers protested against this decision.

|| Mr. Withers afterwards assented to the first article of the Church of England, and

In May 1719, the assembly again met. Some of the violent party were for making new declarations. Mr. Peirce proposed that a fast should be appointed, and that *all* should unite in prayer to the Divine Being to conduct them into the path of truth; that all animosities should cease, and that the subjects of dispute should be discussed in a frank and friendly manner. So reasonable a suggestion was as a matter of course rejected. During the meeting, Mr. George Jacomb applied to be ordained, but he was refused, because he would not give his confession of faith in any other than Scripture language, and in consequence, the following singular record was proposed by the Moderator: "Whereas Mr. Jacomb, out of respect to the Scripture, has refused to declare his faith in other than Scripture words; so the assembly, out of respect to the Scriptures, refuse to admit it." One individual said, that now-a-days Scripture was not plain enough without explanation; and another hoped that God would restore the ministerial and magisterial power to punish heretics. During the assembly, Mr. Samuel Carkeet preached a most striking Sermon, in which he says, he came forth from "unenvied, unmolested obscurity, to bear his testimony" against those encroaching anti-christian teachers, who presumed to erect their system as the standard of faith and holiness, excommunicating and anathematizing all who claimed for themselves "the liberty with which Christ had made them free."

But the orthodox had determined now to effect their object, and in consequence, forty-five ministers signed a declaration, that they could not consent to the preaching of any candidate, or recommend any minister to a congregation, who would not profess his faith in the Trinity; they say they heartily pity and pray for those who had fallen into dangerous errors, and warn their flocks against them, intimating that their sole hope of future blessedness must depend on the soundness of their opinions, which, to preserve unshaken, they recommend should be undisturbed by restless inquisitiveness into the "mysteries of religion."

Mr. Peirce subjoins, "May that good man's yoke sit easy on him! I cannot yet repent that I did not submit to the same."

Let such men and such acts be forgotten, while we record with honourable mention the names of those distinguished ministers who, refusing to receive imposed creeds themselves, or to be instrumental in imposing creeds on others, signed a public protest against the proceedings of the assembly:—

Joseph Hallett,  
Isaac Gilling,\*  
James Peirce,  
John Cox,†  
Matthew Huddy,‡  
Roger Beadon,§  
Samuel Carkeet,||  
Samuel Adams,  
John Parr,¶  
Joseph Hallett, jun.\*\*

\* Of Newton Abbott. He was deserted by his congregation, calumniated and insulted, for having asserted (to a brother minister, who proclaimed Mr. G.'s heresy) his belief in the subordination of Christ. On another occasion, he said "he could not, and would not, believe the Trinity in Unity." At the September assembly, he refused to make any declaration of faith.

† John Cox, of Kingsbridge, was required by his congregation to subscribe to the Fifth and Sixth Answers of the Assembly's Catechism: he refused, and was dismissed. He was a man of exemplary virtue, to which his enemies themselves bore testimony.

‡ Mr. Huddy would make no declaration at the meeting in September; and in one of his Sermons he is said to have cautioned his hearers "against giving too much honour to the Son."

§ Mr. Peirce calls him "honest Mr. Beadon." He was afterwards ejected by his congregation at Budleigh, for denying the genuineness of 1 John v. 7.; for refusing to teach the Assembly's Catechism; and for saying that the Son is not in all respects equal to the Father. The western inquirers accuse him (p. 28 of their Answer) of having been unsound in his faith. See Note, pp. 580, 581.

|| Mr. Carkeet resisted the authority of the assembly in September, and would make no confession of faith whatever.

¶ Mr. Parr gave as his creed the words of Ephesians iv. 4—6, and would give no other. The synod accused him of heresy.

\*\* Mr. Hallett succeeded his father as co-pastor with Mr. Peirce, in 1722. He published a Funeral Sermon for the latter. Himself died in 1744, æt. 52. Some of his works are yet held in high estimation. He was a man of uncommon gentleness of manners and integrity of heart, and was honoured with the friendship and corres-

James How, \*  
 John Force, †  
 Nathaniel Cock, ‡  
 Thomas Hornbrook,  
 George Jacomb  
 John Starr,  
 John Fox,  
 Mark Facy,  
 John Forse.

The violent passions excited by this controversy may be judged of by the opprobrious language used by the orthodox against the Arians; such as "damnable heretics, thieves and robbers, damnable soul-poisoners, dragons and asps, and profane persecutors."|| Their adversaries answered them not by "excellency of speech," and irresistible arguments, but by handing them over to the insults of the mob,

pendence of many of the learned of his time.

\* Mr. How was not a believer in the Trinity, according to the statement of the inquisitors.

† Of Bovey. The Exeter Assembly endeavoured to procure his ejection, but were baffled. He had a conference with the disaffected of his congregation, one of whom was honest enough to say, "though I take the Scriptures for information, I go further for confirmation." On one occasion Mr. Force declared "he never believed in his life the Father, Son and Holy Ghost to be one God;" and again, when the necessity of an *infinite satisfaction* was urged, he replied, "Infinite satisfaction is infinite nonsense."

‡ Of Bideford, was most slanderously and industriously vilified, and abandoned by many of his congregation, in consequence of his refusal to acknowledge the authority of the Western Synod; but the writer has heard his virtues proclaimed from lips ("now still in death") whose praise was no unenviable, no unenvied, honour.

§ Mr. Jacomb's account of the proceedings of the assembly in connexion with himself, is a very interesting pamphlet. When they objected to his proposal of making a declaration in Scripture language, that Arians and Socinians would quote Scripture, he quoted an interesting passage in Baxter's History: Some ministers endeavouring to draw up a list of the fundamentals of Christianity, Mr. Baxter made a more general proposal: they told him that a Papist or a Socinian might subscribe to his articles, and he answered, "So much the better, and the fitter to be the matter of concord."

|| Innocent Vindicated, p. 17.

making them the subjects of scurrilous ballads and drunken songs. In the very streets they were attacked by the brutal and the base, and there and thus "judiciously confuted." ¶

J. B.

Dr. Walker on the Legality of the Affirmation of the People called Quakers.

Bond Court, Walbrook, 13, 8th. 1817.

FRIEND!

FROM thy giving, from time to time, so much place in the Repository to the consideration of the sect called Quakers, who, by the simplicity of their fundamental dogma (inward light) must always, consistently therewith, of necessity be Unitarians, I am induced to address to thee this paper.

In considering the condition of the Quakers not associated with their brethren under the organization of friends, overseers, elders, ministers and clerks, I have thought their lot often to resemble that of the Hindoo who has lost cast, who, deserted by his family and friends, can only console himself with the assurance that the Supreme Being "causeth his sun to shine" on the tent of the outcast. Their peculiar principles sometimes prevent their neighbours from uniting with them in some of the most important concerns of human life; and they are estranged from their fellow-professors. But, what I at present wish to offer to the consideration of thy readers, which include both these descriptions of Quakers, is the matter of giving legal evidence. I have conversed of late with some of both these descriptions of Quakers, on the subject of their affirmation being equivalent to an oath in our courts, in cases not criminal; and both entertain the idea that the law makes no distinction between them; that this was established by the Judge, Lord Mansfield (in a case where counsel attempted to invalidate the testimony of a Quaker, because of his being not associated), in his observing that the law, in recognising the people called Quakers, knew nothing of them as a body, society, or meeting, that he therefore must abide only by the profession of

¶ Mr. Peirce's Animadversions, p. 31.

the evidence; he knew no other criterion of his being a Quaker than that of his own profession.

But does every judge and every magistrate so interpret the law of the land, with regard to the people called Quakers? I meddle not with the *Unitas Fratrum*, or people called Moravians, who also are favoured, in their religious scruples, against the taking of an oath.

I knew an Ex-quaker in Dublin subpoenaed as an evidence; the counsellor, Curran, (what is it that counsellors may not be feed to do?) called out in court, "Hand him the book." "I am a Quaker—cannot take an oath." "You a Quaker, Sir! Pray do you attend their meetings of discipline?" "No." "Do they receive your collections?" "No." "What were you disowned for?" "I have no objection to tell that. I married my wife without consulting my friends." "My Lord! here is a man whom the Quakers have turned out for a breach of their laws, and yet he claims the privilege of giving only his affirmation as a Quaker." "I appeal to the court," said the Quaker, "I avow myself not in membership with the society of Friends, but hold myself liable to all the pains and penalties incurred by taking a false oath, if I affirm what is untrue." "Let his affirmation be taken," said the judge.

Being once subpoenaed myself, in that city, I took the Act of Parliament in that behalf in my pocket. In Ireland it is required that such evidence shall solemnly, sincerely and truly declare, that he is and has been of the profession of the people called Quakers for a year and a day: I proposed to myself to make the declaration; but was not called upon for my testimony. But it has happened to me since, in this city, that on a trial which was to determine (the decision by show of hands) on some points of professional competency, consequently on my bread, on the whole shape, probably, of my future life, one of the company called a public friend (Quaker speaker), a man skilled in the law, publicly declared I was no Quaker, whereby the number of hands in my favour was diminished; though still, happily for me (unheard), constituting the majority. Acknowledged in his society as a minister, I hold him as completely

ordained as any minister of Oxford, or Geneva; as fully consecrated as the Pontiff of Rome. I will say more: though I acknowledge not any man to be the Reverend; yet, I acknowledge it would be a breach of charity to assert that I may not sometimes have had reason to believe him the reverent Richard Phillips. I mean on the occasions of his changing his attitude and uncovering his head, on his letting his voice be heard aloud in meeting. Now, if an acknowledged minister of the Quakers of London could make so public a declaration that I was no Quaker, while I, mistaken man, in different countries abroad, on being interrogated on the subject of my Quakerian peculiarities, have always declared myself a Quaker, what might I not expect from the forensic acumen of the gentlemen of the long robe at Westminster Hall? Being lately subpoenaed to the Court of King's Bench, there, as an evidence on behalf of the Defendant, I had intended appealing, *in limine*, to the judge, on the validity of my evidence, and to have utterly withholden it, if he withheld his explanation, as completely as if his decision had accorded with the notions of Richard Phillips, and not with those of Lord Mansfield, or of his brother on the Bench in Ireland. The Plaintiffs, however, withdrew the cause, and my evidence was consequently not required.

Will, then, any of thy readers, Quaker or other, inform me what is the law in the case of giving evidence, of a man professing himself a Quaker, but not being formally in any religious society of his fellow-professors? I am apprehensive the question will not be easily answered. In the answers I have yet obtained from Friends, I cannot come at any certainty; and, in thus soliciting further information, I will suppose, by way of illustration, a case of considerable complexity, or of the greatest difficulty.

The legitimate children of the members of the society of Friends are, in later times, members by inheritance. It is not necessary for them to make any confession of faith whatever. A young couple in this city lately sent in their resignation, as members of the society, on behalf of themselves and their children. The meeting received the resignation of the parents, but

retain the children in membership. If these children, unchristened, arrive at mature age, and be subpoenaed as evidence, in what form is their testimony to be taken? They generally, perhaps, make no profession of Quakerism. Is the book of the Evangelists handed to them? They never were baptized after the example of Jesus and the other primitive Christians. They were not christened, or sprinkled, like the babies of those Christians who have rejected baptism and adopted rantism. But they may say we are Quakers, and bring twenty Quakers, who pay scot and lot, to satisfy the court. *Ce n'est pas l'embarras.* Their affirmation will be received. The following is the supposed case: These said Quakers by inheritance, like others of the same description, beaux or belles of the fashion of the day, who help to make up the outwardly motley assembly, called a meeting of worship, may have absented themselves from such meetings of worship a certain number of times in succession (*par parenthese*, they may stay away as long as they please from meetings of business, where all the affairs of their society are transacted, and where attendance might, with some sort of decency, have been required), they may have been united in marriage by a priest, or they may have paid him tithes; on any of which considerations they may have been disowned to-day by the society. Tomorrow they appear in court, on a subpoena. Yesterday they were accredited Quakers; their affirmation would have been received. Now Richard Phillips might, perhaps, attempt to prevent their affirmation from being received: he might say they are no Quakers. Perhaps, however, the judge might have reason to conclude that they were, *bonâ fide*, Quakers, however little appearance of the sect might appear about their persons. The kissing of a book they might consider a piece of idolatry. This would be Quakerism. Not being the original record, they might doubt the accuracy of the transcription; must doubt the accuracy of the translation of the learned priests who interpreted it to the modern nations, tongues, &c. who now receive it; would not dare to say "It is the truth." This would be Quakerism. With all their gaiety

and levity of appearance, the charitable conclusion of the judge would be correct: but if the judge were in opposition to them, to prove as dogmatical, or as positive, as Richard Phillips; if he were to conclude they are no Quakers; would the litigant parties in the case, would the cause of justice be deprived of their evidence? Would they be still further degraded by the laws of their country than they were while in membership with the association of their sect, whose testimony in criminal cases is of no avail? *Voilà la question.*

J. W.

SIR,

Aug. 9, 1817.

I HAVE met with a MS. almost 90 years old, an extract from which will display the variety of conjectures, drawn from the prophecies, which, according to a common remark, were not designed to make their readers prophets.

The MS. is dated *May the 8th*, 1728, and is entitled, "Mr. Bedford's Computation of Prophetic Scriptures, guessing at Times of Fulfilment of, or a probable Conjecture of the same." This *Computation* extends to "Anno Christi, 3014, or thereabouts," when the *rapt* Conjecturer sees "errors, immoralities and disturbances arise, and those other particulars which are mentioned as forerunners of the end of the world." I shall confine my quotations to the *Conjecturer's* expectations respecting the period, which has now passed, from the date of the MS. I omit the profusion of texts which, as appears by the events, he so inaccurately expounded.

"1729. This year are terrible battles, with much effusion of blood; all Europe in confusion, and dismal apprehensions. One of the ten kingdoms falls, and a reformation from Popery immediately follows, which is the fatal blow to the Antichristian hierarchy.

"1730. The first vial is poured out upon the enemies of the Church of God. Germany is reformed, not with much effusion of blood, but by a discovery of vile practices of the Romish Church.

"1731. The second vial is poured out. Spain is reformed with much effusion of blood, and probably by a revolution in those kingdoms.

"1733. The fourth vial is poured out. An utter end is put to the Papal hierarchy, of all sorts. Many towns in Italy are burnt with fire, and Rome herself is levelled with the ground.

"1734. All the potentates in Europe throw off the Popish yoke.

"1735. Now Europe begins to enjoy a perfect and general peace; being the happy consequence of the destruction of Antichrist, and settling the kingdom of Christ in these parts.

"1748. The fifth vial is poured out. The Turkish empire is now afflicted with many and great calamities.

"1759. The idolatry of the Church of Rome being now removed, which was the great stumbling block that prejudiced others against Christianity, the Jews are now converted, and, assisted by the European Powers, recover the land of Canaan from the Turks, and are settled there. The Jews being now settled in the land of Canaan, place the several tribes in their order. They rebuild the city of Jerusalem, and a famous church for the worship of God.

"1778. The sixth vial is poured out upon the Turkish empire. The Mahometan superstition seems to decline. Three other vile and abominable heresies arise in that empire. These all encourage the Turks to make war with the Jews, and have frequent skirmishes; but the Turks are always beaten.

"1804. The seventh vial is poured out. The Turks bring their whole army against the Jews, and are most terribly beaten. Their empire is torn in pieces with wars and devastations, and bombarding of towns. It is divided into three kingdoms, and after that into six, and many kingdoms revolt entirely from them; so that their whole power is broken. Here is now a glorious state of the Jews, as converted to the Christian faith, and professing the true religion, and other countries continually coming into the same religion."

There is no mark on the MS. of its having been copied from a printed book, which may have been the case; nor any account besides the name of the Conjecturer, whose fancy favoured him with this *vision through the ivory gate*.

J. W. T.

*Dr. Carpenter's Remarks on Dr. Stock's Letter.*

[Dr. Stock's Letter, given pp. 481—484, was copied into *The Bristol Mirror*, a newspaper: in the same publication of the 27th ult. appeared the following letter by Dr. Carpenter, which we extract. We cannot help observing, that Dr. Stock's change of religion and his letter have been magnified by his new friends into ridiculous importance. Intelligent Calvinists must, we should think, be disgusted at the hubbub raised by this conversion, as if it gave the party something new in a man of education and respectable talents. In fact, we know that this sentiment has been strongly felt by persons who are distinguished amongst the Calvinists for the excellence of their understanding and character. We need not say that Dr. Stock must be the first to feel shame, at being used as an instrument to throw new reproaches upon those whom vulgar bigotry misnames "Socinians." ED.]

*To the Editor of the Bristol Mirror.*  
Great George-street,

SIR, Sept. 18, 1817.

**I**N your last paper you inserted Dr. Stock's letter to the Rev. John Rowe, with the introductory letter of the person who communicated it to the *New Evangelical Magazine* of this month. As Dr. Stock's letter is now, for the first time, submitted to the Bristol public, I request the insertion of the following observations.

The anonymous writer is widely mistaken, if he imagine that the letter had been "confined to the private circle of the Doctor's friends." Copies of it had, long before, been handed about in distant parts of the kingdom. It had been shewn, with triumphant exultation, to the advocates of his former opinions: it had been circulated by their opponents, to strengthen the faith of the wavering, or to recal those who had wandered.

Dr. Stock too well understands the nature of *evidence*, to imagine that his letter assigns a single *reason* why another should follow his example. Those who have so much extolled it, and have recently given it a species of celebrity, which his refined taste cannot relish, any more than his judgment can approve, shew that they consider the question as one which is to be

determined by *authority*, and not by the sober appeal to men's understandings, exercised under a serious sense of responsibility, and a sincere desire to learn the truth as it is in Jesus. We think the contrary. If Dr. Stock had been followed by all whose feelings lead their judgment, it would not have affected the foundation on which his former opinions rest; it would not have weakened the conviction which had been formed by a calm and serious investigation of the *scriptural* evidence for and against them.

When Dr. Stock's change was announced to the public, it was the language of many, "Dr. Stock become a Trinitarian! why *this* is decisive." And the greatest triumph was manifested, as though the whole edifice of Unitarianism were shaken to its foundation; and the most sanguine expectations were expressed, that numbers would follow his example. I should have felt no surprise, if others *had* followed his example, not, however, from that class who have formed their opinions for themselves, upon scriptural evidence, but from those who received Unitarianism upon the authority of others, or merely because they thought it rational, from those whom fashion or wordly motives would influence in any question, or whose weak minds sunk under the opprobrium so unjustly attached to the avowed Unitarian, and the denunciations of eternal perdition, which so often supply the place of argument.

To many, I doubt not, the change was a theme of simple sacred joy and devout thanksgiving, that one soul had been rescued from sentiments which, through ignorance, they dreaded more than sin itself. And others, who felt a strong confidence in the truth of their orthodoxy, and had witnessed, with deep sorrow, the number of instances in which the same confidence had fallen before examination and evidence, would naturally have their feelings cheered, and their convictions invigorated, by perceiving the *retrograde* course run by a man of undoubted integrity and piety, and eminent for talents and literature. But the very circumstance which so much raised, should have damped their exultation. *It was but one.* Talents not inferior to his own, the love of truth as pure, acquirements as varied, and

character as unsullied, are possessed by many whose convictions of the truth of Unitarianism have been *strengthened* by the repeated examination of opposing evidence: and from among those respected individuals, who, by the study of their English Bible alone, and by comparing Scripture with Scripture, gradually arrived at the firm belief and steady avowal of the great principles of Unitarianism, (and the number of such is considerable, increasing and encouraging,) I know not a single instance of the change which Dr. Stock has made.

When it happens that men who have patiently examined the subject, on both sides, for themselves, (employing all the light afforded them by others, but submitting their understanding to the authority of nothing but revealed truth,) and who, after many a painful struggle with early impressions, attachments and interests, have formed a serious conviction that Unitarianism is the doctrine of the gospel,—when it happens that such men again return to their former opinions, then may it stagger, or at least perplex, the advocate for Unitarianism, and lead him to pause, and reconsider before he takes another step in the service to which he believed Christian duty had called him.

But Dr. Stock was not one of these. I want no other proof of my assertion than his own letter. I do not refer to its total deficiency in argument; because, though its admirers think otherwise, its intelligent author well knows that it neither contains, nor was designed to contain, any. It is the *history* of a peculiar mental process, which is chiefly extraordinary, because the subject of it is a man of intellectual attainments and culture. And that history clearly develops two facts. The one is, that Dr. Stock had never calmly and fully examined *for himself* the arguments *against* Unitarianism, nor fairly appreciated their weight, in opposition to the innumerable passages by which its grand principles are supported. The other is, that when doubts were produced by the affectionate perseverance of Mr. Vernon, he dwelt upon them with restless earnestness; that he pursued the subject with intense eagerness, and under the influence of strongly excited feeling; and that, in

the course of a very few weeks, while in a state of mind utterly unsuited to the calm exercise of the understanding, he came to an unhesitating conviction, that instead of the essential, unpurchased mercy of God in Christ Jesus, he was henceforth to rest his hopes of acceptance on the death of Christ, as the procuring cause of salvation; that instead of regarding the Father as the only true God, he was to consider Jesus Christ, whom he has sent, as himself truly and properly God; that instead of paying religious worship to the Father only, and yielding Him alone the tribute of Supreme love, he was henceforward to have Three Supreme Objects of adoration, thanksgiving and prayer.

And it is to be observed, that this momentous decision was formed without his once conversing with those with whom he had been accustomed to converse freely, and who, he must know, would use no means but argument to prevent his change: it was formed in circumstances, in which, as a medical man, he would have recommended another, if possible, to suspend his judgment: it was formed with extreme rapidity, and it was communicated to the world with a precipitancy which seemed to say, that the desperate step must be made at once, or he should relapse.

Nor can I forbear to express my surprise, that one who, in the search after Christian truth, perused the imposing assertions and eloquent declamation of Wardlaw, should have neglected the close and solid arguments of Yates in reply. Some of Mr. Wardlaw's friends, I have heard, have advised him to relinquish the contest; and I am of opinion that they are his wisest.

If Dr. Stock's recollection told him that fluctuation marked his religious history, experience and his knowledge of human nature should have taught him to suspend his decision, till it had stood the test of a calmer and more judicious investigation, after his feelings had become tranquillized, and his powers of discrimination had acquired their usual vigour.

Should I be asked, if I expect that Dr. Stock will ever return to his former sentiments, I answer, not if he places religion in excitement, rather than in steady affection and principle;

not if he makes feeling the test of truth, rather than argument; not, in short, while he believes himself under the special guidance of Divine illumination. If that belief continue, and as long as it continues, he has but one course to pursue; and while so many contribute all they can, to keep him steady to his new doctrines, and to feed the flames of enthusiasm, he will not be likely to follow that resplendent, but less glaring light, by which he would discern, that the spirit of truth cannot contradict itself, and that this has plainly taught, that *besides Jehovah there is no God*, and that *the Father is the only true God*.

I do not presume to set bounds to the agency or influence of God. I believe that the Father of our spirits does afford aid to his frail children, in ways which philosophy cannot yet explain, to strengthen, to console and to guide: but I know no proof that he at present communicates *truth* by any supernatural means. I am sure, at any rate, that we have a right, and that it is our duty, to "try the spirits;" and I feel a firm conviction that that spirit is not of God, which contradicts the plainest principles of common sense, and the plainest declarations of Scripture. What internal feelings can be allowed as a just ground for conviction that Jesus Christ is God Supreme, when his own words are, "The Father is greater than I," and when he exclusively speaks of him, in the solemn act of prayer, as "The only true God"?

"But after all (it will be said) you regret the loss of him." Certainly we do; but not because we cannot do without him. His steady attendance on the duties of public worship, and the still more uniting ordinance of Christian profession,—his ardour of feeling, contributing to cherish zeal in others,—his devout and amiable character, as well as his distinguished attainments,—made him a valuable member of the congregation with which he had been for many years connected. But his importance to its prosperity has been vastly over-rated; not by himself, for he would not do it; but by those who wildly imagined that his change would be the death-blow to Unitarianism, in this city at least. To the welfare of the congregation as a body, various individuals

who have not his claims to the public notice, have contributed much more than he: and as to his importance to the cause of Unitarianism, I do not learn that he took any active share in the measures designed specifically to promote it. His change will prove more beneficial to Unitarianism than his previous services. It will lead, as it has led many, to inquire and to think: and all we ask is, that the serious inquirer will give our cause a fair hearing. Among the many who are afraid to hear, to read or to think, we do not expect success.

I do myself individually regret his change. The little personal intercourse I had with him, and what I knew of him from other sources, led me to believe that I should find in him a friend to value and to love: our pursuits would, in many respects, have been similar; and our great objects, in more: our love of truth would have led us in the same direction; and it would have been cheering, in the duties of my profession, to have had his co-operation. But it should be stated, that he was not the official organ of the Lewin's-Mead Society in their different communications with me. He took, indeed, an active share in the business of the congregation at that period, far beyond what the state of his mind fully authorized; and he composed the letter of invitation to me, (in which he says, "our city has been designated by an eminent writer, as the nursery and hot-bed of English fanaticism; and the particular sentiments which distinguish us as a religious community have to encounter a proportionate degree of misrepresentation and obloquy:") but I was little acquainted with his share in those proceedings till after his change; and I had no direct communication with him whatever.

I regret that change; and believing that it was from truth to error, I regret it on his own account. If, however, in its immediate or remote influence, it should be the means of bending his heart and life, more and more, to the obedience and imitation of Christ, then it must be well with him.

L. CARPENTER.

SIR,

July 10th, 1817.

YOU inserted in your last volume, (p. 220) my letter on Sir Isaac Newton's "Historical Account," in which I ventured to regret his cautious avoidance of any direct declaration on the subject of the Trinity. I have since observed that Mr. Lindsey had found that great man's "prodigious reserve," as he terms it, "ascribed to a blameable timidity and fear of persecution," by "the anonymous author of a pamphlet of some repute," entitled *Causa Dei contra Novatores*, 1748, pp. 31, 58.

"The author," adds Mr. Lindsey, "having mentioned Mr. Emlyn's sufferings, proceeds to say, this persecuting spirit 'kept in awe and silenced some extraordinary persons amongst us, Sir Peter King, Sir Joseph Jekyll, and the greatest man of the age and glory of the British nation, I mean—the renowned Sir Isaac Newton.' After which he points to Sir Isaac's then unpublished discourse or dissertation upon the pretended text of 1 John v. 7, 8, as an instance of of this excessive caution." *Historical View*, pp. 402, 403.

At the close of my letter I conjectured that Sir Isaac Newton's two tracts were probably written about the time of the *Revolution*. That event, while it brought relief to the impugners of established rites and ceremonies, was followed by the indulgence of a persecuting spirit against those who disputed the Faith *by law established*. Thus the *Bill of Rights*, to all free inquirers in religion, whether Christians or Unbelievers, became, what a celebrated republican once described it, on another account, "a Bill of Wrongs and Insults." The sufferers from Protestant persecution, during those falsely vaunted days of personal freedom, will, I am persuaded, be found, on inquiry, to have been far more numerous than has been generally suspected.

N. L. T.

SIR,

Aug. 12th, 1817.

IN the elegant and comprehensive Summary of the Evidences for the Christian Revelation, by the Rev. Mr. Belsham, the following sentence occurs in the first discourse:—"The utmost which the generality of sober

and rational inquirers can expect, is to attain a faith, not perhaps wholly unmixed with doubt, and a hope, not entirely unclouded with fear." With this opinion I perfectly accord. But I would beg leave to ask, whence arises this doubt? The fear requires no explanation. If the evidences of Christianity are so strong, particularly the direct historical ones; if "it is self-evident, that the writers" of the Books of the New Testament "could not be themselves deceived," if "they were not deceivers;" and if "it follows, that their testimony must be true, and that the Christian religion is of divine original, our faith," instead of having the smallest alloy of doubt, should be pure.

We have not any doubt of the facts recorded by Cæsar, or by Tacitus, and yet the evidences for these facts are less powerful, we are told, than for those of the Christian revelation. Whence then, I again beg leave to ask, arises this doubt? Why, in the words of an infidel historian, does "a latent and involuntary scepticism adhere to the most pious minds?"

SCEPTICUS.

Aug. 22nd, 1817.

SIR,  
THE following passage is part of the celebrated Prebyterian Mr. Edmund Calamy's speech, at Guildhall, Oct. 6th, 1643, "in order to the persuading the City unto a liberal contribution towards bringing in the Scots in order to the preservation of the Gospel, as he several times expresseth himself, in that speech." It will serve to shew that the *Presbyterian* Priests, lent the influence of their religious character as readily as the *Episcopalian*, to the objects of their political party:—

"Let me tell you, if ever, gentlemen, you might use this speech, O happy penny! you may use it now, happy money! that will purchase my gospel; happy money that will purchase my religion, and purchase a reformation to my posterity. O happy money! and blessed be God that I have it to lend."

The speech was probably delivered from the hustings at Guildhall, to the Livery, in a common-hall; and Mr. Calamy was, no doubt, appointed

from his extraordinary popularity in the City. It was at a remarkable time, only a few days after the Parliament, the *Assembly* and the Scotch Commissioners had taken the *covenant*, being prepared, as Whitlock says, by one prayer of an hour's length. I copy the passage above from "The Modern Pleas of Comprehension," &c. 1675, 18mo. p. 139. Dr. Calamy the historian had seen that book, for, in his *Account*, 2d Ed. 1713, p. 6, he quotes and controverts a passage in it, respecting his Grandfather's inclination to conform, but never mentions the *apostrophe to the happy penny*. His silence is a sufficient confirmation of this anonymous author, whose chief objects appear to have been to examine the Presbyterians' professed attachment to the Crown, and to oppose their toleration by the arguments which their own writings and their practices, in the short day of their power, had so amply supplied.

HISTORICUS.

Aug. 18th, 1817.

SIR,  
YOUR Correspondent, Mr. Fox, in his reply to "An Old Unitarian," (p. 333) has rather glanced at the conduct of those among his fellow-worshippers who lend their support to Calvinistic Missions. I have some doubts with regard to the soundness of his objection, as matters at present stand; and should be heartily glad to have his answer to one or two queries on the subject. Having lately been applied to by a Calvinist, to add my mite towards promoting the progress of the Church Missionary Society (which circumstance has brought the matter rather nearer home perhaps than before), I have been somewhat puzzled respecting the mode of conduct best to be pursued. If it be a certain fact that Calvinistic Missionaries have greatly promoted the circulation of the Scriptures in foreign districts, does it not become an Unitarian Christian to support them? I think it does; and I also think that the assistance given by Unitarians to Calvinists and Churchmen, on such occasions, will be of service to their cause in two ways: it will evince to the world their eagerness for the spread of the Gospel, even under circumstances which they regard

as unfavourable to its progress: and it may, in time, spur on some of the more zealous of the community, who take umbrage at this junction of Unitarians and Trinitarians, to the attempting something similar themselves. If Mr. Fox, Mr. Wright, or Mr. Aspland, are inclined to venture into Iceland, where, in one district, the parish of Hof, containing 400 souls, but one person is to be found above six years old unable to read the Scriptures, and where, by the bye, till a Calvinistic Missionary, Mr. Henderson,\* went amongst them, very few copies of the Scriptures were to be found; I shall be very happy to subscribe to *this* mission rather than to one undertaken by Calvinists. Till then, I am doubtful whether we ought to be contented with doing nothing towards promoting the circulation of the Scriptures in foreign parts, even although we are obliged to make Calvinists the instruments of our bounty. In no point are Unitarians more open to attack than in their indifference, or at least, want of activity, in spreading the blessings of the gospel among those who now "sit in darkness." They have only *arguments* with which to answer those who contend that there is nothing in Unitarianism calculated to turn the idolater from his errors: they have no *facts* to produce. Let them take a Calvinist to a Unitarian colony, where, in the midst of heathen superstition, *this* Christianity has been planted with good effect; and more, a thousand times more effect will be produced than can be gained by our pulpit warfare at home. T.

Rus in Urbe, Aug. 24th, 1817.

SIR,

I AM apprehensive that your readers, such especially as converse with our earlier biographers and annalists, have not attended so much as they ought to have done, to an excellent proposal, made several months ago, for rendering your work a *repository* of documents and authorities, which may gradually accumulate, till they serve to furnish, if not to form, some future historian of Anti-Trinitarians, in this and the Sister Island, tracing them from the

\* Vide Twelfth Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society, p. 202.

indistinct notices at the æra of the Reformation, to the fuller narratives of modern times.

That I may, however, attempt something more than complaint, I offer the following communications, hoping you will receive such from a variety of quarters. I begin with writers *against* the Anti-Trinitarians, whose names have occurred, on looking over the first volume of Wood's *Athenæ Oxonienses*, Ed. 1691, for a more general purpose.

No. 142, p. 105. "Bartholomew Traheron, Library-keeper to Edw. VI. who conferred the deanery of Chichester on him, about 1551. When Q. Mary came to the crown, he went into Germany—continued there till her death; and then returning, was restored to what he had lost. Among many things, he wrote

"Exposition of a Part of St. John's Gospel, made in sundry Readings in the English Congregation, against the *Arians*. Printed the second time in 1558. 8vo. The readings were ten, and they were performed in the English congregation beyond the sea." B. Traheron was living in 1562.

No. 152, p. 115. "John Pullayne, a Yorkshireman born, was educated in New College. When Q. Mary came to the crown, he was forced beyond the seas to Geneva, but returned when Q. Elizabeth was in the regal throne, and had the Archdeaconry of Colchester bestowed on him. He hath written,

"Tract against the *Arians*;" and translated into English verse "The Ecclesiastes of Solomon;" "History of Susannah;" "History of Judith;" "History of Hester;" "Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs." He died in 1565.

No. 161, p. 120. "William Turner, a noted and forward theologian and physician of his time, was born at Morpeth;—educated in Cambridge, in *Trivials*, and afterwards for a time in the study of medicine. While he was a young man, he went, *unsent for*, through many parts of the nation, and preached the word of God, not only in towns and villages, but also in cities. In his rambles, he settled for a time at Oxford. Following his old trade of preaching without a call, he was imprisoned, and kept in close du-rance for a considerable time. At

length being let loose, and banished, he travelled into Italy, and at Ferrara he was made a Doctor of Physic. In the latter end of K. Henry VIII. he lived at Cologne, and other places in Germany.—Returning, when K. Edward VI. reigned," besides a prebendship from the Archbishop of York, he had "a cañonry of Windsor and the deanery of Wells" given him by the King. About which time, he was incorporated "Doctor of Physic" at Oxford. "He procured a licence to read and to preach, as many laymen did that were scholars; practised his faculty among the nobility and gentry, and became physician to Edward, Duke of Somerset, Lord Protector. After Q. Mary came to the crown, he went into Germany, with several English theologians, thence to Rome, and afterwards, for a time, settled at Basil. But when Q. Elizabeth succeeded, he returned, and was restored to his deanery." Besides several pieces, against the Roman Catholics, he published

"A Preservative or Triacle against the Poison of Pelagius, lately renewed, and stirred up again, by the furious sect of the Anabaptists. London, 1551," 12mo. which book being dedicated to Hugh Latimer, was ushered into the world by several copies of Latin and English verses set before and at the end of it, made by Nich. Grimoald, of Merton College; Thomas Norton, of Sharpenhoe; Randal Harleston, or Huddleston; and Thomas Soame, a preacher.

Though Pelagius does not appear to have impugned the Trinity; yet, it can scarcely be doubted that *Anabaptists*, in 1551, accused of Pelagianism, were also Anti-Trinitarians. Dr. Turner wrote several pieces, more in the way of his medical profession; one entitled "Of the Nature and Virtue of Triacle." By this double use of *Triacle*, he was not unlike Bishop Berkeley, who recommended, even in the same pamphlet, *tar-water* and the Trinity. Dr. Turner died in 1568.

No. 629, p. 512. "Alexander Gill, born in Lincolnshire, 1564, admitted scholar of Corp. Christ. Coll. 1583. In 1590, left the College and became an instructor of youth," probably "in the city of Norwich, where he lived 1597, and then wrote his treatise of

the *Trinity*. In 1608 he became the chief master of St. Paul's school, was esteemed a noted Latinist, critic and divine. His works are

"Treatise concerning the Trinity in Unity of the Deity. Lond. 1601, 8vo. written to *Thomas Mannering*, an Anabaptist, who denied that *Jesus* is very God of very God.

"Sacred Philosophy of Holy Scripture, or a Commentary on the Creed. Lond. 1635, fol. At the end of which is printed, also, his Treatise of the Trinity, before-mentioned. He died 17th Nov. 1635." Dr. Knight mentions *Gill* among the masters of St. Paul's school, *Life of Colet*, p. 378, but gives no particulars except from *Wood*.

*Fasti*. p. 840, 1621. "George Walker, B. D. born at Hawkeshead, in Lancashire, educated in St. John's College, Cambridge, where he was esteemed an excellent Logician, Orientalian and Divine. When *Walker*, who was a severe Puritan, beheld the profanation of the Lord's day, he preached against it, and other practices and opinions, which procured him trouble and two years' imprisonment, as it is said. After the *Long* Parliament began, he preached against the King and his followers, and published several things, which before he was not permitted to do, among which were, *Socinianism in the Fundamental Point of Justification Discovered and Confuted*. Lond. 1641, 8vo. He died in 1651, aged about 70."

At the close of the first volume of the *Athenæ*, is the following account of a *Socinian*, whose political propensities were such as have not been common among Christians who indulged in *free inquiry*:

*Fasti*. p. 901, 1640. "John Webberley, of Lincolne College, B. D. the son of Thomas W. of *East-Kirbey*, in Lincolnshire, was now esteemed by all a high-flown Socinian, and afterwards a desperate zealot for the King's cause, in the grand Rebellion. He had translated into English several Socinian books: some of which he had published without his name set to them: and others, which were lying by him, were taken out of his study by the parliamentary visitors, *an.* 1648, in which year he suffered

much for his loyalty, by imprisonment first and afterwards by expulsion."

Wood then refers to L. 1, p. 405, of *Hist. and Antiq. Univ. Oxon.* the Latin version of his History. His original MSS. in the *Bodleian*, were not many years ago edited by Mr. Gutch. In that work I find the following paragraph:

"1648, April 17, Monday. The visiters commanded a mad woman to be whipt for calling them roundheads and rebels. Mr. Thomas Smith, also, of Magdall. Coll. and Mr. Webberley, of Lincoln, were committed to Bridewell for speaking boldly to and uttering rash words against them; and especially for that Webberley did presume to take his commons in the Hall, after they had suspended him from his office of sub-rector and the emoluments of his place." *Hist. &c.* 5 vols. 4to. 1786—1792, B. i. II. p. 574.

Dr. Walker, a Churchman, of the school of Sacheverell, and worthy of the highest form, has mentioned Mr. Webberley, in his *Sufferings of the Clergy*. He has all his information from Wood, adding, "I should have been glad to omit him, because he was esteemed by all a high-flown Socinian. So that his expulsion wanted nothing but a lawful authority, to make it a most commendable act." *Attempt*, 1714, Pt. ii. p. 121.

Should you accept this offer of correspondence, you may, perhaps, hear again from

CIVIS RUSTICUS.

[We beg *Civis Rusticus* to continue his correspondence. He will find some account of Mr. Webberley, Mon. Repos. X. 82, 83, 498, 499. Ed.]

Clapton, Aug. 30, 1817.

SIR,

IN a note to the first article in the Review of your Repository for July (p. 413), Mr. Wardlaw is charged with repeating a *calumny*, when he says, "truly the laxity of the views of Unitarians respecting the plenary inspiration and universal authority of the Scriptures, is a matter of such flagrant and lamentable notoriety, that I feel no anxiety to defend myself on this head from the charge of misrepresentation, to any who are at all acquainted with their writings." I apprehend the passage contains no

calumny. It states, as I suppose, a fact, and in terms not more offensive than might be expected from a man of Mr. Wardlaw's faith. If to believe in "plenary inspiration," is to acknowledge every word of the Old and New Testament to be the dictate of inspiration; and if to submit to the "universal authority of the Scriptures," is to receive every book, and the whole of every book in the present Canon, as the undoubted word of God, I do not think it is a calumny to affirm that Unitarians do not generally believe in the plenary inspiration, and acknowledge the universal authority of the Scriptures. A railing and injurious and absurd accusation is indeed brought against them, when it is pretended, that they withhold their faith from what God has revealed, as if they disputed the veracity of God. They do refuse to submit their understanding to those interpreters of Divine revelation, *especially*, who presume to array their own interpretation in the same authority as the revelation itself; but this is to question not the veracity of God, but the infallibility of men. To an acknowledged declaration from God no man in his senses ever did, or ever could refuse his belief; and it is manifestly absurd to accuse him of such extravagant and impious folly, who refuses his belief only to what he does not acknowledge to be a declaration from God, to what he considers on the contrary the mere doctrine of man, unsupported and contradicted by the revelation from God. This the Unitarian does in refusing his assent to the popular creed; and to accuse him on this ground of refusing to submit to the authority of God, if it be not calumny, is misrepresentation and injustice. On this charge Mr. Wardlaw and his brethren ought to plead guilty; they construe dissent from their explanation of the Scriptures into resistance to the authority of God. But without pretending to say what is the actual opinion of the body of Unitarian Christians, I do not for myself complain of misrepresentation, when it is said, that they doubt the genuineness of a part of the present Canon of Scripture, and the plenary inspiration of a much greater part. It should, indeed, be added, that they do this because the evidence of plenary inspiration appears to be incomplete,

and not, as is asserted by their opponents, from an unwillingness to submit the controversy to the decision of the Scriptures. None more readily acknowledge that the only safe appeal is to the Scriptures, and that the only authoritative decision must be sought in the Scriptures; they wish their doctrine to be tried by no other test; and they demand constantly and earnestly that this test be applied fairly, that is, critically. But it may be asked, with what consistency do they unite in this appeal to a book of which they acknowledge not the inspiration and authority in every part? The question might be returned upon their opponents—Do they believe every word in the present Canon of the Old and New Testament to be the dictate of inspiration? Perhaps Mr. Wardlaw does so; if he does not, his own conscience will reveal to him, that he has betrayed a want of simplicity and candour in his accusation of the Unitarians, quoted above. He has not calumniated them, but he has presumed to cast a stone, though himself not without sin. It is, however, charitable to believe that Mr. Wardlaw's faith on the subject of inspiration extends farther than that of many of his brethren. Of them there are many who know, that there is not equal evidence of genuineness for every book in the Canon; and there are many too, who, admitting some difference of circumstances in the narration of facts substantially the same, are rational enough to acknowledge, that the narrators were not all inspired. If any of this better informed class of believers join also in the popular cry against Unitarians, "that they do not accept the entire Canon as the undoubted word of God," they may have their reward; but it is not in the satisfaction of an honest mind. Let them not accuse other Christians of want of reverence for the sacred writings in refusing to subscribe to a proposition which is not an article of their own belief; but to those who assert the plenary inspiration of the canonical books of the Old and New Testament a different answer is due: why appeal, they say, to an authority which is not held sacred? In the first place it is proper to ask, what are the grounds of their own persuasion? Where is

the proof of the proposition to which they subscribe? Is it in tradition, in the decrees of councils, or in the writings themselves? In what part of the Scriptures is it asserted that the present Canon was all written under inspiration of God? The Apostles did, indeed, affirm that they received their commission from Christ, and, that they were instructed by him and by the holy spirit what was Christian doctrine: but this was a very different thing from asserting that every word they spoke or wrote in the discharge of their commission was dictated to them by inspiration. Admit the former, and Unitarians do admit it as well as other Christians, and the authority of the Apostolic writings is sufficiently established; and the appeal to that authority, on every question of Christian doctrine, is made decisive. Yet, on this hypothesis, it is fair to ask, may not the Apostles as well as other men have conveyed their meaning in such terms as to make it difficult to ascertain at all times what they did mean? Undoubtedly they may: and, Peter being judge, it is certain that the Apostle of the Gentiles, whose Epistles form so large a part of the New Testament Canon, did write things difficult to understand, and liable to be greatly mistaken even by men who lived in the same age and spoke the same language as himself. It is, therefore, in vain to contend that the interpretation, which would first, or generally occur to the most simple and unlearned readers, must be the true interpretation of his meaning. The same labour and rules of criticism must be applied to some parts of the sacred writings, and especially to the epistolary for very obvious reasons, which are applied to other ancient writings, in order to arrive at the true interpretation. I apprehend it is in this opinion, and not in want of deference to the authority of the Christian Scriptures, that the Unitarian differs from the majority of Christians, and as long as this difference remains there is, indeed, little probability that he, and the great body of Christians, should think alike on several of the most important articles of the Christian faith.

J. M.

*Letter to a Dissenting Minister's Wife.*

[The following Letter has been communicated to us as no unsuitable companion to the "Letter to a Young Dissenting Minister," Vol. VI. (1811), p. 471. Ed.]

THOUGH I have followed you in idea, my dearest daughter, almost from hour to hour since you left us, amidst the various scenes through which I pleased myself with supposing you to be passing, I have not thought it necessary, or even seasonable, to trouble you with either my good wishes or my advice; because I was sure you would give my affection full credit for the former; and because I had no doubt of your conducting yourself, through the various circumstances attendant on your change of character, with that modest and unaffected propriety, which would render the latter quite unnecessary, had I been qualified to offer it in this stage of your proceedings. But now that the ceremonies attending your first introduction are over, and you are beginning to think of settling upon a plain domestic plan, will you allow me to pour forth some of the overflowings of a father's heart, which has often, of late, engaged the head to meditate on your future duties and prospects?

On the qualities which a man of sense will most regard in the choice of a wife, you have read the judicious remarks of Dr. Aikin;\* on the general duties of a wife you have availed yourself of the advice of Mr. Gisborne, and you have perused the strong and often coarse, though too often well-founded, strictures of Mrs. Wollstonecraft. I need not, therefore, say any thing to you on the *general* rights and obligations of husband and wife: you are neither of you, I trust, disposed to be jealous of each other's rights, or grudging in the discharge of mutual obligations. You will not be disposed to exclaim with Mrs. Wollstonecraft, "Is a wife to be an upper servant, to provide her husband's meals and take care of his linen?" No: not as an upper servant; but as a companion and helper, to make his home comfortable and his meals pleasant, when he returns from acting the part of a fellow-servant, in the discharge of

those public or more private duties, by which he is to make the necessary provision for the common maintenance.

But to have done with generals: it was my object to point out some of those particular duties which may be required from the wife of a minister, connected with such a congregation as that at ——. Such a person may render herself a help-meet for her husband in various respects.

In order to form a full idea of all the ways in which she may be so, it is necessary that she carefully consider the nature of his profession, and the ends of it. No less than the religious and moral improvement of *all* his hearers, in order to their usefulness here, and their happiness hereafter. To answer such important purposes he is not to be a mere lecturer, to make his weekly appearance before them with a set discourse; he is to be their teacher, their exemplar, their friend and counsellor; the mediator between his richer and poorer hearers, the director of the charities of the former, and the consoler of the latter in distress; the institutor and manager of useful plans for religious education of the young, and the religious information of persons of all ages; in short, the promoter of religious truth and practice, both by precept and example.

In most of these respects he may be materially assisted by his wife: in many she may, with great advantage, be his proxy.

If she be not fitted or disposed to help him in any of them, he is greatly to be pitied, and, perhaps, even in some degree to be blamed: it is, at least, a sign that he has made a very injudicious choice. The conduct of a minister's wife may often benefit or mislead his flock, almost as much as his own. I have somewhere read, that in the Protestant churches of Hungary, a minister has been degraded "whose wife has indulged herself in amusements which bespeak the gaiety of a mere lover of the world, rather than the gravity of a Christian matron:" a severity said to be grounded on the supposition, "that a wife having promised obedience to her husband, can do nothing but what he either directs or approves." It might have been grounded on the apostolic precept, that the deaconesses "must be grave,

\* Letters to a Son. Vol. I.

not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things." 1 Tim. iii. 11.

A minister's wife ought, therefore, to study her husband's reputation, and give weight to his instructions, by her own discreet and prudent conduct. In the management of her family, aware that she has taken upon herself the task of making a limited income support a respectable appearance, she will study the arts of frugal but decent housekeeping: and will be particularly careful that no needless expenses be incurred on her own account.

But this is, comparatively, a trifling object, though by no means to be overlooked. The main object of the Christian teacher will naturally be, to have his family set an example of attention to religious duties, and of general decorum and propriety of conduct: he will particularly look to his wife for ready and active co-operation in these important particulars. He will be greatly disappointed if she throw any obstacles in the way, if she do not rather cordially join with, and even encourage him, in the establishment and maintenance of family prayer; he will rejoice if she appear disposed to qualify herself for the future education of her own young family (if it should please God to entrust her with such a charge), by previous reading, by personal observation and inquiry, and by an active attention, in the meantime, to the religious and other instruction of the lower classes of the congregation, either in charity or Sunday schools or otherwise; and if she set, in these respects, a good example to the young women in general of her acquaintance. What better preparation can she make for a successful discharge of duty in the education of her own children; who, in the natural course of things, fall to be almost exclusively the objects of their mother's attention during that most important period of their lives, when those impressions are to be made which are most likely to be lasting, and even to give the prevailing direction to the whole of their future lives! For this you are indeed better prepared than most young women, by the care and attention you have shewn to the management of the Sunday schools at ———; and by the alacrity with which, even to your

marriage day, you have submitted to be taught, as well as to exert yourself to teach. In both these respects you will, I am sure, continue to set a good example, as far as your situation affords you opportunity, will willingly place yourself on the bench of instruction, under either your husband or Mr. ———; or will lend your assistance to establish order in any school which may at present subsist, or hereafter be established. But while you are thus actively religious yourself, and engaged in promoting it among others, you will not forget that you are to help, encourage and support your husband, by cultivating a prevailing cheerfulness, both of the countenance and heart. In the ordinary course of his multiplied employments, he will often return from the school, the study, or from visits abroad, fatigued and exhausted; let him find his home made comfortable by pleasant looks and cheerful conversation, or by a readiness to join in his plans of relaxation by such reading as you can be both interested in. I hope he will not often, but I cannot flatter him he will not sometimes meet with disappointments, from want of success in his public or private schemes, from the misbehaviour of his friends, either in a general, moral respect, or to himself in particular. In such cases you must be his refuge, his comfort and counsellor. In no such cases will you ever aggravate, but soften and conciliate as much as possible. In particular you will study to allay any little resentments he may feel upon such occasions. This caution may, perhaps, be particularly necessary in the case of two ministers; for each of whom there will, of course, be partialities, according to the particular tastes and intimacies of individuals. Your husband is in this respect particularly happy in a colleague who, I trust, will always find himself equally happy in him; indeed, I persuade myself that there will never be any jealousies or heart-burnings, in consequence of preferences which are inevitable, and in themselves perfectly innocent, either between them or among the members of the congregation. But if any thing of this kind should occur, let it be your business never to hear any officious reports that may be suggested to you by well

or ill-meaning people: but always study the things which make for peace, and things by which both your husband and his colleague may edify one another, as well as those with whom they are connected. I hardly need to caution you against a proneness to take offence on your own account, or embarrassing your husband with any of your own squabbles. You must alter very much before you engage in any.

Neither do I think you are in any great danger of contracting a meddling, gossiping habit, or giving countenance or encouragement to those that have. A more mischievous quality can scarcely be imagined: by which, instead of becoming her husband's helpmeet, a wife contributes more than any thing to his trouble and vexation. I should otherwise be cautious of offering my next piece of advice, to make yourself acquainted with the several members of the congregation, their characters, occupations, habits, wants, &c. &c. I don't mean that you should personally know them all; but the more extensively the better. You can, at least, learn all the particulars which your husband has collected concerning each in his congregational common-place book. You will thus become acquainted with all the ways in which they can severally be of use to you, or you can render yourself useful to them; you will also learn, by this means, who are the persons with whom you can with the greatest mutual advantage, deal for the several articles you may want to purchase. For, certainly, all other things being equal, or even nearly so, it is a reciprocity which is only fair and reasonable that you should lay out among the congregation that income which you receive from them. You will thus, as well as by a mutual interchange of good offices in other respects, strengthen your husband's interest with his people. Even by knowing their places of abode, and at chapel, you will be prepared to receive and return the civilities of those who will feel entitled to offer them, and not incur the hazard of having it said by any, "that their minister's wife was too proud to speak to them." But you may thus besides have various opportunities of assisting him, and often may even be a preferable sub-

stitute: in various cases of sickness, and other circumstances of distress, especially among your own sex and children, the good offices of a female may be more essentially useful than those of any *man*. "It is not only in his own person," says an eloquent preacher, "that the conscientious minister of the gospel can answer the high purpose of his calling: in his wife, and even in his children, he may find the most useful auxiliaries in his holy employment. To the former, in particular, both himself and those entrusted to his charge are often, in the highest degree, indebted. I will not enter into a full detail of the various means by which the services of this invaluable partner of the cares and duties of the ministerial office are dispensed throughout the district of the husband's labours: but the subject of this discourse (*letter*) would be treated very imperfectly, if so important a particular were altogether omitted. Let it be remembered, then, that it is to her assiduous co-operation that almost all the good that can be rendered to her own sex, out of the house of God, is principally owing. That quick perception, that nice sensibility, which are the natural characteristics of the female mind, peculiarly fit her for the occupation. It is she who can best win the confidence of her neighbours, and penetrate the secret wants and wishes, which modest poverty is often backward to reveal. It is she who can best enter into the detail of their domestic interests, and devise the readiest means of alleviating their distress or employing their industry. It is she whose familiar experience of the cares and duties which belong to them, as wives and mothers, aided by that superior intelligence which leisure and education naturally give, enables her to bring her counsels home to the hearts of her hearers, and to convince them that her precepts are practicable as well as just. In short, by appearing in the character of a friend as well as a benefactress, by engaging the feelings of respectful affection no less than of gratitude, she establishes over them an influence, which the harsher nature and dissimilar occupations of man disable him from acquiring. Now to those who bear in mind how much, under Providence, the success of every endeavour to implant religious feel-

ings, and to promote the habits of virtue in the most numerous class of society, depends upon the conduct of its women, how entirely almost the principles and the morals of the young of both sexes rest upon it, no argument will be necessary to prove the importance of that aid, which the wives, and often, too, the daughters, of the clergy, contribute towards the great purposes of the Christian ministry." Philpott's Sermon at St. Paul's, May 12, 1814. In various cases, also, of co-operation in the management of certain public charities, you may contribute those personal services which it will be out of your husband's line to offer. See Mrs. Cappe's excellent Paper on Female Visitors in Hospitals, in the Pamphleteer.

But besides cheerfulness and active co-operation, fidelity to admonish your husband, if any case should occur of neglect or deficiency, and to remind him of duties, whether general or particular, will never, I persuade myself, be undervalued or ill-received by him. You may, indeed, be of great use to each other in maintaining your respective provinces regular, by keeping an exact account of the business of each day, and by comparing notes every night before bed-time, of what each has respectively done or omitted doing.

I am far from pretending to claim a right, from having myself observed them, to give either to you now, or to your husband formerly, the advices with which you have both been troubled: but I persuade myself, you both will take them in good part; and will believe that there exists no jealousy of either of you excelling, as much as you please, the friends who have gone before you.

With my best love, then, to yourself and your dearest friend, I will at length relieve you by subscribing myself,

Your affectionate Father,  
V. F.

SIR,

Aug. 28, 1817.

IT is with peculiar satisfaction I have observed in one of your late Numbers, (April, XII. 250,) that a benevolent fund has been established at Birmingham, on the plan suggested by Dr. Thomson, of Halifax, which has for its leading object, the affording pecuniary aid to new congregations of

Unitarians, as they may arise, with the view of procuring for them suitable chapels, and otherwise supporting them in their infant efforts, until they shall attain to sufficient strength to depend upon their own exertions.

We need not experience to teach us the benefit which must arise from such institutions. It is evident, at first sight, that if infant societies of any kind can only be carried through the difficulties attendant upon that stage of their existence, as a child is carried through the helpless period of its infancy by parental care, many of the impediments to their arrival at maturity, may either be greatly lessened or altogether removed, their future permanence insured, and their usefulness greatly increased. For these reasons I consider our friends at Birmingham entitled to the cordial thanks of their brethren at large, for their disinterested conduct on this occasion, and would gladly hope that their example will be speedily followed by all other congregations of Unitarians, who find their circumstances such as will enable them to do so. Were such societies more numerous, the general result would be great, probably beyond what we can at present conjecture, while the expense to individuals would be scarcely perceptible. We should then see Unitarian congregations more speedily formed, because their members would more readily be induced to abandon the Established Church, when they saw some prospect of establishing themselves immediately, instead of labouring for ten, twenty or thirty years, almost without hope and without friends, through an accumulation of difficulties, which few men are found firm enough to endure.

But while I would recommend the example above-mentioned, I would at the same time propose to these infant institutions, the adoption of another plan, which, while it would tend to ensure to them the advantages of the benevolent societies already alluded to, would also greatly accelerate the accomplishment of the end in view. The plan I would recommend to them is the establishment of a fund, to be exclusively appropriated to the building of a chapel, in every case where such a measure shall be found indispensably necessary. Let them

not wait in the hope that the day will soon arrive when, by additions to their numbers and by liberal subscriptions, they will be enabled to provide the necessary means. But after they have adopted some method of conducting public worship among themselves, let them try whether a few individuals cannot be found who, while they may not have it in their power to pay down a large sum at once, would be willing to contribute annually or monthly to a fund for building a chapel; and if so, let them immediately constitute such a fund. The accumulation of these subscriptions, in a few years, would amount to a sum greater, perhaps, than what, even at the expiration of that period, they might be enabled to raise by immediate subscription; at all events, a sum to a certain amount would infallibly be secured: and this sum, added to the assistance they might obtain from such benevolent societies as may hereafter be formed among other congregations, would secure to them a small comfortable chapel, which, in nine cases out of ten, is a requisite of the first importance to their perfect establishment as a society, not excepting even the obtaining the services of a regular minister.

## AN UNITARIAN.

*Assumption of Dr. Chalmers's.*

[Extract from a Letter from a friend, dated August 8, 1817.]

**T**O the admirable Review of Dr. Chalmers, [Mon. Repos. XII. 418—426,] I should have been desirous to have added, if I had had the necessary documents, that the objection arising from the Newtonian philosophy, did not originally occur among the unbelievers, if it was ever brought forward by them, for which I have only Dr. C.'s information, and he quotes no authorities; but by the high orthodox, who make Revelation plaintiff against Plurality of Worlds defendant. Baker's Reflections on Learning, (Ch. viii.) is quoted by Parkhurst, under the word כִּבֵּב against the "delusive idea" of the moon's being inhabited: but there is a book, under the title of *Εἰς Θεοῦ, Εἰς Μεσσηνίας*, (written, I think it was said, by Mr. Nares,) reviewed in the *Gent. Mag.* fifteen or twenty years ago, the principal object of which is, to argue against the Plurality of Worlds, from the fatal

consequence that would arise of the absurdity of the supposition, that the Creator of the worlds should go about dying for every set of his rebellious creatures.

*Addition to Names of Writers in the Theological Repository.*

SIR, Oct. 2, 1817.

**I**N the Monthly Review for 1776, (Vol. LIV. p. 134,) there is a very correct account of the writers in the first three volumes of the *Theological Repository*, so far as they had come to the knowledge of the Editor, Dr. Priestley, by whom they were furnished to Dr. Kippis, the Reviewer of the work. From that article, and from some private resources, I offer you the following additions to the list furnished you by T. R. S. p. 526.

*Cautus*, 1, Rev. Newcome Cappe, York.  
*Cornelius*, 2, Rev. William Lillie, Bingley, Yorkshire.

*Eclectic*, 1, App. Rev. Dr. Calder (omitted by T. R. S.)

*Erastus*, 3, Rev. George Walker, F. R. S. who republished this excellent article on the character of Judas in his Sermons. Vol. I. Sermons xi. and xii. p. 241—297.

*Eusebius*, 1, 2, 3, Rev. W. Turner, Wakefield; whose Life is reprinted, with some important additions in the *Universal Theol. Mag.* Vol. I. p. 113; in p. 85 of which valuable Miscellany, is a correspondence between Mr. Turner and John Bunce, Esq. (T. Amory), on the meaning of 2 Pet. i. 19.

*Jodvadib*, 6, Rev. Job David, Frome.

*Marmos*, 6, Mr. John Marsom. This excellent refutation of the doctrine of an intermediate state was communicated, with the Author's leave, by your present correspondent.

*Moderatus*, 4, 5, Rev. Benjamin Carpenter, Stourbridge.

*Nepiodidascalus*, 4, 5, 6, Rev. Gilbert Wakefield.

*Philander*, 2, A Dissenting Clergyman in the North of Ireland, at that time deceased: so that the *Philander* of Vols. 4 and 6, must be some other person.

*Pyrrho*, 1, 2, Rev. Wm. Graham, M. A. of Halifax: an early and constant friend of Dr. Priestley, and author of several very valuable Sermons and Tracts.

—r. The Rev. Jeremiah Gill, of Gainsborough.

*Theophilus*, is Mr. Mottershead, of Manchester, and U, (not V,) Mr. Scott, of Ipswich.

Of *Verus*, Mr. Brekell, and of *W.W. Mr. Willets*, there will be found Memoirs in the Appendix to Toulmin's Life of Bourn.

V. F.

SIR, Leeds, Oct. 2, 1817.

I AM happy in being able to throw some farther light on the names of the contributors to the Theological Repository, edited by Dr. Priestley. The following I have extracted from a copy of the said work, which belonged to an intimate friend of the Doctor's, during his residence at Leeds, and I have no doubt of their authenticity.

J. S.

B. Rev. George Walker.

*Vigilius, Eusebius, Erastus*, Rev. Wm. Turner, Wakefield.

*Theophilus*, Rev. Mr. Mottershead, Manchester.

*Pyrrho*, Rev. —, Graham, of Halifax.

V. Rev. Mr. Scott, of Ipswich.

*John Buncl*, Mr. Amory.

*Cautus*, Rev. Newcome Cappe, York.

*Verus*, Rev. Mr. Brekell.

*Charistes*, Mr. Merivale.

*Philaethes, Rationalis*, Rev. Mr. Hazlitt, of Maidstone.

*Phileleutherus Vigorniensis*, Mr. Cardale, of Evesham.

*Cornelius*, Rev. Mr. Lely.

*Barumensis*, Rev. Mr. Badcock, of Barnstaple.

W. W. Rev. Mr. Willetts, of Newcastle-under-Line.

J. F. Rev. Jotham Foljambe.

*Pacificus*, Rev. Mr. Badcock.

### On Vitality.

SIR, Aug. 30, 1817.

BEFORE I resume my subject, [see pp. 210 and 342,] that more may not be expected from me than I have proposed to myself, I would observe, that it is not my intention to prove what is vitality, or of what it is composed, or how it acts upon matter, or whether it is material or immaterial, or if the Deity can impress organized matter with a principle of life and a thinking faculty, or to state what is the modus of its corporeal dominion, or how that dominion first took place, or how its separation from the decomposed body is effected, or where is its place after such separation; these, and many more curious questions, are connected with the subject, but do not come under this investigation, in which, I only purpose to inquire, whether this our organized corporeal form is one with, or distinct from the vitality which animates it and gives us the consciousness of our personal identity, and what is the Scripture doctrine concerning it.

If organic matter is so impressed with vitality, that no separation can take place, it follows, that man's resurrection is not a calling into action the vital principle alone, but a recall to active exertions of the vitalized organic body. This resurrection presents innumerable difficulties in the way of our belief in it. To human reason, it is impossible; the believer in it has no ground to rest on, but the miraculous and more than creative power of Deity. But if the vital, conscious principle is as distinct from the organized matter it animates, as the mouth is from the trumpet, then all these difficulties vanish, the same mighty power of God is still employed, but we shall see that he created with foresight, and looked forward before the birth to man's future existence, and death was in the Divine intention but a mean for that mutation the Creator designed should take place. The fear of death then ceases. It is looked to, by the believer in it, with expectation; it is the passage to a higher order of existence, and to a glory far beyond and exceeding that of this dispensation. Death becomes a stimulus to virtue, an assured foundation for the hope of immortality.

Paul, in his reasoning on this subject, appears to me most fully to argue on the ground of the most complete distinctness between the man and his corporeal form. In 1 Cor. xv. 50, he asserts, that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God;" and his after reasoning shews, that he did not mean these words figuratively in this place, that a man subject to carnal appetites could not, whilst he was thus enslaved, be a Christian, by being a member of the kingdom of God on earth; though this may be true, the apostle was looking beyond this, to the next state of things, for he explains, "neither doth corruption inherit incorruption."

These strong and direct assertions arise out of the premises, v. 35, "Some will say, how are the dead raised? With what body do they come?"—stating in these questions the greatest difficulties there are against man's belief in the resurrection. The objector seems to imply by his question, how is it possible to raise the dead? Some bodies are consumed by animals, others by fire, others turn to vegetable

mould and become the food of vegetation, after having been decomposed by the putrefactive fermentation, one way or other. Time dissolves every corporeal fabric, and their atoms are dissipated and dispersed through the elements, and not a vestige of their recrements can be found; how then is the body to be raised from death? This first question of the objector alone belongs to our subject.

The apostle, in his reply, shews the objection was founded on the objector's ignorance of facts. "Inconsiderate man," replies Paul, "that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die; and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body which shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat or some other, but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed its own body." Without entering into a philosophical examination of this argument, which I think to be strictly analogous to nature, I need only observe, that whether Paul was right or wrong in his comparison, his conclusion evidently is, that we are not to expect the same body to arise from the dead, but though it is a medium for a future state of existence, when buried it is no more than a decayed and worn out garment waiting to be changed.

Again, the same mode of reasoning we find 2 Cor. v. 6, "Whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord." And that this *at home in the body*, signifies being in this earthly tabernacle, instead of being in a state of utility, glory and happiness with Jesus, is further evident from the 5th ver. "We are confident, and willing, rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord. Wherefore, we labour, that whether present or absent we may be accepted of him." In the 1st ver. of this chapter he speaks similar language: "We know," says he, "that if our earthly house of this tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands." It was from this confidence that injury done to this mortal body does not affect the man farther than for the time being, that Paul was enabled to anticipate death with joy: thus, in writing to the Church of Philippi, Phil. i. 22, he says, "If I live in the flesh." Ver. 23, "I am in a strait between two, having

a desire to depart and be with Christ which is far better; nevertheless, to abide in the flesh is more useful to you." So to 2 Tim. iv. 6, "I am now ready to be offered, the time of my departure is at hand;" thus ceasing to be in the flesh, is departing from this earthly tabernacle to the kingdom of our Father.

But without multiplying passages to shew that this was the general tenour of the language of the apostles, and endeavouring to prove from history that such were the consequences of this their teaching upon the primitive church, that for two or three centuries the early Christians courted death, in its most awful forms, from the most perfect conviction that martyrdom, whilst it destroyed the body, liberated the mind from mortality, and prepared it to receive an incorruptible organization that could not pass away, and a mansion in the palace of God, John xiv. 2:—instead of doing this, I shall now endeavour to shew that Jesus had the same ideas on this subject; probably both Jesus and his apostles derived them from the Jewish Church, and that church from primitive revelation.

Mark relates, xii. 18, that the Sadducees came to Jesus, and stated a case, the decision of which they might think would overturn the doctrine of the resurrection. The case was this, seven brothers had, in succession, as one died after the other, married the same woman, in obedience to the law of Moses; and the question was, whose wife, of the seven brothers, the woman should be at the resurrection? Obedience to the law of Moses was righteousness. Here was, then, a case of eight righteous persons who, in the most trying of all circumstances, obeyed unto death. To this question Jesus replies, that the difficulty of the case arose, first, from their ignorance of the Scriptures, and secondly, of the power of God. And first, The Scriptures call the Deity, "the God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob." "God," said he, "is not the God of the dead, but of the living." Therefore, the consequence must be, that though Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, died and were buried in the cave of the field of Macpelah, and that their bodies there mouldered into dust and past away, yet they them-

selves were amongst the living, and the God of the living was their God. Secondly, For such is the mighty power of God exerted towards the righteous dead, who are worthy of a part in the first resurrection, that when this mortal state of things is over, there is no further increase by marriage, therefore marriage ceases, and the righteous dead become like the messengers of God in heaven.

This reply of Jesus is much illustrated by the transfiguration on Mount Tabor, when Moses, one of the righteous dead, who had been buried in the land of Nebo, appeared as a messenger of God to Jesus, with Elias the prophet, another messenger, and conversed with Jesus on his crucifixion that was to be. This is also farther illustrated by Rev. xix. 10, xxii. 9. In both which places we find, that the angel or messenger of Jesus, sent to make known future events to John, expressly tells John, "I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the teachers, and of them who keep the sayings of this book." Probably a James or a Stephen, one of the first martyred teachers of Christianity; whosoever he was, at least his resurrection and office shew that there has been, and still is, a first resurrection prior to the general resurrection from the dead: and, that such resurrection is not the raising of the body, but the raising of the vital, mental conscious principle; and of which principle Jesus said, Matt. x. 28, "Fear not them who are able to kill the body, but are not able to kill the living principle, but rather fear him who is able to destroy both living principle and body in the grave."

Passing from the New Testament to the Old Testament, there the language for death is, "he slept, he slept with his fathers, he was gathered to his fathers," all speaking of the dead as in a state of existence, though their bodies were in general passed away. If we may be permitted to take the language of the historians as evidence of their ideas concerning things, it may be said that the history of ancient times by Moses, confirms the language of Jesus, where he tells the Sadducees that the righteous dead are, in the state called heaven, as the messengers or angels of God. Thus Moses, in the xviii. and xix. chapters of

Genesis, in different places of the same account, speaking of the persons who appeared, he sometimes calls them angels and sometimes men, using the words synonymously with each other, which he could not do if they were, as they appear to have been, supernatural agents, but on the ground of the righteous dead being employed as divine messengers, when the Deity thought proper to appoint such extraordinary intercourse on any occasion with his creature man. This synonymous use of the word is also to be found in Judges xiii. when the angel of the Lord appeared to Manoah's wife; and again in the appearances at the sepulchre of Jesus, by comparing John xx. 12, Luke xxiv. 4, Matt. xxviii. 2—5, Acts i. 10. See also the appearance to Lot, Gen. xviii. xix., and Simpson's admirable Essay on Angels.

From this evidence, and that in my former Letters, I conclude, that seeing all living existence is formed, ab origine, by a union of the vital principle to matter, there is not any ground for supposing that this vital principle does not exist at the death of the body, and completely independent of it, with a capacity of animating with all its recollections such spiritual body, as may be appointed for it, seeing that original life, by its recollections, continues, though the matter is momentarily changing.

Against this doctrine, Dr. Priestley has justly been considered as the most formidable antagonist. If I understand his arguments they may be reduced to these four objections:—

1, All ideas have come from corporeal senses; thought cannot exist without an organic body; the induction, therefore, from these allowed facts is, that the organic body thinks.

2, That the reason why it is contended that the mind and body are distinct is, that the mind may be proved capable of living after the death of the body; but if it was capable of such separate existence, it would also continue its activity when the body swooned or slept.

3. If the mental faculty is immaterial and immortal, all its particular faculties would be so too; but every faculty is liable to be impaired, and death renders them all extinct.

4, If the sentient principle is imma-

terial it cannot have extension, and, therefore, all belonging to it must be simple and indivisible; but our ideas, the archetype of our minds, are facts retained: these ideas are divisible or they could not be reasoned on, and such reasoning is an extension and divisibility of the mind, and by it proves its materiality.

If I have, as I intended to do, rightly stated the learned Doctor's objections, I think they can have no force against facts and Scripture, and that the reasoning of them confounds the distinct principles of mind and body, and are no more conclusive than the Doctor's argument would be to prove that himself and his pneumatic trough were one person, because the one never did, or could act without the other; but my paper being filled, I have only room to say, that I mean not to be disrespectful to his memory, by observing, that the premises and conclusion appear to me unphilosophical and unworthy so great a man.

N. \*

SIR, Stockport, July 9, 1817.

AS a friend to free inquiry, and an impartial examination of subjects connected with religion and morals, I rejoice that so convenient and valuable a medium for discussion is presented to the public through your Repository.

The topic of *vitality* has, in some late Numbers, been considered by your Correspondent N. (pp. 210 and 342). In his two Letters or Essays he has, doubtless, discovered much knowledge of natural science; yet it appears to me, that the points which he aims to prove are not so clearly established, as I apprehend he imagines, and that there is much justice and force in the remarks of your Correspondent E. (p. 341), upon his first essay. The subject, if I rightly understand the author of the two essays, is the same as that which has often been discussed by metaphysicians and divines, whether the soul is a principle

distinct from the body, and can exist without it or not? This, I presume, will, to many persons, be in general an interesting topic of inquiry; and is, perhaps, at the present time more peculiarly interesting, on account of the expected approaching trial of Mr. John Wright, on the charge of blasphemy, in consequence of having, in a discourse, advanced sentiments upon this subject contrary to the popular notions. Sentiments similar to those espoused by Mr. J. W. were many years ago publicly professed by some persons of high rank in the Church of England, as well as by men of research and learning amongst the Dissenters. Your Correspondent V. F. (p. 276), has made some just remarks upon the speech of the Bishop of Chester, in the House of Lords, as given in some of the public prints, in reference to the case of Mr. J. Wright. The father of this prelate, the late Dr. Edmund Law, Bishop of Carlisle, was a man whose soul could not be confined by the shackles of an established system, but would avail itself of its natural liberty. Those who wish to make themselves well acquainted with matters, which have a connexion with the topic discussed in your learned Correspondent N.'s essays, and with the subject, which is the ground of offence in Mr. J. Wright's Sermon, would do well to consult Dr. E. Law's "Discourse on the Nature and End of Death under the Christian Covenant, with the Appendix and Postscript," subjoined to his "Considerations on the Theory of Religion." This judicious and learned writer, in this Discourse, considers 1, "In what sense we are *delivered from death* by the sufferings and death of Christ." 2, "Why so much of *the power of death* is still permitted to continue in the world." 3, "What *notions* of it are now proper and agreeable to the Christian state." Under the first head he endeavours to ascertain the meaning of the word *death*, as it is strictly and properly applied in Scripture; and to do this, he refers to that "remarkable passage, where it is first used in that denunciation which brought Adam and his posterity under it, and where, we must suppose it used in all the plainness and propriety of speech imaginable." (Gen. ii. 17.) Our author asserts, that the original

\* [As another Correspondent has, for many years, used the signature of N. attached to this and the former communications on Vitality, we ought to have requested some addition or alteration in the subscription, which perhaps our present correspondent will hereafter make. ED.]

Hebrew signifies, "thou shalt utterly die." He supposes that this matter is "sufficiently explained in the sentence passed on our first parents; where they are reminded of their original, and of that state to which this change should reduce them. 'In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.'" (Gen. iii. 19.) This language, he considers, must have been understood by our first parents, as meaning "a resumption of that natural life, or conscious being, which their Creator had been lately pleased to bestow upon them, the forfeiting which, must necessarily include a total loss of all those benefits, that then did, or ever could proceed from him." After considering the meaning of the word *death*, he proceeds to shew, how we are delivered from it by the obedience of our Lord. This, he asserts, "will appear more clearly from the *date* of that deliverance, and this is every where in Scripture represented as commencing at the resurrection. 'Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection from the dead,' and 'as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.'" Under the second head our author takes notice, that mankind "could not have subsisted always in the present world; at least not been supported in such numbers as now take their turn there, and supply each other's places in succeeding generations." He also says, "could we, at any time, without pain or the apprehension of any, quit our abode here, and convey ourselves to the realms above, how ready, on every slight occasion, would each be to dispatch himself and others thither!" Our author likewise shews, "that such a dispensation as this of death, however disagreeable, is yet in our present circumstances of great service." Under the third head of the Discourse, the writer intimates, that we have ground for comfort, and that we may look upon death, as "a passage from a mixed, imperfect, to a pure and perfect portion of felicity, the end of all our labours in one state, and the beginning of our recompense in another. 'Mortality is swallowed up of life.'" Death is represented as a sleep.

"Though in the sight of the unwise we seem to die, yet is our hope full of immortality." In the Appendix our author treats, "concerning the use of the words *soul* or *spirit* in the Holy Scriptures, and the *state of the dead* there described;" and he says, that "all philosophical arguments drawn from our notions of *matter*, and urged against the possibility of life, thought and agency being so connected with some portions of it as to constitute a *compound being* or *person*, are merely grounded on our *ignorance*, and will prove equally against known fact and daily observation; in the production of various animals, (oviparous and vegetable ones particularly,) as well as against the *union* of two such heterogeneous principles, as those of our own soul and body are supposed to be." In the Postscript Dr. Law defends his sentiments relating to the subject which he had been discussing, and points out the inconsistency of the popular scheme with the gospel, representing it as "a total subversion of that positive covenant which professes to entitle us to everlasting life."

S. P.

Mr. Belsham's Animadversions on the Attack, in the "Monthly Retrospect," upon his "Plea for Infant Baptism."  
Essex House,

SIR, October 8th, 1817.

THE writer of that article in the Repository for July, which is rather quaintly styled "The Christian's Survey of the Political World," has thought fit to travel somewhat out of his record, [p. 448,] in order to pass a censure upon a work which he has probably never read, and to controvert an argument which it is plain that he does not understand. As the passage is but short, as it is a sort of *bonne bouche* in controversial theology, and finally, that I may not be accused of misrepresenting a writer upon whom I find it necessary in self-defence, and in justice to the argument which I have advanced, to animadvert, I will, with your permission, transcribe the passage entire.

"But we must not be too severe in our strictures on this abuse of baptism, (alluding to the unwarrantable stress laid upon the rite of baptism in the Roman Church as applied to the in-

fant daughter of the Duchess of Berri,) when even in our own body is found a writer to set up the strange notion of the propriety of infant sprinkling as a Christian rite, derived from the apostles. The true Christian will not, however, be led away by such strange fancies: he will consider what baptism really was, and that it could not be introduced till the parties were prepared to be disciples. Make disciples was the precept; the initiatory rite was the consequence: and how a disciple is to be made of a babe who cannot assent to any proposition, it is in vain for any learned Rabbism to attempt to explain. We must not set the plain terms of a law aside to bring it within the pale of tradition. For, had the tradition been well-grounded, and we believe that there is no foundation for it, this would no more justify the practice than it would justify Peter's error which was by Paul so justly condemned."

Upon this precious *morceau* of theological lore, which, in the estimation of the writer and perhaps of the *οἱ πολλοί* with whom confidence of assertion and a contemptuous sneer supply the place of proof, is regarded as a decisive answer to a late PLEA FOR INFANT BAPTISM, I beg leave to offer the following animadversions.

In the first place, this political Christian, or Christian Politician, professes to soften the severity of his censure upon the Romish error of baptismal salvation out of courtesy to the author of the Plea, who has asserted the obligation of infant baptism upon totally different grounds. The author is not insensible to the intended kindness, and in return he would whisper to his gentle monitor, that another time it might be advisable just to take the pains to understand a question before he publishes his remarks upon it.

But the Christian Politician regards infant baptism as a *strange fancy*.—Perhaps he considers infant circumcision as also a *strange fancy*: and yet there are many *true Christians* who seriously believe that circumcision was a divine institution.—Perhaps the Christian Politician may go a little further still: he may think public worship a *strange fancy*: he may call the Lord's Supper a *strange fancy*: he may regard the appointment of the Lord's-day as a religious and joyful

commemoration of the resurrection of Christ as a *strange fancy*; for these external rites, however reasonable and useful in themselves, yet as Christian institutions, they stand upon no other foundation, nor can a better be desired, than infant baptism, viz. the uniform, universal, undisputed practice of the primitive Church from the apostolic age. This the Christian Politician, by a misnomer, calls tradition, whereas it is in truth the very strongest species of historic evidence. It is by far the surest method of tracing an institution to its original authority, infinitely better than any positive testimony from single texts which are liable to be altered and mutilated in a thousand ways. And, in fact, it is the self-same evidence by which the records of the Christian religion are authenticated and their genuineness is established. For how is it known that the Gospel of Matthew was written by Matthew, and the Gospel of John by John, but from the uniform undisputed testimony of Christian antiquity: and why do the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Book of Revelation stand upon a lower scale of credibility or rather of authenticity than the Gospels and Paul's Epistles: but that they are in the number of the *ἀντιλεγόμενα*, books whose genuineness was not universally admitted by the earliest Christians?

But though the rite of infant baptism stands upon this very strong ground of primitive antiquity, yet it appears that those who practise it are not true Christians in the estimation of our Christian Politician. "The true Christian will not," says he, "be led away by such strange fancies." This, methinks, is somewhat of a sweeping censure. I have myself been pretty severely schooled for not extending indiscriminately the appellation of Unitarian to the mixed multitude, who, for one reason or another, claim the title, and who gather in such swarms around the Unitarian standard, that they almost remind one of the old saying, "how we apples swim!" But never did I dream of excluding from the great community of Christians any who professed to believe in Christ, and whose lives were correspondent to their profession, for any difference of opinion or practice relating either to Christian

doctrine or to positive institutions. But this Christian Politician wields his theological hatchet with a more ruthless mind than the savage throws his tomahawk; and in the true spirit of the imperial tyrant who wished that the Roman people had but one head that he might enjoy the pleasure of striking it off, he severs at one mighty and decisive stroke, from the Christian community, the great mass of professing Christians for the first ten centuries, all the members of the Asiatic, the African, the Greek, and the Roman Churches; Catholic and Protestant, Lutheran and Reformed, Episcopalian, Presbyterian and Independent, the vast majority of martyrs and confessors of ancient and modern times, the teachers, the reformers, the pillars and bulwarks of the church, and without hesitation he delivers them over to Satan, and assigns them their portion with hypocrites and unbelievers; for whatever they might profess, or however eminent they might be for talents and virtues, for their piety, their orthodoxy, their zeal and usefulness, they baptized infants and consequently were no "true Christians." Indeed, according to this new gospel, so "strait is the gate and so narrow is the way," that few beside the Christian Politician himself, and the noted John of Leyden, and those far-famed Christian politicians, the pious German Anabaptists of the sixteenth century, and a few worthy and good men of modern times, stand any chance of salvation.

But the Christian Politician appeals to positive law. "Make disciples was the precept: the initiatory rite was the consequence. We must not set the plain terms of a law aside to bring it within the pale of tradition." Granted. But does it follow that because proselyte baptism is a Christian institution, infant baptism is not? Where is the Christian Politician's logic, if from such premises he draws such a conclusion? Proselyte baptism is unquestionably a rite of the highest authority: and upon what ground does the evidence rest? Not surely upon the doubtful authority of a doubtful and reasonably suspected text: but upon the uniform, universal, and invariable practice and testimony of the primitive church; upon that high ground of historic evidence, which

the Christian Politician is pleased to call tradition, but which he well knows is the only evidence upon which the Gospel of Matthew can be received as genuine, and consequently the only authority upon which the precept rests. But the very same testimony which establishes the obligation of proselyte baptism, establishes that of infant baptism: and if it is competent to authorize the one, it is equally competent to authorize the other. What foundation is there, then, for that unmeaning sneer of the Christian Politician, "how a disciple is to be made of a babe, who cannot assent to any proposition, it is in vain for any learned Rabbism to attempt to explain"?

But the Christian Politician demurs to the fact. "We," says he, meaning, I suppose, himself and his snug party of true Christians, "believe that there is no foundation for it." Had these true but simple Christians been men of sound understandings and of competent learning, they would not only have told us *what* they believe, but *why* they believe; they would have shewn, that though Jerome and Augustin on the one side, and Pelagius and Celestius on the other, who examined the subject with the greatest attention, declare the universality of infant baptism, and that they had never seen or read of any heretics so impious as to deny it; yet that nevertheless these great and learned men, the most eminent writers of the fifth century, were quite mistaken; and that there had been a time, when the whole Christian church were utter strangers to infant baptism, and applied the rite only to adults. They would have appealed to some nation, or sect, or church, in which adult baptism only was practised: or they would have produced some early instance of the descendant of a baptized person, whose baptism was deferred to years of discretion: or at least some early ecclesiastical writer, who opposed the practice of infant baptism, and denied its apostolical authority. And finally, these well-meaning true Christians, if they had understood any thing of the art of reasoning, would have endeavoured to shew how it came to pass that when Christ and his apostles had appointed one mode of baptism, the universal church should, in less than a century, practise a different mode; and that this great change should have

taken place in total silence, without the smallest opposition, without one single voice being heard, without a single line being written, in defence of the original apostolic divinely authorized practice. No: all that these worthy good-hearted true Christians, with the learned Christian Politician at their head, have to say for themselves is this, "We believe that there is no foundation for it."

Although, however, this may be a very concise way of disposing of the question, it is possible that some speculative persons may not be altogether satisfied with this solution of the case. But happily our Christian Politician has, with great ingenuity, devised a hypothesis which, if admitted, completely relieves his pious and believing brethren, "the true Christians," out of all their difficulties. It is, indeed, perfectly original: none will dispute the honour of the invention it could only occur to an adventurous and enterprising mind, perfectly free from the trammels of vulgar prejudice. It is this: "Had the tradition been well grounded, viz. that infant baptism was an institution of the apostles, and the universal practice of the primitive church, this could no more justify the practice than it would justify Peter's error, who was by Paul so justly condemned."

Now it appears that the offence for which the apostle Peter was publicly and severely rebuked by the apostle Paul, was doing a thing which, at the time, he knew to be wrong. See Gal. ii. 11. And upon the Christian Politician's principles, by parity of reason, if the apostles instituted infant baptism, they knowingly contravened the explicit orders of their great Master; they promulgated a strange fancy of their own as an ordinance of Christ; they did what they at the time knew to be wrong, and instead of being approved and obeyed, as it appears they were by the universal primitive church, they ought to have been severely rebuked, and publicly censured, as Peter in a similar case had been condemned by Paul.

This is an argument so novel and unexpected, that I frankly acknowledge that I am not prepared to answer it. I had always been accustomed to regard the apostles as authorized interpreters of their Master's will: and

I had the simplicity to believe that whatever was taught by the apostles, and received unanimously by the primitive church, constituted a vital part of the Christian revelation. And having traced infant baptism to this sacred source, I was content to leave it there: nor is it in my power to add any thing further to the argument.

If, however, through weakness of judgment, I have unfortunately erred in assuming this principle, I have only to request, not in my own name only, but in that of many others, who would be "true Christians," if they could, that the Christian Politician will have the goodness to embrace an early opportunity of stating all those doctrines and institutions which, having been taught by the apostles and universally acknowledged by the primitive church, are now discovered to be "strange fancies," which endanger men's salvation, and "by which no true Christian can be led away:" and for the promulgation of which, in opposition to their better knowledge, the apostles deserve to be severely rebuked as Peter was by Paul. A communication of such importance cannot but be most gratefully received by multitudes, as well as by, Sir,

Your Constant Reader,  
T. BELSHAM.

SIR, *Palgrave, Oct. 6, 1817.*

I AM very happy to find, by a late Number of the Repository, [pp. 503, 504,] that the Unitarians of Kent and Sussex have petitioned Parliament to be permitted to marry among themselves, in conformity with their religious principles; in the same manner as Jews and Quakers have been for some time permitted to do. And I should hope, that if this boon be granted, and I can hardly see upon what grounds it can be refused, that our Unitarian divines will not introduce into their service any of the ludicrous and really indelicate observations which pollute the present established marriage ceremony, and are quite sufficient to suffuse with blushes the face of female modesty. But before the question is carried before Parliament, so far as to come to discussion, would it not be well to consider, how far it might be desirable to endeavour to remove the solemnization of the marriage contract alto-

gether out of the hands of those who minister in holy things, and place it, where, I confess, it appears to me it ought to be, in the hands of the magistrate. I am not going here to discuss what is marriage, or what the views with which it ought to be entered into, or with which it is entered into. But whatever may be determined on these points, if it should hereafter be necessary to discuss them, the manner in which the intention of the parties, intending to be man and wife, should be made public is a *civil* affair, and is designed for the preservation of harmony in society. Any grievances arising to married parties, as far as redress can be obtained, is sought for in our civil courts: the proceedings in the ecclesiastical courts scarcely can be said to form any exception to this remark. At all events, the *moral* guilt of parties offending, seems to be considered of trifling importance. Their punishment is visited in degree, according to the supposed magnitude of their civil offence. Besides, suppose a Unitarian should happen to marry a Trinitarian, the latter must be married (I use the term as it is generally used) according to the present law at church, because the mode adopted by Unitarians would not be binding on the Calvinistic lady. This is now done by Quakers, I believe, when they happen to marry out of their own community. It will be necessary that some clause should be introduced into the act, to obviate this inconvenience, provided the affair is still to be considered so far as a religious matter as to be left in the hands of ministers: but I wish to see from any of your correspondents, a substantial reason why it should not be rather ratified before the magistrate.

J. F.

SIR, *Nantwich, Aug. 6, 1817.*

I HAVE long thought that the subject of the marriage ceremony deserved the most serious consideration of the worshipers of the one undivided God, and I am glad that it is again introduced into the Repository. The remedy, however, which your Warrington Correspondent [p. 409,] proposes, appears to me to be worse than no remedy at all. There is something in it of hostility to the Established

Church, and, therefore, to adopt it would frustrate our efforts to obtain relief. Let us neither seek to "increase the scanty incomes of our own ministers," nor to "deprive the church of any pecuniary object," but to be eased of a burden which we ought not to bear. Let us respectfully petition Parliament, not for permission to solemnize our own marriages, but for relief from a ceremony which does violence to our consciences, leaving it to their wisdom how such relief shall be afforded.

If a request so reasonable should be denied, nothing will then remain for us, but to "obey God rather than men." Let us be determined to do our duty, but let us do it in singleness of eye as unto God and not unto men, and with meekness and gentleness, and universal peace and love.

F. K.

*Marriage Ceremony, as it respects Unitarians.*

This subject has attracted public attention. A better proof of this cannot be given than its being agitated in the *Times* Newspaper, a Journal, which is conducted, we believe, upon the mercantile principle, of provoking the discussion or of adopting the side which is most popular, that is, most profitable. From this paper we make the following extracts: No. I. consists of *Remarks* in the *Times*, Sept. 18; No. II. is a *Letter* from Mr. W. Smith on those Remarks; and No. III. contains the further *Remarks* of the *Times* upon the general subject and upon Mr. Smith's Letter.

No. I.

*Remarks in the Times, Sept. 18.*

IT will be recollected, that towards the close of last session of parliament a notice was given by Mr. Smith, the member for Norwich, of some intention to move a bill, the object of which was to allow Unitarians, as they call themselves, or Socinians, as they are more generally called, to marry in their own chapels, and according, we presume, to a ritual of their own, either already compiled, or to be compiled hereafter. About the same time, we should suppose, a question relating to the same subject has been agitated with uncommon warmth in the British settlement of

Newfoundland, where marriages have actually been solemnized by authorities deemed incompetent in this country, and the legitimacy of which was therefore doubted. The Methodist ministers, it appears, have performed this ceremony, arguing, that the marriage act of England did not extend to that colony; and that it was therefore competent to them, or even to laymen, to officiate. The matter being of great importance, application was made to the government of England, from which the following official communication has been received at the colony, and has thence found its way into the mother country:—

*Provincial Secretary's Office,  
Halifax, Aug. 19, 1817.*

The following copy of a letter from Earl Bathurst to his Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, is published by authority:—

*“ Downing-street, May 31, 1817.*

“MY LORD,—Herewith I have the honour of enclosing to your Lordship an order of his Royal Highness the Prince Regent in Council, dated the 26th ult., disallowing an Act passed by the Legislature of the Province of Nova Scotia, in 1816, entitled, ‘An Act to explain the Acts concerning Marriage and Divorce, passed in the thirty-second year of his late Majesty’s reign, and the first year of his present Majesty’s reign.’

“I have the honour to be, &c.  
“BATHURST.

*“ To Lieutenant-General the Earl of Dalhousie.”*

Immediately after the date of this letter, a bill to the above effect was proposed to Parliament by Mr. Goulbourn, and on the 27th of June, received the Royal assent. From this act it appears, that the interpretation of the Methodist ministers, upon which an act of the Provincial Legislature of Nova Scotia had been founded, has been set aside, and that the British marriage act has been averred to extend to the colonies. The subject is so interesting to the morals of society, that we are disposed to say something more upon it than what merely results from the occasion. It appears to us, that in situations where regularly ordained or licensed ministers cannot be had, the ceremony should be performed in such practi-

cable way as may be best calculated to give it solemnity and publicity, and that such marriages should be held valid. In Scotland, if we recollect right, the declaration of the parties that they are married, added to the notoriety that they live together as in a conjugal state, is a conclusive proof that the ceremony has been performed. The Quakers, who have no priesthood, marry by a simple declaration of the parties, which is afterwards signed and attested in their meetings. But it may be asserted as a general rule, that in every Christian country marriage has been esteemed a religious solemnity and a civil contract united, and has been performed in the face of the Church by the Established Clergy, with consequences as to settlement, issue and relationship, prescribed and ordained by law. We confess that we shall be sorry to see any of these forms set aside, because we shall apprehend injurious effects to the purity and morals of our posterity. The Romish Church considers marriage as one of its seven sacraments; and when Christianity was interdicted in France, then, also, was the religious solemnization of marriage prohibited. Whatever respect, also, may be due to Dissenting ministers of various denominations and sects, whatever extraordinary purity we might, for argument’s sake, be disposed to allow to their creed; yet they do not themselves, under the existing state of things, pretend to put their public acts upon a level as to general effect, as to the power of exciting attention, or making an impression, with those of the Established Clergy; and we are convinced that every thing of solemnity that can be added to that ceremony, from which all the relations of life spring, is necessary to sanction and enforce the due observance of its obligations.

If it be asked, whether we would oppose the progress of Mr. Smith’s bill through Parliament, we confess that we have such apprehension of raising the terrible howl of intolerance, that we should rather recommend it to the sound discretion of that gentleman to relinquish his intention; for if the Socinians are allowed to marry in their chapels, there is no reason why the same privilege should not be

conceded to the other sects; some of whose ministers would be obliged to attest the performance of the ceremony with their marks instead of their names. There is no reason why the solemnization should not take place in every licensed house of worship; though these structures so often change the purposes for which they are employed; and are one time dedicated to the worship of the Deity, at another to the consummation of those vices which he abhors.

We trust that the Established Church will always be pre-eminent for the dignity and the solemnity of its ceremonies: but we should farther think, that the more respectable Dissenters will shudder at the introduction of a custom, through which they will certainly be disgraced by the practices of their ruder brethren. We think it, however, our duty to add, that the Marriage Act of George II. is a very confused production.

No. II.

*Letter from Mr. W. Smith on the above Remarks.*

*To the Editor of the Times.*

SIR,—I observe in your paper of yesterday some remarks on the solemnization of marriage, the calm and dispassionate tone of which, while in those who most differ from you it need not provoke an angry feeling, seems proportionally better calculated to excite useful discussion on the subject. In this discussion, however, I do not now propose to engage, but only request to correct that part of your statement, which erroneously represents me as having “given notice in the House of Commons of some intention to bring forward a motion,” for the purpose of altering the law of the case; and from whence occasion is taken to appeal to what you are pleased to term “my sound discretion” against such a proceeding. Now, whatever may be my opinion, I beg it may be understood, that on the occasion referred to, acting only as the organ of others, I merely presented the petition of a number of Unitarians who conceive themselves to be aggrieved by the existing law, and that I did not hold out any pledge, or (to the best of my recollection) even hint a design of farther prosecuting the

business. Allow me, before I conclude, to embrace the opportunity of making one remark. You say that “in every Christian country marriage has been esteemed a religious ceremony and a civil contract united.” Now, for the argument’s sake, allowing this to be ever so accurately true, I would wish to ask, whether the most logical and legitimate, as well as the best practical inference from the premises, would not be, that while for the security of social order and of property, descendible or otherwise, the most effectual means should be adopted to render the civil contract firm, indissoluble and easy of judicial proof, the strength and permanence of the *moral* tie would not be best ensured by leaving the religious ceremony to be performed in the mode most congenial to the religious sentiments of the persons themselves; by which their most valuable feelings would inevitably be more deeply interested in the transaction than they can be by the use of a form to which the parties may unfortunately have annexed the ideas of inexpediency or impropriety?

I am, Sir,

Your obedient humble servant,  
W. SMITH.

*Parndon House, Essex, Sept. 19.*

No. III.

*Remarks of the Times upon the general Subject and upon Mr. Smith’s Letter.*

It seems that Mr. Smith, the member for Norwich, did not give notice of any motion for the purpose of altering the law of the land on the subject of marriage in favour of Socinian or Unitarian Dissenters; but, “acting as the organ of others,” simply presented a petition from a number of that body who conceive themselves aggrieved by the existing law. In conformity with the request of that honourable gentleman, we hasten to correct our mistake, and have inserted his letter to us in another part of the journal. In that he asks, adopting our definition of marriage “as a religious ceremony and a civil contract united,” whether “the most logical and legitimate, as well as the best practical inference would not be, that while for the security of social order and of property, descendible or other-

wise, the most effectual means should be adopted to render the civil contract firm, indissoluble and easy of judicial proof, the strength and permanence of the *moral tie* would not be best ensured by leaving the religious ceremony to be performed in the mode most congenial to the religious sentiments of the persons themselves?" To this question we cheerfully reply; first, that logically, Mr. Smith's supposition would make marriage *not* a religious ceremony and a civil contract *united*, but a religious ceremony and a civil contract separated, and therefore, not necessarily co-existent; and that the practical inference would be, that the contracting parties would take as much of either as they liked. For example, the Socinians, we believe, exist in all conceivable gradations, from Christianity, or something near it, down to no Christians at all. There can be no reason why the latter should practise a religious ceremony enjoined by Christ, and recalled by him to primitive purity, by the restriction of single male to single female: with these, therefore, the marriage rite would lose all its solemnity, and become an affair of wax and parchment. On the contrary, the religionists of an opposite description, the enthusiasts, would make it wholly a pious rite or celebration, and limit its commencement and duration to the feeling or experience of passion; the internal motions of what they call godly love, directing them and giving them a right to the enjoyment of its object. With such the civil contract, affecting to bind those whom God had bound, would be superfluous, nay, even impious; and we are not speaking here by conjecture: this has been the language and the practice also of enthusiasts on the subject. Indeed we think it obvious, that if marriage were to be considered as a civil contract only, there can be no reason why it should not observe the character of all civil contracts, and be dissoluble at the will of the parties: but as a divine ordinance, it obtains a controul over the mind itself, and can only be directed, as to form and circumstance, by human laws.

At present the church service enjoys by prescription the right of so-

lemnizing this ceremony with most effect; and we should think, that the respectable Dissenters of all classes would desire, as they have hitherto acquiesced in the practice, that it should not now be set aside. It is only their respectability that can suffer by the change; the marriages of the Established Church will not be affected.

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

No. CCCXVI.

*Magnanimity of a King of Sweden at a Public Execution.*

The late King of Sweden had condemned a soldier to die; and stood at a little distance from the place of execution. The fellow, when he heard this, was in hopes of a pardon; but being assured he was mistaken, cried, his tongue was yet free, he would use it at his pleasure, which he did with great license, accusing the King most insolently, and as loud as he could speak, of barbarity and injustice, and appealing to God for revenge of his wronged innocence. The King, not hearing him distinctly, inquired of those about him, what the soldier had been saying; and was told, by a general officer, who was unwilling to heighten his resentment against the miserable, that he had only repeated very often and loud, that God loves the merciful, and teaches the mighty to moderate their anger. The King was touched by the lesson, and sent his pardon to the criminal. But a courtier, of an opposite interest, took advantage of the occasion, and repeated to the King exactly the licentiousness of the fellow's railing; adding gravely when he had done, that men of quality and trust ought never, in his opinion, to misrepresent facts to their sovereign. The King for some time stood suspended in his thoughts; but turning at length toward the courtier, with a face of reproof; *it is the first time, said he, that ever I have been betrayed for my advantage! But the LIE of your enemy pleased me better than your TRUTH does.*

*Plain-Dealer, No. I. May 12, 1724.*

## BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

*Dr. Alexander on Philip. ii. 5—11.*

SIR, Wakefield, June 12, 1817.

LOOKING over some of my papers the other day, I cast my eye on the following criticism on Philip. ii. 5—11; and recollecting some years ago to have shewn it to my friend Mr. Jones,\* who, at that time, expressed his cordial approbation of it, it occurred to me, that it might not be unacceptable to your readers in general. In no version that I have yet seen does the sense of the original appear to me to have been adequately expressed; nor does any exposition of the passage that I have hitherto met with, convey, in my apprehension, the full force and peculiar propriety of the apostle's language. If, therefore, you deem it not unworthy of a place in your miscellany, it is entirely at your service.

DISNEY ALEXANDER, M. D.

In the passage before us the apostle is exhorting the converts at Philippi to cultivate the amiable virtues of *humility, condescension and benevolence*, intimating to them, at the same time, that they would be called to *suffer* in the cause of religion. And in order to give the greater effect to his exhortation, he places before them the animating example of the Founder of their faith, and reminds them of the glorious reward with which *his* obedience has been crowned. "Let this mind be in you which was likewise in Christ Jesus, who, though in the form of God, *thought not of the robbery of being equal with God*, but divested himself of it, and assumed the form of a servant; who being in the likeness of men, and proved to be in frame as a man, abased himself so

---

\* Author of *Illustrations of the Four Gospels*, a work replete with ingenious criticism and philosophical research; and which the scholar should read for its elegance, the Christian for the confirmation of his faith, and the sceptic for the cogent and luminous display of those beauties and evidences of our religion, which, however they may escape the notice of the careless and superficial, are nevertheless powerfully adapted to impress conviction on the mind of every serious and dispassionate inquirer.

as to become obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. On which account God hath highly exalted him, and conferred on him a name which is above every name, that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, among those that are in heaven and on the earth and under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." On the passage thus rendered, I proceed to submit the following observations to the judgment of the reader.

*Though in the form of God.* The allusion is, as I conceive, to the transfiguration on the mount, where he assumed a *divine* or luminous or supernaturally splendid *appearance*, his face shining as the sun and his raiment becoming white as snow: *μορφή Θεῶν* without the article, literally *in a form of God*, a phraseology precisely answering to that in Mark ii. 22, Acts vii. 20, Gen. xxx. 8, and various other passages.

*Thought not of the robbery of being equal with God.* This is an exactly literal version of *εχ' ἀρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἰσὰ Θεῶν*. So far was he from *claiming* it as his *due*, that he never *harboured* such an *idea*, never once thought of the *robbery* of being equal with God; *i. e.* of arrogating to himself that worship which he well knew to be the prerogative of God alone. The language is evidently borrowed from the Jewish Scriptures. "Shall a man *rob* God? Yet ye have *robbed* me." Mal. iii. 8. "Ye are cursed with a curse, for ye have *robbed* me, even thy whole nation," ver. 9. See also Jer. vii. 11. But what gives a singular force and energy to this expression, is the circumstance that the Jews *did actually accuse* our Lord, during the exercise of his ministry among them, of *this sacrilegious act*. Compare carefully John v. 18, and x. 33. To repel, therefore, so unjust and invidious a charge, a charge which, it is probable, still continued to be urged against the meek and lowly Jesus by many, both among the open enemies and false friends of the Christian faith, appears to have been the chief, if not the sole object

of the writer in using this pointed and energetic language. And this remark shews the futility of the ingenious Mr. Robinson's sarcastic animadversions on the Unitarian interpretation of the passage in his *Plea for the Divinity of Jesus Christ*, a book, nevertheless, which contains the best and most eloquent defence of that doctrine which has, perhaps, ever yet appeared, and reflects equal credit on the talents and on the integrity of its author. The common *English* translation of this text, suggests a sense decidedly at variance with the uniform tenour of Scripture. But the propriety of retaining the *literal* sense of the term ἀρπαγμῶν is, I think, obvious from what has already been remarked; and I may add, it is still farther confirmed by our Lord's own language; for in John x. 8, speaking of those false shepherds who obtruded themselves into the fold of God, and *claimed divine honours*, he explicitly denominates such persons *thieves and robbers*. Compare Acts viii. 9, 10, and 2 Thess. ii. 4.

But *divested himself of it*, i. e. of that divine or supernaturally splendid form which he assumed on the mount, and which, had he been so disposed, he might have retained. So far, however, was he from seeking his own aggrandisement and exaltation, that, as soon as it had answered the end proposed, he laid it aside and assumed a character and situation exactly the reverse, *taking upon him the form of a servant*. How striking a contrast is here! and how necessary it is that it should be preserved in the translation! Wakefield, though he may have given the general sense of the passage, has not expressed it with that point and energy which the original manifestly displays—the *form of a servant*. We have seen, that in the former verse the apostle had been alluding to *one specific and remarkable occurrence*, and we shall find that he here refers to *another*; thus preserving the strength and beauty of the contrast. And when did Jesus assume the form, in other words, sustain the character of a servant? Surely, when after *girding himself with a towel, he washed the feet of his disciples*. Such a singular instance of *condescension* in one whom they regarded as their Teacher and Lord, was not less likely to live in the

recollection of the apostles, than the *luminous and transporting scene* which had presented itself on the mount; and it is no wonder that we find Paul making honourable mention of it, and deducing, from so memorable an act of humility and affection, an argument to enforce on his brethren the indispensable obligations they were under to be mutually affectionate and condescending one to another.

The impostors, while they maintained the Divinity of Christ, asserted that he was a *man only in appearance*, denying at the same time the *reality of his death*. They denied his death, with a view to set aside the scriptural doctrine of the resurrection; and it is probable they rejected his real humanity, that they might have a more plausible pretext for disputing the reality of his death; and thus we see why the great doctrines of the *humanity and death* of Jesus were necessarily *connected and associated together in the mind of our apostle*; and likewise, why the apostles in general, both in their discourses and in their epistles, so frequently recur to these topics, and appear to lay so much stress upon them. It is to these that the writer next adverts. *Who being in the likeness of men, and proved to be in frame as a man, abased himself so as to become obedient unto death, even the death of the cross*, i. e. as Jesus in form resembled men, so he was *found or proved*, on the fullest investigation, to be *really* a man. The term εὐρεθείς *found or proved*, seems to be used in a *judicial sense*, and implies *full and satisfactory evidence* of the fact (compare John xx. 27, Acts i. 3, Luke xxiv. 39, and 1 John i. 1, &c.); and as a farther confirmation of his “possessing a real human nature, and at the same time a mind infinitely exalted above all selfish or ambitious views, he submitted to a death at once the most *public, painful and ignominious* that can be conceived.”

Wherefore, or on which account God also hath highly exalted him, agreeably to the tenour of his own declaration, *he that humbleth himself shall be exalted*. That the exaltation of Jesus to a state of unrivalled dominion and supreme felicity, was the *reward* of his previous self-abasement and voluntary sufferings, is the uniform doctrine both of the Old and of the New Tes-

tament. “*Therefore,*” says the prophet, “will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; *because he hath poured out his soul unto death,*” &c. Isa. liii. 12. “*Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows:*” Heb. i. 9, and see Heb. ii. 9.

*And given him a name that is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of those that are in heaven and in the earth and under the earth.*

The first thing observable here is the *double* sense of the word *name*, which occurs three times in this paragraph. This I conceive to be a distinction of some importance, though it has escaped, to the best of my knowledge, the notice of commentators. In the *two* first places, it is, I believe, generally admitted to denote that *power or authority*, that *pre-eminence of rank or dignity*, with which Jesus was invested, as the *Son of God*, the *Lord of the new creation*, the *Saviour and Judge of the universe*. Very opposite to this is the signification which it bears in the *third or last* place of its occurrence. It there refers to the *simple humanity* of the *Messiah*, to the *personal name* of Jesus, with which his enemies had associated every sentiment of obloquy, derision and contempt, and which many, even among the professed converts to Christianity, were reluctant and *ashamed publicly to acknowledge*. The obscure son of a carpenter, the humble and persecuted prophet of Nazareth, a condemned malefactor, a crucified Redeemer, were sounds equally abhorrent from the feelings and hostile to the prejudices both of Jew and Gentile; and it is a fact, well known to readers of ecclesiastical history, and amply corroborated by the testimony of the sacred writers, that, in those early days, numbers of the professed advocates of the gospel, in order to facilitate its acceptance among the higher ranks of society, endeavoured to sink the *personal name* of Jesus under the splendour of his assumed divinity, and to roll away the reproach of the cross, by representing him as a *supernatural being*, incapable of suffering and superior to death. And this circumstance not only satisfactorily explains, but

will be found to throw a new and beautiful light upon several other passages in the New Testament, which, without the knowledge of the above fact, must be allowed to be extremely obscure, if not quite unintelligible. See 1 Cor. xvi. 22, Acts ii. 22, 32, 33, 36, 1 John iv. 2, 3, Rom. i. 16, Mark viii. 38, Gal. vi. 14, 1 Peter ii. 7.

The apostle, therefore, by this clause intimates, that whatever *odium* may be affixed to the name of Jesus by his open enemies or pretended friends, it was a name, beyond all others, *precious* in the sight of *God*; and that, that very Jesus whom men rejected and anathematized was appointed *sole Mediator* between God and man, the honoured instrument of effecting the subjugation of all created intelligences whatsoever, to the dominion of the one living and true God.

*And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.*

The apostles, no less than the Saviour himself, uniformly made the glory of God their ultimate end and object. The glory of God required that his Son should be honoured and acknowledged. He had sent him into the world: he had entrusted him with a most awful and important commission. This commission the Son had executed to the perfect satisfaction of the Father. The Father had already expressed his approbation of the conduct of his Son, by the high state of exaltation and glory to which he had raised him; he had given him a kingdom, he had seated him upon a throne, and he now called upon all men to acknowledge his authority and to obey his commands. And so far is this from derogating from the honour due to God alone, that by it the Father is glorified; as a monarch esteems himself honoured when his ambassador is treated with respect. Compare Isa. xlv. 23, John v. 23.

I conclude by remarking, that this passage seems to me strongly to inculcate that most consolatory and animating doctrine, *the final restitution of all men to virtue and to happiness*. What! shall the designs of Providence, in the redemption of mankind, be frustrated? Shall the puny arm of a feeble mortal counteract the intentions of Omnipotence? If Jesus

Christ hath tasted death for every man—if he be exalted a Prince and a Saviour to give repentance and remission of sins unto his people—if the lip of infallible truth have declared by the mouth of an apostle, that for this very end Christ was thus exalted, viz. “that every knee might bow and every tongue confess Jesus to be Lord, to the glory of the Father;” does it not follow, as a necessary inference, even supposing it no where to have been expressly asserted, that, under the government of an infinitely wise and powerful and benevolent Being, a period will come, when, to use the emphatic language of Scripture, “death and hell” having been “cast into the lake of fire,” God shall reign the acknowledged Sovereign and beloved Father of all his rational offspring, and the empire of truth, of virtue and of happiness, be universally and eternally predominant?

*Translation and Emendation of Psalm cxxxvii.*

SIR, Alnwick, Aug. 30, 1817.

IN perusing your Monthly Repository, I frequently find many valuable criticisms upon obscure passages in the New Testament. This encourages me to hope, that some observations upon difficult texts in the Old Testament, will not prove uninteresting. I am not so presumptuous as to imagine, that my views will always be correct, or that my solutions will afford constant satisfaction; yet, if what I advance, will induce abler pens to discuss the subject, I shall be satisfied; as the end I have in view will be attained.

The 137th Psalm has often been admired for the tenderness of its strains, and it is presumed, that no person can peruse it without being affected. Beautiful as it is, there is a harshness in the last verse, of which I can never approve, and which, I think, the writer never intended. The verse to which I allude runs thus:—“Happy shall he be, that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against a stone.” If we consider the book of Psalms, as many do, to have been written by men divinely inspired for that purpose, we perceive a spirit of savageness and barbarity in this passage utterly incompatible with that goodness which characterizes a holy God. Or, if we view the Psalms, as some sensible

Christians do, to be the effusions of uninspired men, still the brutal fierceness expressed in the text, is irreconcilable with all our ideas of humanity, honour and justice. To seize little children and to dash them against stones; to refuse to censure the perpetrator of such an act, but even to applaud the monster, and to consider him a happy man, evince a ferocity and insensibility of mind, which, it is presumed, could not exist, in the breasts of men, so enlightened and polished as the Jewish prophets were.

The Hebrew עוֹלָלִים here rendered children, has a variety of significations; but as it often denotes wickedness, injustice, &c., I would suggest, that it should be rendered in this passage, *idols*, not children. What confirms the idea is this, the Babylonians were idolators. The worship of their idols brought upon the Jews such heavy calamities, as led them to deprecate idolatry, and to consider that man happy, who durst seize the little household gods of their oppressors, and dash them to pieces. Let us translate the whole Psalm anew, and consider how it agrees with this emendation.

1. By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down,  
We wept also, when we remembered Zion.
2. Upon the willows in the midst, we hung our harps;
3. For there, those who captivated us,  
Demanded of us, the recitation of a song;  
And our spoilers said in mirth,  
“Sing us one of Zion’s songs.”
4. How can we sing the song of Jehovah,  
In a foreign land?
5. But if I forget thee, O Jerusalem!  
Let my right hand forget its office.
6. Let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth,  
If I do not remember thee —  
If I do not exalt thee, O Jerusalem!  
Above my chief joy.
7. Jehovah remembers the Edomites,  
Since the day Jerusalem was taken;  
Who said, “Raze, raze it to its foundations.”
8. Daughter of Babylon! who art to be destroyed,  
He will be happy who will repay thee;  
Who will reward thee, as thou hast acted towards us.
9. He will be happy, who will seize,  
And dash thy idols against the stone.

CAMBER.

## REVIEW.

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

ART. I.—*The Second Part of Armata.*  
8vo. pp. 218. Murray. 1817.

THE hand of the same noble author appears in this Second Part that we traced in the First Part of *Armata*. [Mon. Repos. present Vol. p. 140, &c.] The work is unquestionably *Lord Erskine's*. But whilst it bears the character of his mind, it can scarcely be said to reflect honour on his genius. The story of *Armata* is clumsy and ridiculous. Its merit consists in its five speeches, or rather fragments of speeches. In these, however, the Second Part is decidedly inferior to the First. We do not make an exception of Chapter VI. or of that part of it relating to Law, which is the best portion of the present publication.

Lord Erskine is quite a religionist. He sets out with an odd thought, namely, that *but for the sea*, “ the propitiation for sin accomplished in Palestine,” would have been of no avail: as if apostles could not have travelled by land! He describes “ Revelation” as “ communicating a fallen condition and a mediatorial redemption.” He is in favour of a reconsideration of the Articles, and against their being made use of as Tests. He declares himself a churchman, but expresses a wish that the “ national religion, as well as civil state, should be balanced by a popular constitution, and that the free spirit of the Dissenters should continue.” “ Many persons,” he says, “ have been reproached or sneered at as *Methodists*, only for maintaining and believing the very same doctrines which OUR SAVIOUR preached when upon the earth.”

With these marks of attention to religion, we know not how to reconcile certain expressions and inuendoes, and one abominable degradation of the most sublime passage of Scripture; but we observe, that the noble author has a theory of his own, with regard to perfection, which is, that it consists in the equal mixture of opposite qualities, and we conclude, that he applies this not only to political constitutions and ecclesiastical establishments, but also to individual character.

ART. II.—*An Excursion to Windsor, in July, 1810; interspersed with Historical and Biographical Anecdotes, for the Improvement of the Rising Generation. Also a Sail down the River Medway, July, 1811.* By John Evans, A. M. To which is annexed, a *Journal of a Trip to Paris, in the Autumn of 1816.* By John Evans, Jun. A. M. 12mo. pp. 568. Sherwood and Co. 1817.

MR. EVANS designs this work to be a companion to his “ *Juvenile Tourist*,” and, like that publication, it is well adapted for the amusement and “ improvement of the rising generation.” The author has brought together the acquisitions of an active literary life, and has illustrated the little route from London to Windsor, and the “ *Sail down the river Medway*,” with a great variety of anecdote, biography, history, poetry and moral reflection. He preserves in himself, and he encourages in the reader, a feeling of good nature towards all ranks of persons in civil life and all religious sects. This freedom from prejudice and bigotry makes his pages of great value to the younger reader.

On his arrival at Windsor, Mr. Evans led his party to the Terrace, and the following is his description of the Royal Family:

“ We entered Windsor about six o'clock, and having refreshed ourselves at the inn with a cup of tea, hastened to the Terrace, where we found a considerable portion of genteel company. Intent on the gratification of a laudable curiosity, we felt peculiarly happy in joining them on this occasion. It was seven o'clock, and the good old King soon made his appearance with his accustomed punctuality. A little door in the castle was thrown open, when two attendants were seen leading this venerable personage with great care down a flight of steps till he safely alighted upon the Terrace. Then the Princesses Elizabeth and Augusta, who were present, accompanied him, one on each side, or rather took hold of his arm; they paced backwards and forwards for an hour, two bands of music playing alternately; the fine tones of the several instruments being heightened by the stillness of closing day. The King was dressed neatly; blue coat with gilt

buttons and star, white waistcoat and small-clothes, white stockings and gold buckles in his shoes. His hat somewhat resembled that worn by the clergy, with the addition of a gold button and loop, mounted by a black cockade, which marks him out conspicuously from the rest of the company. His Majesty looked ruddy and full; his voice sonorous, and he converses with cheerfulness, though, when he attempts to speak rather hastily, it is with hesitation. His want of sight is very apparent, for his hat is drawn over the upper part of his face, and he feels about with his cane, especially ascending or descending a step. It is affecting to see him, though he appears cheerful when he speaks, and seems as if nothing were the matter with him. He now and then stops to converse either with the officers or with the nobility and gentry. We saw him several times on the Terrace; but on this first evening there was a more than ordinary degree of conversation. He was full of inquiries respecting the installation of Lord Grenville, as Chancellor of the University of Oxford, which had taken place during the week. He inquired also about the balloon in which Mr. Sadler had ascended on the occasion, and was particularly anxious to know how long it continued in the air and where it had alighted. Harrow on the Hill was mentioned, though the spot had not then been ascertained. He conversed at all times on a variety of topics with the utmost freedom and even hilarity. This daily promenade must benefit both his mind and body, while the presence, as well as the attention, of so many of his subjects, some coming from distant parts, must yield him no inconsiderable gratification. The countenances of the Princesses are replete with good nature, and most exemplary is their attention to their aged parent. This, indeed, is their best praise, their noblest recommendation. Filial piety is the characteristic attribute of humanity. It sheds a lustre upon all the other virtues which enrich and adorn the great family of mankind. It should be mentioned that the King, in returning back to his apartments in the Castle, passing by the band of musicians on the steps, always touched his hat, and said, in an audible voice, 'Gentlemen, good night, I thank you.' Indeed, his Majesty, during the whole time, seemed in perfect good humour with all the company.

"The only etiquette observed on the Terrace is, that when the King passes, the ladies and gentlemen withdraw on either side, the latter merely uncovering the head, bows and curtsies being dispensed with on the occasion. A police officer is in attendance, who, with a little switch, keeps individuals from pressing too much on the King when he stops to converse;

but this is done with the greatest urbanity."—Pp. 291—295.

Mr. Evans paid a visit to Dr. Herschel, which he thus relates:

"We now pushed on to the little village of Slough, and paid our respects to the venerable Herschel, of astronomic renown. Introduced to him by a letter, he received us politely, and in shewing us his wonderful apparatus in the garden paid every possible attention. His immense telescope, forty feet long, raised and supported by complicated appendages, is seen by every passing traveller from the public road. The lesser instruments are ranged around, like so many Satellites in the planetary system!

"Dr. Herschel, a native of Germany, and originally a musician in the army, was the discoverer (13th of March, 1781,) of a new planet, denominated the Georgium Sidus, out of compliment to his Majesty. It is apparently at the extreme boundary of the solar system. Other discoveries have been made by this indefatigable astronomer. He was pleased to present me with a well-executed engraving of his great telescope, upon my telling him that I always explained its construction to my pupils at the conclusion of my lecture on astronomy. Mentioning, also, an excellent Orrery I had lately purchased, he replied, with great good humour, 'Orreries are pretty play-things—my Orrery is up there!'—pointing to the sky. The old gentleman was very affable, and, notwithstanding his extraordinary merit, is distinguished for his modesty. He is evidently an enthusiast in his profession, enamoured of the divine science of astronomy; its pleasures are ineffable."—Pp. 359, 360.

The account of Bishop Pearce [p. 421], bears marks of a too hasty pen. For "Commentary on the Epistles," should be read *Commentary on the Gospels*; and something more might surely have been said of this invaluable work, than it "is held in estimation," and some higher eulogium might have been passed upon the author, as a scholar, than that he "possessed a considerable portion of theological learning." Mr. Evans relates the story of this prelate's wishing to resign his bishopric, and being opposed by his brethren the bishops, who reckoned that the measure would form an invidious precedent.

The latter part of the volume is furnished, as the title-page announces, by Mr. Evans, Junior; and his Journal is introduced in a manner creditable to both father and son.

ART. III.—*The Confessions of an Arian Minister; containing a Narrative of his Conversion, and exhibiting his present Views of the principal Doctrines of the Gospel, in a Letter to his Son.* By William Gellibrand. 8vo. pp. 31. Williams and Co. 1817.

WE recollect to have read a pamphlet\* satisfactorily accounting for “the unbelief of Edward Gibbon, Esq.” from the circumstances of his life. In like manner, it will not be difficult to explain Mr. Gellibrand’s conversion; this letter shewing that his change of religious sentiment has been the effect of a bad theological education, of the want of studious habits, and of the force of certain social attachments. From his *confessions* we shall collect abundant evidence in support of our allegation: nor will attentive readers fail to perceive that such a convert’s avowal of reputedly *evangelical* opinions is far from being presumptive of their truth.

I. The *Divinity Professor* under whom Mr. G. studied, he represents (7) as “a man of great learning, eminent piety, and much Biblical acuteness,” but adds that he “had not the happy talent of engaging the attention, or even of securing the respect of his pupils.” As the natural consequence, “his labours were disregarded,” and in this branch of education the students “exhibited the most deplorable ignorance.” Mr. Gellibrand’s creed therefore was not the result of theological knowledge and inquiry: it did not rest on an examination of the Scriptures. With some inconsistency † he speaks of himself as having been, at this period of his life, a *determined Arian*; “advancing fast,” says he, “to what I then considered as the pure and rational views of Christianity, as supported and recommended by Dr. Priestly” [Priestley]. Now it does not appear that Mr. G. ever gave up the doctrine of our Lord’s pre-existence: and the following sentences are a memorable comment on this *Arian* minister’s approximation to pure views of Christianity. His experience and his *confessions* prove, as ecclesiastical history also proves, that

the grossest mistakes concerning the person of Christ have originated in a false shame of the “mere humanity” of the Saviour. Let us hear our author’s acknowledgment: [13]

“I could listen without any disgust or uneasiness whilst this friend and benefactor to the world was not only praised, but even exalted to a seat upon the throne of God. I often thought that the preacher erred, but it was an error more in unison with my heart and my love, than if he had attempted to degrade his Saviour by sinking him to the level of mere humanity.”

Defective indeed must have been the theological education of the man who could write such a sentence! What is Mr. G.’s avowal? That he approved of a creed which, nevertheless, he considered as erroneous! Of the light (Pref. 4) in which *we* view this or any part of his Letter let him be as careless as he please: he should know however that, by the declaration before us, he virtually accuses himself of inconsistency, and proves how little he is acquainted with the laws of evidence and with the test of truth. Numerous additional illustrations of the evils of an ignorance of the principles of Biblical and Scriptural criticism, are supplied by his pamphlet. When the candidate for the ministry is a stranger to them, he will not possess the ability—perhaps not the desire—of explaining to his fellow-men the records of Revelation: his sermons will not be really *evangelical*; and it is probable that he will be indifferent to religious opinions,—will lightly embrace and as easily dismiss them.

II. But did the “*Arian minister*,” who makes these *confessions*, attempt to supply the deficiencies of his theological course, in the former academy at Hoxton, by any subsequent regard to theological studies? “The world,” says he, (8, 9,) “presented itself to my view, and stole too much of my heart from God and from heaven—I was hastening fast to a state of irreligion and unbelief; I was immersed in the pursuits, in the pleasures, and, oh! sad to relate, in many of the vices of the world.” This, be it remembered, is his own statement of his own case. We “would not hear his enemy say so:” and, possibly, in the revulsion of his feelings, his self-accusation is extravagant. If however he was *immersed* in the pursuits of the world,

\* By the Rev. John Evans, M. A.

† See p. 13 of this pamphlet.

he, plainly, had neither time nor relish for those of sacred literature. His studies took a different, and even opposite, direction. Perhaps they were of a gainful nature (19). The neighbourhood of the metropolis, presents well-known temptations to such employments: and we have heard of Dissenting ministers, some of them orthodox, some of them heretical, who have been assiduous, and not unsuccessful, votaries at the shrine of *Mammon*.

So far as his own care and exertions are concerned, the respectability and usefulness of the Christian minister will much depend on the object and the regularity of his studies, after he has quitted the college or the academy. On the foundation which he there laid he ought constantly to build. His education is only begun: he must every day carry it forward to maturity. In the excellent charge which Mr. G. received\* at his ordination (8), this advice was enforced with the affection and earnestness due to its importance. By many divines, of every communion, Scriptural learning is neglected. Some of them, it is true, possess not the means of access to books which they are desirous of consulting: and more, we humbly think, should be done, by the enlightened, opulent and generous friends of religion and literature, to prevent or remedy this evil. If clergymen and ministers do not feel, or cannot fulfil, their obligation to make themselves acquainted with the volume of Revelation, in a critical no less than in a devotional and practical view, it is little wonderful if, like Mr. G. they are unfurnished with any consistent and stable knowledge of its doctrines.

III. This "Arian minister" confesses, further, that his change of sentiment has been produced, in part, by the force of certain social attachments. To his son he says (11),

"Since I married your most excellent mother-in-law, whom I must ever regard as being, in the hands of Providence, a principal means of my recovery to a just sense of the obligations of religion and virtue, I have constantly attended," &c.

Now we cannot doubt that this consideration has exercised a much stronger influence on the mind of

Mr. G. than he seems to be aware. But is not such an influence, however natural, and, to a particular extent, honourable and salutary, perfectly distinct from any thing like *evidence*, whether presumptive or direct?

Speaking with reference to his conversion, he alleges (17), that "the plain and unlearned interpretations of the Scriptures seemed to his mind more consistent with the design and end for which they were written than those subtle and scholastic views he had been accustomed to regard." An unequivocal proof of his not being in the habit of studying the Scriptures as they ought to be studied, of his not making them, as Locke made them, their own interpreter! The true meaning of the sacred volume, is not necessarily, or even probably, that which those men affix to it whose explanations are dictated by the creed of their infancy or by the articles of their church; although, under the bias of self-love and self-deception, we confound vulgar prejudices with natural and unforced comments. Nothing can be more incongruous than to explain the language of ancient and of foreign writers in uniform agreement with the conceptions of a modern age. *Plain* interpretations are not those which appear such to uninformed and unreflecting readers, but those, on the contrary, which are suggested by a correct acquaintance with the phraseology of the Scriptures. What Mr. G. intends by "subtle and scholastic views of Christianity," he has left us to conjecture. The propriety of his applying such epithets to the "Arian" and Trinitarian hypotheses we fully admit: to the *views* of the persons who unequivocally believe in one God, the Father, and in one Mediator, the man Christ Jesus, they are not in the slightest degree applicable. From scholastic ideas and scholastic terms the creed of the Unitarian is altogether free: and to its friends its simplicity is truly attractive, but to the lovers of mysticism, unspeakably revolting. Not a single passage of Scripture expresses literally and unreservedly the doctrine of the Trinitarian and of the Arian: while that of the Unitarian is represented in numerous texts, which are understood by us without any mental gloss. Is this *subtle*? Is this *scholastic*?

\* From Dr. Kippis.

Mr. G., as might be looked for, is no friend to the *Improved Version*, &c. Part of his advice however in respect of this work, we shall adopt with regard to his own performance; excepting, of course, the epithets that we inclose in brackets,

“ — exercise your GOOD JUDGMENT and your COMMON SENSE upon their [laboured and far-fetched] interpretations and commentaries” (28).

Thus we perceive that *common sense* is appealed to even by those who censure others for employing it. On the whole of these *Confessions* we wish the reader to exercise his “good judgment” and his “common sense;” and we shall not then doubt what will be his verdict.

## POETRY.

### SONNET BY MR. ROSCOE

ON PARTING WITH HIS LIBRARY.

AS one, who destined from his friends to part  
 Regrets his loss, but hopes again ere while  
 To share their converse and enjoy their smile,  
 And tempers as he may, affliction's dart—  
 — Thus lov'd associates! chiefs of elder art,  
 Teachers of wisdom! who could once beguile  
 My tedious hours and lighten every toil,  
 I now resign you—nor with fainting heart,  
 For, pass a few short years or days or hours,  
 And happier seasons may their dawn unfold,  
 And all your sacred fellowship restore,  
 When, freed from earth, unlimited its powers,  
 Mind shall with mind direct communion hold,  
 And kindred spirits meet to part no more.

### THE MOSLEM BRIDAL-SONG.

FROM THE ITALIAN.

*Attributed to a modern living Poet.*

[From the Literary Gazette.]

There is a radiance in the sky,  
 A flush of gold and purple dye.  
 Night lingers in the west,—the sun  
 Floats on the sea.—The day's begun  
 The wave slow swelling to the shore  
 Gleams on the green like silver ore;  
 The grove, the cloud, the mountain's brow,  
 Are burning in the crimson glow;  
 Yet all is silence,—till the gale  
 Shakes its rich pinions from the vale.

It is a lovely hour,—tho' heaven  
 Had ne'er to man his partner given,  
 That thing of beauty, fatal, fair,  
 Bright, fickle—child of flame and air;  
 Yet such an hour, such skies above,  
 Such earth below, had taught him love.

But there are sounds along the gale—  
 Not murmurs of the grot or vale—  
 Yet wild, yet sweet, as ever stole  
 To soothe their twilight wanderer's soul.

It comes from yonder-jasmine bower,  
 From yonder mosque's enamelled tower,  
 From yonder harem's roof of gold,  
 From yonder castle's haughty hold:  
 Oh strain of witchery! who e'er  
 That heard thee, felt not joy was near?  
 My soul shall in the grave be dim  
 Ere it forgets that bridal hymn.  
 'Twas such a morn, 'twas such a tone  
 That woke me;—visions! are you gone?

The flutes breathe nigh,—the portals  
 now

Pour out the train, white veiled, like snow  
 Upon its mountain summit spread,  
 In splendour beyond man's rude tread;  
 And o'er their pomp, emerging far  
 The bride, like morning's virgin star.  
 And soon along the eve may swim  
 The chorus of the bridal hymn;  
 Again the bright procession move  
 To take the last, sweet veil from Love.  
 Then speed thee on, thou glorious sun!  
 Swift rise,—swift set,—be bright—and  
 done.

HERMES.

### TO THE EXILED PATRIOTS, MUIR AND PALMER.

[FROM POEMS, BY ROBERT SOUTHEY, THE  
 POET LAUREATE.]

Martyrs of Freedom, ye who, firmly good,  
 Stept forth the champions in her glorious cause:  
 Ye who against Corruption nobly stood  
 For Justice, Liberty and equal laws:  
 Ye who have urged the cause of men so  
 well,  
 Firm when Corruption's torrent swept  
 along;  
 Ye who so firmly stood—so nobly felt—  
 Accept one honest Briton's grateful song.  
 Take from one honest heart the meed of  
 praise;  
 Let Justice strike her high-toned harp  
 for you;  
 Take from the minstrel's hand the garland  
 bays,  
 Who feels your energy—and sorrows too.

But be it your's to triumph in disgrace—  
Above the storms of Fate be your's to  
tower,—  
Unchang'd is Virtue, or by time, or place,  
Unscared is Justice by the throne of  
power.

No, by the Tyrant's heart let fear be known,  
Let the Judge tremble who perverts his  
trust;

Let proud Oppression totter on his throne,  
Fear is a stranger to the good and just.

And is there ought amid the Tyrant's  
state,

Or ought in mighty nature's ample  
reign—

So excellently good—so grandly great  
As Freedom struggling with Oppres-  
sion's chain?

Swells not the soul with ardour at the  
view?

Bounds not the breast at Freedom's  
sacred call?

Ye noble Martyrs—then she feels for  
you—

Glow in your cause and crimson at  
your fall.

And shall Oppression vainly think—by  
fear

To quench the fearless energy of mind?  
And glorying in your fall exult it here,  
As tho' no free-born soul was left be-  
hind?

CANZONETTE.

BY THE LATE JOHN BOWDLER, JUN. ESQ.

'Tis sweet, when in the glowing west  
The Sun's bright wheels their course are  
leaving,  
Upon the azure Ocean's breast  
To watch the dark wave slowly heaving.

And oh! at glimpse of early morn,  
When holy Monks their beads are telling,  
'Tis sweet to hear the hunter's horn  
From glen to mountain wildly swelling.

And it is sweet, at mid-day hour,  
Beneath the forest oak reclining,  
To hear the driving tempests pour,  
Each sense to fairy dreams resigning.

'Tis sweet, where nodding rocks around  
The nightshade dark is wildly wreathing,  
To listen to some solemn sound  
From harp or lyre divinely breathing.

And sweeter yet the genuine glow  
Of youthful Friendship's high devotion,  
Responsive to the voice of woe,  
When heaves the heart with strong  
emotion.

And Youth is sweet with many a joy,  
(That frolic by in artless measure;  
And age is sweet, with less alloy,  
In tranquil thought and silent pleasure.

For He who gave the life we share,  
With every charm His gift adorning,  
Bade Eve her pearly dew-drops wear,  
And dressed in smiles the blush of  
Morning.

TWO SONNETS ON THE GRASS-  
HOPPER AND CRICKET.

[FROM POEMS BY JOHN KEATS.]

I.

The poetry of earth is never dead:  
When all the birds are faint with the hot  
sun,

And hide in cooling trees, a voice will  
run

From hedge to hedge about the new-mown  
mead;

That is the Grasshopper's;—he takes the  
lead

In summer luxury,—he has never done  
With his delights; for when tired out  
with fun,

He rests at ease beneath some pleasant  
weed.

The poetry of earth is ceasing never;  
On a lone winter evening, when the  
frost

Has wrought a silence, from the stove  
there shrills

The Cricket's song, in warmth increasing  
ever,

And seems to one, in drowsiness half  
lost,

The Grasshopper's among some grassy  
hills.

December 30, 1816.

II.

BY LEIGH HUNT.

Green little vaulter in the sunny grass,  
Catching your heart up at the feel of  
June,

Sole voice left stirring 'midst the lazy  
noon,

When e'en the bees lag at the summoning  
brass;—

And you, warm little housekeeper, who  
class

With those who think the candles come  
too soon,

Loving the fire, and with your tricksome  
tune

Nick the glad silent moments as they  
pass;—

O sweet and tiny cousins, that belong,  
One to the fields, the other to the  
hearth,

Both have your sunshine; both though  
small are strong

At your clear hearts; and both were  
sent on earth

To ring in thoughtful ears this natural  
song,

—In doors and out,—summer and win-  
ter,—Mirth.

December 30, 1816.

## OBITUARY.

1817, June 25, at *Paris*, at the age of 82, **JEAN ETIENNE HARDOUIN**, the translator of *Young's Night Thoughts* into French verse. He also paraphrased Fénélon's *Telemachus*; translated the fragment of the 91st book of *Livy*, discovered by Paul Jacques Burns, in the MSS. Library of the Vatican; and published a collection of *Anacreon's Poems* in the original Greek text, with a Glossary, and translations into Latin prose and verse, and French prose and verse.

— 30, at *Athens*, of a fever, brought on by fatigue, in the ardent pursuit of knowledge, and rendered fatal by the extreme heat, **Mr. BENJAMIN GOTT**, second son of Benjamin Gott, Esq. of Leeds. This excellent young man was endowed with virtues and talents which eminently qualified him for an exalted rank in both public and private life. He died the day after he had completed his 24th year, and his remains were deposited in the temple of Theseus, close by those of the celebrated Tweddell.

July 17, in *Glen-street, Kilmarnock*, **WILLIAM STEVENSON**, aged 87. He was originally from *Dunlop*, and bred a mason; but during many of the latter years of his life he wandered about as a common beggar. Thirty years ago, he and his wife separated upon these strange conditions, that the first that proposed an agreement should forfeit £100. This singular pair never met again, and it is not now known whether the heroine yet lives. Stevenson was much afflicted, during the last two years of his life, with the stone. As his disease increased, he was fully aware of his approaching dissolution; and for this event he made the following extraordinary preparation:—He sent for a baker and ordered twelve dozen of burial cakes, and a great profusion of sugar biscuit; together with a corresponding quantity of wine and spirituous liquors. He next sent for the joiner, and ordered a coffin decently mounted, with particular instructions that the wood should be quite dry, and the joints firm and impervious to the water. The grave-digger was next sent for, and asked if he thought he could get a place to put him in after he was dead. The spot fixed upon was in the church-yard of *Riccarton*, a village about half a mile distant. He enjoined the sexton to be sure and make his grave roomy and in a dry and comfortable corner; and he might rest assured that he would be well rewarded for his care and trouble. Having made

these arrangements, he ordered the old woman that attended him to go to a certain nook, and bring out £9 to be appropriated to defray the funeral charges. He told her, at the same time, not to be grieved, for he had not forgotten her in his will. In a few hours afterwards, in the full exercise of his mental powers, but in the most excruciating agonies, he expired. A neighbour and a man of business were immediately sent for to examine and seal up his effects. The first thing they found was a bag, containing large silver pieces, such as crowns, half-crowns and dollars, to a large amount: in a corner was secreted, amongst a vast quantity of musty rags, a great number of guineas and seven shilling pieces. In his trunk was found a bond for £300, and other bonds and securities to a very considerable amount. In all, we heard, the property amounted to £900. His will was found among some old paper, leaving to his housekeeper £20, and the rest of his property to be divided among his distant relations. As it required some time to give his relatives intimation of his death, and to make preparations for his funeral, he lay in state four days, during which period, the place where he was resembled more an Irish wake, than a deserted room where the Scots lock up their dead. The invitations to his funeral were most singular. Persons were not asked individually, but whole families; so that, except a few relatives dressed in black, his obsequies were attended by tradesmen in their working clothes, bare-footed boys and girls, an immense crowd of tattered beggars; to the aged among whom he left sixpence, and to the younger threepence. After the interment, this motley group retired to a large barn fitted up for the purpose, where a scene of profusion and inebriety was exhibited almost without a parallel.—  
(*Glasgow Courier.*)

In August, at *Birmingham*, about 65 years of age, the **Rev. GEORGE WATSON**, late Dissenting minister of *Daventry*. He was a native of *Kettering* in *Northamptonshire*, of reputable parents, and was employed for some time as a mechanic; but being of a serious turn of mind, and wishing to be a Christian minister, his friends sent him to the **Rev. Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Addington**, of *Market-Harborough*, who, at that time, kept a flourishing boarding-school in that town. From thence he removed, in 1773, to the Dissenting academy at *Daventry*, then under the care of that strict disciplinarian, very studious and able tutor, **Dr. Caleb Ashworth**. After con-

Continuing there five years he settled, in the year 1778, with a congregation at Horwich, near Bolton, in Lancashire. There he continued until the year 1797, when he was invited to be co-pastor with the Rev. Thomas Tayler, minister of the congregation at Carter-lane, London; but being only afternoon preacher, and having but few hearers, he soon became dissatisfied with his new and flattering situation, and in a very few years removed to Daventry in Northamptonshire. In this place he continued until bodily infirmities rendered him unable to perform the duties of his office, when he found it advisable, a few months ago, to go to Birmingham, where his only son resides. Here his health improved, and he supplied the congregations of Cradley and Stourbridge several Lord's days; but his afflictions soon returned and removed him out of our world.

He published, in the year 1792, a Sermon on Charity, which he preached at Horwich, for the benefit of the Manchester Infirmary, as did many other ministers of that neighbourhood at that time.

He also, in the year 1810, favoured the public with a Memoir of that excellent man the Rev. Thomas Robins, [Mon. Repos. V. 362—364,] who was laid aside, many years before his death, both from preaching and tuition, by the relaxation of the organs of speech, occasioned by being very unhappily prevailed on to preach three times in one day to a large congregation, when he was indisposed with a cold. Wisdom is necessary to direct. Be soberly wise.

Mr. Watson was a truly religious person, of simple and unaffected manners, a plain, sensible and serious preacher, but his delivery was not sufficiently energetic. A volume of his discourses would, probably, be found far preferable to many that are daily issuing from the press.

In his last letter to me, which is dated Birmingham, June 27, 1817, speaking of another minister who had lately resigned his charge, he says, "I have not heard whether he means to continue in the ministry, but I suppose not as a stated preacher. But, like me, probably he will preach occasionally in the place and neighbourhood where he resides; thus we are reminded of our declining years, and our approach to that time when we shall cease to speak in the name of the Lord. It is humbling to think how little good we have done, and I am sometimes pained with the reflection that I might have done more had I exerted myself more, and my only resource is to acknowledge it before God, and cast myself upon his sovereign mercy. And yet I am not without some hopes that I have been useful, in a number of instances, in the course of my ministry, but, alas! how few in comparison of the many in which I see no evidence of good done."

Farewell, brother Watson, a long farewell. All who, by the grace of God in Christ Jesus, shall get safe to a better world, will doubtless find thee there. But, for the present, farewell.

I can now, in a moment, run, in idea, through the whole clerical history of my deceased friend, and, O, what a shadow it appears! "Mine age is as nothing before thee."—Psalm xc.

Of how little importance it is where we spend the few fleeting moments of life, so that we spend them in the fear of God! Verily, every man and every minister of Jesus Christ, in his best state, is altogether vanity.

JOSEPH JEVANS.

September 21, at *Riverhead*, in Kent, at the advanced age of eighty-five years and four months, MARY, the wife of John SIMPSON, formerly of Hackney. Her death was sudden, though not unexpected; years and infirmities had long oppressed her—she had been afflicted more than thirty years with deafness, and in her last year she nearly lost her sight: thus cut off from her favourite employment *reading*, she would request that others would read to her, which was ever cheerfully complied with, though it required great exertion of voice to reach her hearing. To her honour she filled up every relation of life, as became a woman professing godliness, and will ever be remembered with the sincerest affection by her surviving partner, (with whom she had lived in matrimonial harmony sixty-two years and seven months,) and by her numerous offspring of children and grandchildren. She was interred in the burial ground at Worship-street, on Friday 26th of September, and the Rev. Mr. Gilchrist addressed a mourning audience at the grave.

J. S.

— 23rd, at *Abergavenny*, of a paralytic stroke, received whilst travelling in a post-chaise to that place on the 14th, HENRY HINCKLEY, Esq. of Guildford-street, for some time Treasurer to the *London Unitarian (Book) Society*.

— 29, aged 64, Mrs. ANNA TAYLOR, of Banstead, Surry, only surviving daughter of the late Rev. Henry Taylor, Rector of Crawley and Vicar of Portsmouth, the author of *Ben Mordecai's Letters*, &c.

Oct. 7, at his apartments at *Brompton*, the Right Hon. J. P. CURRAN. He is almost the last of that brilliant phalanx, the contemporaries and fellow-labourers of Mr. Fox, in the cause of general liberty. Lord

Erskine, in this country, and Mr. Grattan, in Ireland, still survive.

Mr. Curran is one of those characters which the lover of human nature, and of its intellectual capacities, delights to contemplate. He rose from nothing. He derived no aid from rank and fortune. He ascended by his own energies to an eminence, which throws rank and fortune into comparative scorn. Mr. Curran was the great ornament of his time of the Irish bar, and in forensic eloquence has certainly never been exceeded in modern times. His rhetoric was the pure emanation of his spirit, a warming and lighting up of the soul, that poured conviction and astonishment on his hearers. It flashed in his eye, and revelled in the melodious and powerful accents of his voice. His thoughts almost always shaped themselves into imagery, and if his eloquence had any fault, it was that his images were too frequent. But they were at the same time so exquisitely beautiful, that he must have been a rigorous critic, that could have determined which of them to part with. His wit was not less exuberant than his imagination; and it was the peculiarity of Mr. Curran's wit, that even when it took the form of a play on words, it acquired dignity from the vein of imagery that accompanied it. Every jest was a metaphor. But the great charm and power of Mr. Curran's eloquence lay in its fervour. It was by this that he animated his friends and appalled his enemies; and the admiration which he thus excited was the child and the brother of love.

It was impossible that a man whose mind was thus constituted, should not be a patriot; and certainly no man, in modern times, ever loved his country more passionately than Mr. Curran loved Ireland. The services he sought to render her were coeval with his first appearance before the public, and an earnest desire for her advantage and happiness attended him to his latest breath.

The same sincere and earnest heart attended Mr. Curran through all his attachments. He was constant and unalterable in his preferences and friendship, public and private. He began his political life in the connexion of Mr. Fox, and never swerved from it for a moment. Prosperity and adversity made no alteration in him. If he ever differed from that great man, it was that he sometimes thought his native country of Ireland was not sufficiently considered. There was nothing fickle or wavering in Mr. Curran's election of mind. The man, that from an enlightened judgment and a true inspiration of feeling, he chose, he never cooled towards and never deserted.

Mr. Curran had his foibles and his faults. Which of us has not? At this awful mo-

ment it becomes us to dwell on his excellencies. And as his life has been illustrious, and will leave a trait of glory behind, this is the part of him that every man of a pure mind will choose to contemplate. We may, any of us, have his faults: it is his excellencies that we would wish, for the sake of human nature, to excite every man to copy in proportion to his ability to do so. (*Morning Chronicle.*)

It was truly said of him, that no advocate ever made the cause of his client so much his own. He entered into it with as much zeal as if he was pleading for his own life; and to his credit it must be owned, that his rare combination of talent and of zeal was in most instances successful. In 1806 Mr. C. was appointed Master of the Rolls in Ireland, a situation in which he particularly distinguished himself for clear and correct decisions. He held that office until 1815, when he was succeeded by Sir William M'Mahon.—(*Day.*)

A. B. K. L.

Oct. 8, at his seat at *Ammondell*, the Hon. HENRY ERSKINE, brother to the Earl of Buchan and to Lord Erskine. Thus at one and the same moment the former great leaders and ornaments of the Scots and Irish bar, have paid the debt of nature. Mr. Henry Erskine was long the Dean of Faculty, to which he was raised by his brethren, from their respect for the superiority of his talents, and his uniform maintenance of the dignity and independence of the bar. On the return of the Whigs to office, he was appointed Lord Advocate of Scotland, at the time when his brother was made Lord Chancellor of Great Britain. His devotion to the cause of civil and religious liberty, was proved by the sacrifice which he made of the titular honours and advantages that would have been gladly lavished on him by successive administrations, if he had surrendered his political integrity to their views. He was inflexible only in his liberal opinions—in all the relations of private life he was most placable and conciliatory. From this honest stubbornness all the influence of the ministerial hostility was exerted against him, and to such a degree of rigour was the malice of the domineering faction carried against him, that for some years, with faculties unimpaired, and even while enjoying the height of popular confidence and admiration, he felt the post of honour, as of repose, to be the private station. It was peculiarly honourable to the illustrious family of Buchan, that at one and the same time, and for many years, the two brothers of the Noble Earl should be the unrivalled leaders of the English and Scots bar—both equally eminent, not only for the ardour with which they maintained the privileges, and guarded the lives, liberties and pro-

erties of their fellow-citizens, but also for the brilliant wit, perfect integrity and irresistible persuasion of their professional exertions. The conversational powers of Mr. Henry Erskine were of the first order—prompt, gentle and luminous,—his flashes of wit irradiated every countenance, while its amenity left no sting behind. His epigrams and *bon mots* were innumerable; many of them are on record, and we trust that the elegant effusions of his muse, and his impromptus at table, will be collected by the biographer of his honourable life.

Mr. Erskine was called to the Scottish bar in 1768. He was twice appointed Lord Advocate, in 1782 and 1806, under the Rockingham and the Grenville administrations. During the years 1806 and 1807, he sat in Parliament for the Dunbar and Dumfries districts of boroughs.

In his long and splendid career at the bar, Mr. Erskine was distinguished not only by the peculiar brilliancy of his wit, and gracefulness, ease and vivacity of his eloquence, but by the still rarer power of keeping those seducing qualities in perfect subordination to his judgment. By their assistance he could not only make the most repulsive subjects agreeable, but the most abstruse, easy and intelligible. In his profession, indeed, all his wit was argument, and each of his delightful illustrations a material step in his reasoning.—To himself it seemed always as if they were recommended rather for their use than their beauty; and unquestionably they often enabled him to state a fine argument or a nice distinction, not only in a more striking and pleasing way, but actually with greater precision than could have been attained by the severer forms of reasoning.

In this extraordinary talent, as well as in the charming facility of his eloquence, and the constant radiance of good humour and gaiety which encircled his manner in debate, he had no rival in his own times, and has yet had no successor. That part of eloquence is now mute—that honour in abeyance.

As a politician, he was eminently distinguished for the two great virtues of inflexible steadiness to his principles, and invariable gentleness and urbanity in his manner of asserting them. Such, indeed, was the habitual sweetness of his temper, and the fascination of his manners, that though placed by his rank and talent in the obnoxious station of a leader of opposition, at a period when political animosities were carried to a lamentable height, no individual, it is believed, was ever known to speak or to think of him with anything approaching to personal hostility. In return, it may be said with equal correctness, that though baffled in some of his pursuits, and not quite handsomely

disappointed of some of the honours to which his claim was universally admitted, he never allowed the slightest shade of discontent to rest upon his mind, nor the least drop of bitterness to mingle with his blood. He was so utterly incapable of rancour, that even the rancorous felt that he ought not to be made its victim.

He possessed, in an eminent degree, that deep sense of revealed religion, and that zealous attachment to the Presbyterian establishment, which had long been hereditary in his family. His habits were always strictly moral and temperate, and in the latter part of his life even abstemious. Though the life and the ornament of every society into which he entered, he was always most happy and most delightful at home, where the buoyancy of his spirits and the kindness of his heart found all that they required of exercise or enjoyment; and though without taste for expensive pleasures in his own person, he was ever most indulgent and munificent to his children, and a liberal benefactor to all who depended on his bounty.

He finally retired from the exercise of that profession, the highest honours of which he had at least *deserved*, about the year 1812, and spent the remainder of his days in domestic retirement, at that beautiful villa which had been formed by his own taste, and in the improvement and adornment of which he found his latest occupation. Passing, then, at once from all the bustle and excitement of a public life to a scene of comparative inactivity, he never felt one moment of ennui or dejection, but retained unimpaired, till within a day or two of his death, not only all his intellectual activity and social affections, but, when not under the immediate affliction of a painful and incurable disease, all that gaiety of spirit, and all that playful and kindly sympathy with innocent enjoyment, which made him the idol of the young, and the object of cordial attachment and unenvying admiration to his friends of all ages.—(*Morning Chron.*)

Oct. 14, ANNA LEONORA OSBORNE FISHER, eldest daughter of Thomas Escolme Fisher, of St. Ives, in the county of Huntingdon, solicitor. For some years past she had read and thought much on eternal things. Her character was always serious, and her reflections just and greatly above her years. During an illness of five months, though frequently in great bodily pain, she shewed the greatest resignation to the Divine Will, being convinced, she said, that her illness was for her good. She always discoursed upon her own death with the greatest composure; and exactly one week before her decease, she disposed of her money among twenty poor widows and others, with each of whom she took an affectionate farewell. She thanked God for the bless-

ings she had enjoyed, and prayed fervently to the last moment of her existence for her parents, for her relatives and for herself. During this illness, she often discoursed upon the vanity of human pursuits in quest of happiness, and said, they were vain and empty, and that religion alone could afford happiness to the mind. She declared her firm conviction of the existence of one supreme God, in one person, and her faith in Jesus Christ, as the promised Messiah, the sent of God. She could not believe, she said, that Christ was God, equal with him, and had often wondered at the unintelligible jargon called the Trinity; that, for her own part, she had, unknown to any one, examined the Scriptures for herself, and the more she had examined them and thought upon the subject, the more she felt convinced of the absurdity of it. To her parents, who were weeping by her bedside, a few days before her departure, she said, "Why do you cry? Rejoice, rejoice, I am happy and shall be happy:" and a few minutes only before her death, she shook hands with each around her, and said to her mother, "Good bye, I am happy;" she then exhorted her younger sister to be good, and, without a sigh or groan or struggle, departed this life, aged 15 years and one week.

St. Ives, 20th Oct. 1817.

Oct. 15, at his seat at *Melchburn*, Bedfordshire, the RT. HON. ST. ANDREW LORD ST. JOHN, Baron St. John, of Bletso. His Lordship was the 13th Peer in succession of that name, Baron of Bletso and Baronet. The family were summoned to Parliament in the first year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Lord St. John represented the county of Bedford in Parliament for twenty-five years, previously to the death of his brother, whom he succeeded in the Peerage. He was firmly and consistently attached to the political opinions of the late Mr. Fox, with whom he passed much of his life in habits of the strictest friendship. And though he was a less constant attendant on Parliamentary duties since the death of Mr. Fox, the time which he no longer appropriated to politics, he devoted to the more confined duties of the county in which he lived, and was, for the last few years, a most active, upright, intelligent magistrate. Perhaps nobody will be more sincerely regretted in the sphere in which he moved than Lord St. John. He has left a widow, daughter of Sir Charles Rous Boughton, Bart. pregnant, and a son, who succeeds him in his title and estates, of five years of age.

## INTELLIGENCE.

### FOREIGN.

#### RUSSIA.

*Jewish Christians.*—On Easter Sunday there was published an Imperial Mandate in favour of the *Jews*, who are converted to Christianity, who are to be incorporated, under the name of *Society of Jewish Christians*. Lands are to be assigned to the Society in the Northern and Southern Governments. It is to manage its own affairs by officers of its own election, under a Board at Petersburg for the affairs of the *Jewish Christians*, of which Prince Alexander Golyzin is appointed President. The members may carry on any trade or manufacture: they are free from taxes and billeting of troops for twenty years, and are exempt from military service. What effect this Ukase may have in tempting the children of Abraham to undergo trine immersion in worship of the Holy Trinity, time only will discover; we observe with pleasure, however, a provision in the Decree for entire religious liberty to the converted *Jews* in their adoption of a Christian Confession of Faith. This is the first attempt to convert the *Jews* on the right principle of civil and religious freedom.

*Russian Dissenters.*—Another act of the Emperor Alexander's is honourable to his wisdom and liberality: it is a rescript to the Governor of Cherson, in favour of the *Duchobooze*, a sect of *Dissenters* from the Greek church; by this, all persecution of this sect is forbidden. The *Hamburgh* papers say, that it bears a striking similitude to Trajan's celebrated Letter to Pliny, but that its superiority is unquestionable.

*Russian Bible Society.*—The following letter from Mr. Henderson, at Petersburg, to Mr. Dick, of Hamburgh, also, shews the Emperor's steady patronage of the *Russian Bible Society*, and contains many interesting particulars:

"St. Petersburg, Dec. 28, 1816.

"With you, and our other friends, I had formed a very favourable idea of the *Russian Bible Society*. Their animated and comprehensive undertakings, the interesting and pious tenour of their reports, and the distinguished success attending their labours, commanded my surprise, and drew forth my affection. But I can truly say, since I came here, that the half had not been told me; I have now had an opportunity of observing the spirit with which the business is conducted, and am happy

to be able to assure you, that it will be difficult to find a committee, that in London, perhaps, excepted, that entertain juster and more impressive views of the nature of the dispensation committed to them. Some of the leading men give evidence that they have experienced the power of the truth, and in almost all of them, there is a strong disposition to hear any accounts that can be furnished of the spread of Christianity in the world. The president is a most worthy nobleman; and it gives me great pleasure to be able to add, that every day almost presents new proofs of the religious disposition of our imperial patron, Alexander I. He takes great delight in reading missionary intelligence. I have lately made some interesting extracts from Mr. A. Paterson's journal, which, together with Pomarree's last letter, and the state of things in the South Sea Islands, are about to be laid before him. We had yesterday a meeting of the General Committee, at Prince Gallitzin's; it was very fully attended. The Archbishop of Tvers—two Archimandrites—the Roman Catholic Metropolitan—were present, all dressed in the vestments of their respective communions,—together with a great number of *starred* gentlemen, who all listened with deep attention to the detail of facts presented, and to the chain of propositions submitted to deliberation. No sooner was it intimated, that letters from Messrs. Steinkopff and Owen were received, than a general, but pious curiosity was excited: and the Prince himself called for and read the first, with a pathos and feeling, which evidently proceeded from the heart. The business of the meeting, which lasted nearly four hours, finished with a letter from our *Cairneyhill* correspondent (M. B.), which received repeated expressions of approbation from all sides; but from Prince Gallitzin especially.

“ ‘The Emperor has lately made the society another donation of 15,000 roubles, to buy paper. The work going on here is immense, as is the demand for Slavonian Bibles.—The 5000 Bibles and 5000 New Testaments, printed at Moscow, are all gone; and another edition, consisting of the same number of copies, has been begun in that city. The Holy Synod have also sent twenty Muscovite boys to print for the society here:—so liberal and generous is that very body, which was commonly regarded as a kind of second-hand Inquisition. 5000 New Testaments (Slavonic) were lately stereotyped here, but they are also mostly all gone: only 1200 copies remain to satisfy the demands of several thousands. The stereotype edition of 5000 Slavonian Bibles, printed here, is just finished; but 15,000 copies are demanded with the most urgent impetuosity. Another edition, however, in 4to.

is rapidly advancing. The Armenian New Testaments are also almost all off, but we are printing a new edition, along with that of the whole Bible; and an edition of the Finish, which has been long in the press, will be out in a week or two. Mr. Alexander Paterson, of Karass, has lately finished a very interesting journey in the Crimea: Turks, Tartars, Jews, nominal Christians, Imans, Mollahs, Effendis, have all discovered anxiety to receive the New Testament in the Tartar language, and have accepted copies with every demonstration of gratitude and joy. One anecdote I cannot but relate:—Having crossed between the Sea of Asoph and the Black Sea, he fell in with an old grey-headed man, whose venerable appearance indicated that he was of some consequence in the place. This aged sage asked Mr. Paterson, *if he was a believer in the last times?* Mr. Paterson stated to him his sentiments on the point; which so pleased the old man, that he called out to his wife, ‘Bring him the best loaf in the house, he is a believer in the last times.’ We are waiting impatiently to see the New Testament in modern Russ. This will be one of the most important works ever published by Bible Societies. It is designed to supply the wants of thirty-four millions of immortal souls! You think much has been achieved in Russia; but nothing is yet done, compared with what is to be done. About one hundred languages and dialects are spoken in this immense empire.’

“ Thus you see (adds Mr. Dick), that a glorious work is going on in the northern parts of the world—a work which, I trust, will not cease till time itself has finished its course;—and the blessed effects of this work shall be coeval with the ceaseless ages of eternity. What encouragement does this afford to all who love the Lord Jesus, and wish well to the souls of men, to pray without ceasing and to labour without fainting—to be steadfast and unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord; forasmuch as they know that their labours shall not be in vain in the Lord”!

*Russian Literature.*—There are at PETERSBURGH fourteen printing-houses, of which three belong to the Senate, the Synod and the War Office. The others belong to the academies or to individuals. One prints in the Tartar language, another prints music. There are thirteen foreign booksellers and about thirty Russian. There are also six reading-rooms.

PRUSSIA.

*Union of the Lutherans and Calvinists.* We announced in our last (p. 571), that a *Reformation Fête* was projected by the Protestant Universities of Germany: it

will appear by the following document, that the King of Prussia wishes to seize this occasion to unite the two denominations of Protestants, the Lutherans and the Reformed or Calvinists. Their chief, if not only difference, respects the Lord's Supper.

*Berlin, Oct. 11.*—His Majesty the King has been pleased to address the following invitation to the Consistories, Synods and Superintendencies of the Monarchy:—

“My illustrious ancestors, reposing in God, the Elector John Sigismund, the Elector George William, the Great Elector King Frederick I., and King Frederick William I., as is proved by the history of their reigns and lives, endeavoured with pious zeal to unite the two separate Protestant Churches, the Reformed and the Lutheran, in one Evangelic Christian church in their dominions. Honouring their memory and their salutary views, I willingly join them, and wish to see a work agreeable to God, which met with insuperable obstacles in the unhappy sectarian spirit of those times, to be brought about in my dominions, to the honour of God and the weal of the Christian church, under the influence of a better spirit, which disregards what is not essential, and holds fast what is the vital part of Christianity, in which both churches are agreed; and I desire to see the beginning made upon the approaching secular festival of the Reformation. Such a truly religious union of the two above-mentioned Protestant churches, who are separated only by external differences, is conformable to the great objects of Christianity; it answers the first views of the Reformers; it lies in the spirit of Protestantism; it promotes religious spirit; it is salutary to domestic piety; it will be the source of many useful improvements in churches and schools, which have been often hindered hitherto merely by the difference of religions. To this salutary union, so long desired, and now again so loudly called for, and so often sought in vain, in which the Reformed church does not go over to the Lutheran, or the latter to the former, but both unite in one new, animated, Evangelic Christian church, in the spirit of their Holy Founder, there is no longer any obstacle in the nature of the thing itself, if both parties seriously and honestly desire it in a true Christian spirit; and if produced by this it will worthily express the gratitude which we owe to Divine Providence for the invaluable blessings of the Reformation, and honour the memory of its great authors in the continuance of their work.

“But much as I must wish that the Reformed and Lutheran churches in my dominions may share with me this my well-tryed conviction, I have far too much respect for their rights and their liberty to

force it upon them, or to order or decide any thing in this affair.

“This union, besides, can have real value only, if neither persuasion nor indifference have a part in it, if it proceed from the unbiassed liberty of self-conviction, and is not only an union in external form, but has its roots and vivifying service in unity of heart, according to the genuine principles of Scripture.

“As I shall myself celebrate in this spirit the approaching secular festival of the Reformation, in the union of the late Reformed and Lutheran congregations at Potsdam, in one Evangelic Christian congregation, and take the holy Sacrament with them, I hope that this my own example will have a beneficial influence on all the Protestant congregations in my country, and that it may be generally followed in spirit and truth. To the wise direction of the Consistories, to the pious zeal of the Clergy and their Synods, I leave the exterior coinciding form of the union, convinced that the congregations will readily follow in a true Christian spirit, and that every where, when the attention is directed seriously and sincerely, without any interested secondary views, to what is essential to the great sacred cause itself, the form will be easily found, and the external will naturally result from the internal, simple, dignified and true. May the promised period be no more remote when, under one common Shepherd, all united in one faith, one charity and one hope, shall form only one flock!

“FREDERICK WILLIAM.

“*Potsdam, Sept. 27, 1817.*”

“To the Consistories, Synods and Superintendents.

“The undersigned Minister, charged with the publication of this expression of his Majesty's wishes, does not doubt of the desired and happy success; because as it has been accepted since the first of this month by the clergy of this city, of both Evangelic Confessions, united in one Synod, with unanimous joy and grateful respect for his Majesty's sentiments and views therein expressed, it will certainly be received in the same manner by all the Evangelic clergy and congregations in the kingdom.

“Minister of the Interior,

“VON SCHUCKMANN.

“*Berlin, Oct. 8, 1817.*”

SWITZERLAND.

*Unitarianism at Geneva.*

THE long suspected heresy of the Genevese has been gradually disclosing itself. The new *Version of the Bible* in 1805, and above all, the *Geneva Catechism*, put out in 1814, and lately translated into English, (see our Review, Vol. XI, p. 235,) made the fact unquestionable. English orthodox

zeal has at length given notoriety and decision to the Genevan Unitarians, with whom *Servetus*, rather than *Calvin*, is now the tutelary saint.

The following articles on this interesting subject are from the Newspapers.

An article from Lausanne, dated the 23d August, in the Paris Papers, says—“An English Methodist, Mr. Drummond, domiciliated at Geneva, is, it is said, preparing a new French translation of the Bible, not finding that of the pastors and professors of Geneva sufficiently faithful. He is employing several young theologians to translate into French the latest works of the English Methodists. It is understood that he intends to reprint the works of Calvin.”

We find the following article in the *Journal du Commerce*, dated from Geneva, the 5th September:—“The sect of Methodists in this city, encouraged in various ways by Mr. Drummond, a rich English gentleman, increases and acquires more consistence every day. From the Hotel of Secheron, which they make their headquarters, they correspond with the reformed churches of Switzerland, Piedmont and the South of France, with the view of inducing them to subscribe to their new translation of the Bible, and their republication of Calvin. They have published, through the medium of an Advocate, named Grenus, a justificatory Memoir, having for its title, ‘An Historical View of the Reformed in the Eighteenth Century,’ in which they accuse the majority of the Genevese Ecclesiastics of evidently leaning towards the doctrines of the Socinians. The Editor of this brochure manifests an ardent zeal for the opinions of the 16th century. Mr. Drummond himself having addressed a letter to the pastors, in which he considered them as heretics and blasphemers of the name of Christ, has been ordered by the Council of State to suppress his Letter, and to make a promise to be more circumspect in future.”

An article dated Geneva the 30th Sept. in the *Journal du Commerce*, says, “Two foreigners recently arrived here, one M. Leo, and the other Mr. Wells, an English gentleman, announce, it is said, the project of taking Mr. Drummond’s place with the sectarists of Geneva. The former is employed in distributing books of devotion, and the other teaches and preaches Methodism. The paper war which has existed for some weeks between the Puritans and the rational people does not seem likely to terminate. The Sieur Gremes has published a second diatribe, in which he continues to accuse the Genevese clergy of Socinianism; and Empeytoz from the

bosom of his pious retirement with Madame de Krudener, has launched forth new attacks upon the doctrines of the pastors of Geneva. Every day gives birth to some new brochure, either attacking or defending the Established Church.”

THE following is an extract of a letter, dated the 17th ult. from Geneva:—

“It may be interesting to you to learn in what way the *thinking people* of Geneva find mental occupation in this season of peace and tranquillity, when the want of stimulus is so heavily felt by all the tribe of the *soi-disant* politicians. The good folks here do not trouble themselves at this moment about politics. Content with the freedom they enjoy, rejoicing in being delivered from French bondage, from the conscription, and taxes to which they were subject under the tyranny of Buonaparte, and proud of their union to the Swiss Confederacy, they seek no political change; but dissensions of another nature seem to threaten danger to the happiness, if not to the internal quiet, of this peaceful city. Religious controversy at present gives employment to these reflecting citizens; as yet, but a war of pamphlets and of letters merely, but which in the sequel may give rise to the establishment of sects, and of new places of worship in this cradle of Calvinism, where there has been but one church—one and indivisible—since the Reformation. Let me give you some account of this dissension.

“The whole of the clergy here are publicly accused of having departed from the pure faith as established by John Calvin, and of being at this day Arian and Socinian, but not Christian ministers. This change of principles is said to have occurred some years past. It appears, that in 1805 the clergymen here published a new translation of the Bible, where the confession of faith, founded by Calvin, was suppressed, which had been attached to all the former editions; and in this new translation, it is said, the text where it relates to the Divinity of Jesus Christ, has been materially altered. Added to this is the complaint, that the Catechism of Calvin, which was taught in the schools, was laid aside, as well as that of Osterwald; and a new Catechism put forth by the Ministers in 1814, in which is found the following question:—‘Q. What results from all that we have said of the person of Christ?—A. That we ought to be penetrated with respect for him.’

“On this the faithful here exclaim, that Mahometans profess to do the same; and that this Catechism tends completely to destroy the doctrine of the Divinity of our Saviour. Then comes the last act of the clergy, which has been the immediate cause

of the existing strife. On the 3d of May last, previous to the annual consecration of the Students in Theology, they exacted a written promise from each candidate for the ministry, that he would abstain in his sermons, whilst he should preach in any church within the Canton of Geneva, from touching—1st. On the manner in which the Divine nature was united to the person of Jesus Christ.—2d. On original sin.—3d. On the manner in which grace operates, or, on the efficacy of grace.—4th. Upon predestination. One young man who refused to subscribe to this promise, was denied admission to the sacred office, and a minister, who likewise refused to abide by it, was forbidden again to appear in the pulpit. Upon this, *voilà la guerre ouverte*; these two young men and their party have found a powerful supporter in an English gentleman here, a Mr. Drummond, with whom they are said to be employed in preparing for the press another French edition of the Bible, free from the errors of that of 1805, and whose house is said to be the rendezvous for all the true believers. The clergy and their adherents accuse Mr. D. of inflaming people's heads here, by other arts and other means than reasoning; and rumour even says, that they were trying their influence with the magistrates, to obtain an order that this Englishman should withdraw from the territory of Geneva. It is probable no such proceeding was seriously contemplated, for it would have been too bold an attack on a British subject; but if it had taken place, it would have been a curious illustration of the change of opinion within half a century, for little more time has elapsed since Rousseau was driven out from hence and his books burnt, for attacking those religious principles and that creed, which the clergy of the present day are accused of having forsaken.—*Public Ledger and Daily Advertiser, Thursday, October 2, 1817.*

*Extract of a Letter from Geneva,  
Sept. 26.*

At a time when Bible and Missionary Societies are extending themselves on all sides, and by their exertions communicating the knowledge of the Gospel to the heathen world, it will doubtless surprise and grieve your readers, to be informed of the great departure from the doctrines of Christianity which prevails in the Church of Geneva;—a church so interesting to every Protestant, as having been the cradle of the Reformation.

The proofs of a departure from the true faith in the Church of Geneva, are derived, not from uncertain documents or from the religious opinions of individual members of its body, but from recent public acts of the company of its pastors.

1. The ancient catechism of Geneva taught expressly the doctrine of the Divinity of Jesus Christ. This Catechism was withdrawn from the Church some years ago, and its place has recently been supplied by another Catechism, which maintains a guarded silence with respect to the Divinity of our Lord.

2. In 1805 the company of pastors introduced into the Churches of Geneva a new version of the Bible, in the publication of which they not only omitted the Confession of Faith of the Reformed Churches of France and Geneva, which had been prefixed to all their former Bibles, but made also many very important alterations in the translation itself; particularly in parts relating to the Divinity of Christ, to Original Sin, and to the Personality and Offices of the Holy Ghost. This version is still used in their Churches.

3. These acts were followed by another of a still less equivocal character, by which the pastors of Geneva endeavoured, as far as they were able, utterly to exclude from their churches the peculiar doctrines of Christianity. By a rule of their company, passed by them so recently as May 3, 1817, all candidates for holy orders are required solemnly to promise, that they will abstain from preaching in the Churches of the Canton of Geneva on the following subjects:—

1. On the manner in which the Divine nature is united to the Person of Jesus Christ.

2. On Original Sin.

3. On the manner in which Grace operates, or on Efficacious Grace.

4. On Predestination.

This rule has been already twice acted upon,—a candidate has been refused ordination, and a minister prohibited from preaching, for objecting to subscribe to it.

These acts, authorized by a great majority of the company of pastors, leave no room for the exercise of that charity, "which thinketh no evil;" they render it but too evident that *the present Church of Geneva has essentially departed from the orthodox doctrines of its predecessors.*

It should be remembered that Geneva is an university, that youth from different parts of Europe, and particularly from the Reformed Church of France, are sent here to be instructed in theology, and that the Professors are chiefly, if not exclusively, chosen from the company of pastors. Of this company, consisting of twenty-five persons, not more than five hold the orthodox faith. The remainder unite in opposing it. The consequence of this state of the Church at Geneva on the minds of the students may be easily conceived; by far the greater number of them have imbibed the doctrine of their instructors, by whose means the

infection will probably be carried into other churches, and the evil be extensively diffused.

“Hac fonte derivata clades  
In patriam, populumque fluxit.”  
*Day or New Times, Oct. 26.*

DOMESTIC.

RELIGIOUS.

*Opening of the Unitarian Chapel,  
Stainforth.*

As was intimated in the last Number of the Repository, (p. 564,) the Unitarian Chapel, lately erected at Stainforth, near Thorne, was opened on Thursday, Oct. 9th. The Rev. J. Brettle, Pastor of the Unitarian Church at Rotherham, commenced the solemn services of the day by giving out a hymn peculiarly adapted to the occasion. The Rev. P. Wright, Pastor of the Unitarian Church at Staunton, near Sheffield, conducted the devotional service and read appropriate portions of Scripture. And the Rev. R. Wright, Unitarian Missionary, delivered a most animated and impressive discourse from Isaiah xxxv. 8, 9: “And a highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called the way of holiness: the unclean shall not pass over it; but it shall be for those: the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein. No lion shall be there, nor any ravenous beast shall go up thereon, it shall not be found there, but the redeemed shall walk there.” In considering this highly figurative passage as expressive of the nature and design of the Christian religion, Mr. W. successfully endeavoured to shew, that it could be descriptive of none of those gloomy, mysterious and unintelligible dogmas which have so undeservedly obtained the character of evangelical truths, and that it could only have allusion to the plain and open path of Unitarian Christianity—to that “great highway of the King of kings, in which all are both able and permitted to walk.” This important fact he fully established by comparing the ideas contained in the text, *first*, with the reputed orthodox doctrines, and *secondly*, with the pure and simple truths of the gospel: he then concluded his remarks upon the difference between the doctrines of Unitarianism and Trinitarianism, and their very opposite tendency, pretty much in the following words:—“None can walk in the dark, narrow and crooked passage of modern orthodoxy, without leaving their reason behind them—without discarding the only natural guide which God has given to his creatures to conduct them on their pilgrimage through the world.” The latter part of the sermon was a most vigorous attack upon the ravenous beasts spoken of in the second verse of the text; against them the preacher exerted all his weapons, which,

as his hearers can testify, were neither few nor small.

After the service, several of the friends with the ministers and visitors present, retired to an Inn in the village, where they partook of an economical dinner, and spent the afternoon in a most social and edifying manner. The whole company appeared to view with gratitude and pleasure, the circumstances which had occasioned their meeting:—new zeal and animation beamed in every countenance, and nothing seemed wanting to complete their happiness but the presence of those venerable and departed friends, who will ever be ranked among the first and steady adherents to the cause of Unitarianism in Stainforth and its neighbourhood. In respectful remembrance of the persons alluded to, the Rev. R. Wright, by whose labours and affectionate instructions some of them had been reclaimed from the gloomy and pernicious paths of Trinitarianism, before they were called to meet their Redeemer in Heaven, proposed the following sentiment to be received in silence: “To the memory of the once zealous and active promoters of Unitarianism in Thorne and Stainforth, who were only permitted to see the distant approach of that glorious success which has lately attended the cause in this neighbourhood; and who would have beheld with transport and gratitude the things which our eyes have this day witnessed.”

At six o'clock in the evening, public worship was again held in the chapel, when the Rev. Nathaniel Philipps, D. D. introduced the service, and the Rev. Mr. Brettle delivered a very interesting and impressive discourse on the Paternal Character of God, from *Matt. vi. 9*, “Our Father who art in heaven.”

It is in vain, Mr. Editor, to attempt to express the feelings that were experienced by the friends and advocates of Unitarianism in Stainforth on the day when their chapel was opened. Some of them can well recollect the difficulties with which they once had to struggle; others can repeat the expressions of anxiety and despair that were sometimes employed when, for the space of two or three years, they beheld their small society undergoing no change, except in the loss of some of its first and most valued members; and all will declare that the man would have been deemed a visionary enthusiast, who not many years back should have ventured to imagine, that an Unitarian Chapel would by this time have been built both at Stainforth and Thorne.

The recollection however of the difficulties and discouragements which the Stainforth Society have overcome, and the pleasing conviction of their present comparative prosperity, will, it is hoped, not only inspire *them* with additional zeal, in the defence and propagation of the doctrines

of the gospel, and in the practice of pure religion, but will also furnish to all infant Societies of Unitarians, however much despised and neglected by the world, on account of their apparent insignificance, another stimulus to fortitude and perseverance—another demonstration of the fact, that “great effects may spring from little causes.”

J. G.

P. S. Owing to an inadvertent omission in the letter from Stainforth, inserted in the last number of the Repository, the number of inhabitants in that village was not stated. For this deficiency, the Editor and Readers of the Repository are requested to accept the apology of the Author, and to write 600 in the blank space left for the purpose.

The expense incurred in building the Unitarian Chapel at Stainforth, &c. is estimated at £185.

The following subscriptions have already been received:

		£.	s.	d.
Mr. William Marsdin,	Stainforth	5	5	0
Miss Marsdin - - -	ditto	1	0	0
Mr. Martin Simpson	ditto	5	5	0
Mr. Richard Simpson	ditto	2	2	0
Mr. R. Lee - - -	ditto	0	10	6
Mr. John Lee - - -	ditto	0	10	6
Mr. William Fisher -	ditto	0	10	6
Mr. Thomas North -	ditto	1	1	0
Mr. E. Godfrey -	ditto	1	1	0
Mr. John Bladworth	ditto	2	2	0
Several Friends at -	ditto	2	3	0
Mr. William Darley,	Thorne	5	5	0
Mr. Robert Darley -	ditto	5	5	0
Mr. Charles Darley -	ditto	1	1	0
Rev. John Gaskell -	ditto	1	1	0
Mr. C. J. F. Benson	ditto	1	1	0
Mr. John Marsdin, the Levellis, near	ditto	2	10	0
Mr. R. Jennings, ditto	ditto	1	1	0
Mr. F. Moat, Fishlake, near	ditto	1	1	0
T. Peacock, Esq. Crowle, near	ditto	5	5	0
Mrs. Peacock, ditto	ditto	5	5	0
Two Friends - - -	ditto	0	9	0
Mr. S. Simpson,	London	2	2	0
Mr. T. Eyre, Rawmarsh, near	Rotherham	1	1	0
Edward Tompson, Esq.	Hull	1	1	0
Rev. R. Astley -	Halifax	0	10	6
Rev. C. Wellbeloved,	York	1	1	0
<i>By the Rev. R. Aspland.</i>				
Mr. Allen - - -	Stratford	1	0	0
Richard Cooke, Esq.	Bath	1	1	0

SIR, *Clapton, Oct. 27, 1817.*

HAVING now completed a volume of Dr. Priestley's Works, to be immediately delivered to the Subscribers, at Mr. Eaton's, 187, High Holborn, I beg leave to mention to your readers that the volume now in the press, with that designed to follow it, will contain—

The Examination of Reid, &c.—Intro-

ductory Essays to Hartley's Theory—The two Volumes of Disquisitions, &c.—The Correspondence with Dr. Price—The Two Letters to Mr. Palmer—Letter to Mr. Bryant—Preface to Collins's Philosophical Inquiry, and probably a part, if not the whole of the Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever.

I mention these works in the order which I propose to observe, to invite your readers to assist me with any information respecting them which may promote the correct execution of my design. Such communications as well as any assistance towards my proposed account of the Life and Correspondence of Dr. Priestley, I request them to address to Mr. George Smallfield, Printer, Hackney.

J. T. RUTT.

*Unitarian Fund.*

Joseph Liddell, Esq. Moor Park, near Carlisle, by the hands of the Rev. W. Turner, Newcastle-upon-Tyne	£50	0	0
Mr. Robert Brown, Charleston, South Carolina, by the hands of Mr. Wm. Hall, Grove, Hackney	5	5	0

*Tiverton Unitarian Chapel.*

Subscriptions already reported in Mon. Repos. for August	£75	16	3
<i>Since Received.</i>			
Vote from the Unitarian Fund	5	5	0
Richard Cooke, Esq. Bath, per Rev. Robert Aspland	1	1	0
Fellowship Fund, George's Meeting, Exeter, per Rev. James Manning	5	0	0
	£87	2	3

A SUNDAY EVENING Lecture has been established, in addition to the two services of the day at this Chapel, which is proposed to be continued during the winter. The subjects are intended to be chiefly confined to the particular views of the gospel, which are maintained from Scriptural proofs and inferences, by the Unitarian Christian, with the sanguine hope that, as the consoling and pure doctrines of the gospel become more known, they will be more readily embraced, and the unjust prejudices that are entertained against them through ignorance be subdued. Two evenings' Lectures have been already delivered, which have been extremely well attended.

M. L. Y.

*Manchester College, York.*

THE following sums have been received on account of this Institution, since the last Report in the Monthly Repository:—

*Congregational Collections.*

At Exeter, by the Rev. Dr. Carpenter - - - - -	£12	4	2
At Kendal, by the Rev. John Harrison - - - - -	9	17	6
<i>Benefactions.</i>			
A Friend at Bury St. Edmunds	2	15	0
Sundry small sums from Exeter, by W. B. Kennaway, Esq. - - - - -	2	11	0
James Crowe, Esq. Stockton-on-Tees, 2d benefaction -	5	0	0
A Friend, in Yeovil, by Dr. Southwood Smith - - -	5	0	0
Henry Hinckley, Esq. London	21	0	0
<i>New Annual Subscriptions.</i>			
Rev. Joseph Bretland, Exeter	2	2	0
Thomas Walker, Esq. Killingbeck, near Leeds - - -	2	2	0
Mr. Cumming, Exeter - - -	1	1	0
Mr. James Cox, ditto - - -	1	0	0
Mr. Charles Bowring, ditto -	1	1	0
Mr. Abraham Tozer, ditto -	1	1	0
A Lady, at Exeter, by Mr. Kennaway - - - - -	1	0	0
Mr. Isaac Cox, Honiton - - -	1	0	0
Mr. Thomas Potter, Polefield, near Manchester - - -	1	1	0
Mr. Richd. Potter, Manchester	1	1	0
Varley Beilby, Esq. York -	2	2	0
Mr. Samuel Scolefield, Hull -	1	1	0
	£73	19	8

GEO. WM. WOOD, Treasurer.  
Manchester, July 31, 1817.

*Re-opening of the Presbyterian Meeting House, Colchester.*

ON Friday, October 10, the Old Presbyterian Chapel, in Helen's Lane, Colchester, was opened for Unitarian worship. The Rev. Mr. Fox preached two sermons on the occasion. The subject in the morning was, The preaching of the Apostles contrasted with that of the Advocates of Modern Orthodoxy; and in the evening, Unitarianism a Scriptural System, especially in its leading Doctrine of the proper Unity and Paternity of God. The Rev. J. Perry, of Ipswich, and Mr. Meek, of the Hackney Academy, assisted in the services. The attendance was respectable in the morning, and in the evening very numerous. Many were present belonging to different congregations in the town, who listened very attentively to the preacher's exposition of the tenets of a sect which they had heard "every where spoken against" in the pulpits of their own teachers on the preceding Sunday. Should the congregation at Colchester be able soon to obtain a minister adapted to the situation, there is little doubt of their becoming a flourishing society. The seed of divine truth is already sown, and only requires diligent culture to produce an abundant harvest.

*Unitarian Chapel, Glasgow.*

Donations to the Unitarian Chapel, Glasgow, at the time of its erection:—

	£	s.	d.
Thomas Nelson, Glasgow -	5	5	6
A Friend, by James Ross -	2	2	0
The Trustees of Cross-Street Chapel, Manchester - - -	10	0	0
A Friend, by Rev James Yates	10	0	0
Rev. James Scott, Cradley -	1	0	0
W. Thomson Smith, Glasgow	1	1	0
Mr. Wm. Hastings, Rochdale -	5	5	0
Rev. John Yates, Liverpool	21	0	0
Mrs. Mary Hughes, Hanwood	2	0	0
Mr. Joseph Yates, Liverpool	15	0	0
Mr. Ashton Yates, Liverpool	15	0	0
J. Crooks, per Mr. Hastings -	2	0	0
Mr. Robert Hendry, Glasgow	1	0	0
Mr. E. L. Ireland, Birmingham	2	2	0
Unitarian Congregation, Warrington - - - - -	11	3	0
Rev. Richard Astley, Halifax	1	1	0
Rev. C. Wellbeloved, York -	1	0	0
Mr. Robert Driffield, York -	10	0	0
R. Philips, Esq. Park, near Manchester - - - - -	10	10	0
Miss Yates, Liverpool -	2	2	0
Miss E. Yates, Liverpool	1	1	0
Mr. R. B. Blyth, Edinburgh	5	5	0
A Friend, by the Rev. James Yates - - - - -	5	5	0
Mr. John Sweet - - - - -	10	0	0
London Unitarian Fund -	20	0	0
Rev. Thomas Belsham -	5	0	0
Mrs. Barr, Birmingham -	5	5	0
Mr. Cameron, Glasgow -	1	1	0
Unitarian Church, Paisley	1	5	6
Dr. Carpenter, Exeter -	1	0	0
J. F. Baham, Esq. Exeter -	2	0	0
W. B. Kennaway, Esq. Exeter	1	0	0
John Mackintosh, Esq. Exeter	5	0	0
Rev. Ed. Butcher, Sidmouth -	1	0	0
Samuel Kenyon, Esq. -	5	0	0
Mr. Drewe, Exeter - - -	2	0	0
Mr. Oxenham, Exeter -	2	0	0
Mr. Charles Bowring, Exeter	1	0	0
Mr. James Cox, Exeter -	1	0	0
Mr. Madge, Crediton -	1	0	0
Dr. Blake, Taunton -	3	0	0
E. Jefferies, Esq. Taunton -	2	0	0
Mr. William Bowring, Exeter	1	0	0
Mr. Powell, Exeter -	2	0	0
Mr. John Cross, Exeter -	1	0	0
Thomas Fisher, Esq. Dorchester	1	0	0
Mr. Thomas Fisher, Jun. Dorchester - - - - -	1	0	0
Mr. John Fisher, Dorchester	1	0	0
Rev. John Simpson, Bath -	3	3	0
Rev. Dr. Estlin, Bristol -	2	2	0
Donations from Liverpool, by			
Mr. John Fletcher -	20	0	0
Mr. Richard Yates, Liverpool	5	5	0
J. Clarke, Esq. London -	10	0	0
William Friend, Esq. London	5	0	0
R. Wainwright, Esq. London -	5	0	0
Mr. Matthew Paterson, Glasgow	5	0	0

The following sums, being the whole or parts of loans on the chapel, are agreed to be relinquished.

Robert Smith, Esq. Glasgow	£150	0	0
Rev. James Yates, Ditto	-	100	0
Mrs. Auchinvole, Ditto	-	10	10
Mr. James Ross, Ditto	-	29	0
Mr. William Rae, Ditto	-	29	0
Mr. Thomas Muir, Ditto	-	15	0
Mr. Wm. Morison, Ditto	-	5	0
Mr. John Lawson, Ditto	-	10	10
Scotch Unitarian Fund	-	16	16

N. B. The Gentleman who holds the bond on the chapel, has agreed to allow the same to continue.

The following are additional Donations lately received in Glasgow, the amount of which will be still increased.

John Williamson	-	-	1	1	0
James Brock	-	-	1	1	0
William Owen	-	-	0	10	0
John M'Kenzie	-	-	1	10	0
Matthew Paterson	-	-	1	1	0
John Stevenson	-	-	0	12	0
James Donovan	-	-	0	10	0
John Robertson	-	-	1	1	0
John Malcolm	-	-	1	11	6
William Drew	-	-	2	2	0
Thomas Mochrie	-	-	2	2	0
James Hedderwick	-	-	2	2	0
J. H. Burn	-	-	2	2	0
George Wilson	-	-	1	1	0
David Potter	-	-	1	1	0
William Atwell	-	-	1	1	0
J. W. Hedderwick	-	-	2	2	0
John Thomson	-	-	1	1	0
William Bachelor	-	-	1	1	0
Thomas Muir	-	-	10	0	0

Glasgow, Oct. 12, 1817.

Received for Glasgow Chapel, by Rev. R. Aspland, Hackney.

Richard Cooke, Esq. Bath	1	1	0
Robert Brown, Esq. Charleston, South Carolina	-	-	1
	1	1	0

*A Course of Sunday Evening Lectures, which will be delivered at the Unitarian Chapel, St. Thomas's Street, Southwark; commencing November 2d, 1817.*

SERVICE TO BEGIN AT HALF-PAST SIX O'CLOCK, PRECISELY.

Nov. 2d. Rev. R. Aspland. State of the Controversy between Unitarians and other denominations of Christians.

9th. Rev. W. J. Fox. The Peculiarities of Unitarianism.

16th. Rev. T. Rees. The Evidence in favour of the Unitarian Doctrine from the History of the Church before Constantine.

23d. Rev. J. Gilchrist. The Unitarian Doctrine considered in reference to the Divine Character.

30th. Rev. T. Rees. The Moral Influence of Unitarianism.

Dec. 7th. Rev. W. J. Fox. The indirect influence of Unitarianism.

14th. Rev. J. Gilchrist. Hindrances to the reception of Truth.

21st. Rev. T. Rees. The Ancient Prophecies concerning Christ considered in reference to his Person.

28th. Rev. J. Gilchrist. On Love to Christ.

The Treasurer will attend in the Vestry every Evening after Service, to receive the Subscriptions of those who may be disposed to contribute to the Support of these Lectures.

*A Course of Thursday Evening Lectures, which will be delivered at the Meeting-House, in Worship-street, near Finsbury Square; commencing Thursday, October 23, 1817.*

SERVICE TO BEGIN AT SEVEN O'CLOCK, PRECISELY.

(First Series.)

1817. Oct. 23d. Rev. T. Cooper. Our Lord's Sermon on the Mount the Standard of Orthodoxy.

30th. Rev. T. Cooper. The Promises and Privileges of the Gospel universal.

Nov. 6th. Rev. W. J. Fox. Reasons for Dissent from the Church of England.

13th. Rev. T. Rees. Creation of all things by Jesus Christ.

20th. Rev. J. Gilchrist. On the Misrepresentations of Unitarianism.

27th. Rev. W. J. Fox. Love to Christ.

Dec. 4th. Rev. R. Aspland. The Divine Justice; considered in reference to the Calvinistic Scheme.

11th. Rev. T. Rees. The "great Mystery of Godliness."

18th. Rev. J. Gilchrist. The Importance of the Unitarian Doctrine.

25th. Rev. W. J. Fox. The Birth of Christ.

Before the expiration of the year, the conductors of the Lecture design, with the Divine Blessing, to publish a list of Subjects for the remainder of the Course.

The Treasurer will attend in the Vestry every evening after service, to receive the subscriptions of those who may be disposed to contribute to the support of these Lectures.

*Removals amongst Unitarian Ministers.*

Mr. BULL BRISTOWE, late of Hinckley, has acceded to the unanimous invitation of the Presbyterian Congregation at Ringwood, to become their Pastor, in the room of Mr. Warren, removed to Stourbridge.

Mr. READ, late of Gosport, has accepted the charge of the Presbyterian Congregation at Cirencester, as successor to Mr. Holt, who has retired from public duty to reside at Hackney.

Mr. HINTON, late of the Baptist Academy, Bristol, has been appointed Minister of the Unitarian Congregation, Crediton.

## MONTHLY RETROSPECT of PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR,

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

IN contemplating the affairs of Europe, there is much to excite our attention. Though, what are called by the men of this world, great and splendid actions do not occur, yet there is enough to shew, that the terrible revolution, of which we have been witnesses, has not been brought to an end without many important results and evident changes, it is hoped for the better, in the government of this part of the world. The agitation that at present prevails is a proof that men think more than they were accustomed to do on the relations to each other of all classes in society. Kings appear to have gained every thing at the close of the revolution: they have changed, at their pleasure, forms of government, and have transferred dominions as they pleased; yet in this great change, in the destruction of almost every thing that bore the name of republican in Europe, the mass of the people have probably been greater gainers than the kings; and the influence of public opinion operates so forcibly, that those tyrannical actions, which formerly were the characteristics of most governments, are less likely to occur than at any former period.

We are naturally more interested in what takes place in the religious than in the political world, being convinced that when men think seriously on their greater, they will be more attentive to the lesser duties. It is not to be expected that a vital change should instantaneously take place, nor that the factions that have arisen from religious disputes will subside at once into a uniform obedience to the precepts of our Saviour. Yet symptoms of a better mode of thinking, in this respect, have occurred, and we must carry our views back to a remote period to understand thoroughly the system which is now beginning to develop itself. At the time of the great revolt from Popery, vulgarly though very improperly going under the name of the Reformation, the professing Christians of the greater part of Europe were divided into three great factions, under the name of the Papists, the Lutherans and the Calvinists, according as they subscribed to certain opinions, sanctioned by the pretended Holy Father, or the two great heads of the revolt from his authority, Luther and Calvin. In whatever manner these factions disagreed with each other, in one point there was a uniformity of opinion, namely, in the interpretation of Scripture by their respective dogmas, and in a great aversion to every one who presumed to differ from the established doctrines. Hence they were all involved in the same breach

of our Saviour's command—"The kings of the earth exercise authority, but it shall not be so with you." It shall not be so with Christians: amongst them the word of command cannot be known. They are all brethren, and have too great a deference to each other and to their Holy Master to presume to exercise authority over any one in his fold. The two great revolters thought they could not complete their triumph without drawing up a set of rules and a formulary of faith for their adherents. Their scheme succeeded, and from the time that this great point was established, the different bodies have occupied nearly the same tracts of land in which their respective tenets were adopted. Very slight inroads have been made upon each other. The children born in the same town followed in general the mode of faith to which their fathers had been accustomed; and it is not uncommon, in going from a Protestant town in Germany, to find the first village in the way as bigoted Papists as their ancestors were at the time of the revolt from Popery.

Several attempts have been made at different times to form a union amongst these differing sectarians, to bring together the Lutherans and the Calvinists, or to form a union between the sect established by law in England and the pretended Holy See. These attempts have, from natural causes, hitherto failed. But there is a strong ground for believing that the wall of separation between the Lutherans and Calvinists is likely to be broken down, or at least that the enmity between them will give way to better sentiments of each other. The attempt is now making in Prussia: to what extent it will succeed time must determine. But there seems to be an inclination in each party to soften down the points of dispute, and it is not impossible that a political union at least may be formed, which will not shake their grand notion of setting up the traditions of men in the room of the laws of God, nor tend to lead their adherents to the only point of importance, the conformity of our spirit with that of the gospel.

For the promotion of this union a wish is expressed, that the names of Lutheran and Calvinist should be merged in that of Evangelical, this word not being used in the sense attached to it by a certain party in England, but more generally as importing a deference to the words of the gospel rather than to the interpretation of them by the respective leaders of the two parties. This without doubt is a gain. For if Paul was offendéd, and justly so, by Christians

of his day calling themselves by the names of himself, or Apollos, or Cephas, how much more would he be astonished at finding the professing Christians of this day ranging themselves under the names of men of so much inferior pretensions! There is great reason, however, to apprehend, that in having got so far, they will still find a difficulty in arranging themselves under a new order of things. Many of the points in dispute have, through length of time, grown in a great measure obsolete: the teachers of both parties are better informed than their predecessors: and they would willingly give up many of their ancient tenets, if they could but agree in what should be retained. Whatever may be the case, as it is only a political establishment, which is the basis of the whole business, the true Christian is less interested in its success; hoping only that this adjustment of opinions will lead many of the two parties to compare the new doctrines with the system established by our Saviour; and, as they think less of their political leaders, they will approach nearer to him who ought to be their only guide; for, separated from him they can do nothing.

Prussia is not the only place in which this change in men's minds has taken place. It is felt in Geneva, the great headquarters of Calvinism. Calvin, the artful leader of the sect which bears his name, was as much a pope, in his little circle, as the pretended Holy Father at Rome. He loved the pre-eminence just as much, and formed his hierarchy on similar principles, though on a different plan. His code of laws was adopted, but time discovered in them numerous flaws: and in the course of two hundred and fifty years, the pastors of Geneva gradually departed from the austere tenets of this autocrat. This is now evident, and pains are taken to point out this deviation, and to erect again the standard of the ancient faith. The thing cannot be done: but in the mean time a stir has been created, which has occasioned the magistracy to interfere, and to prescribe a silence on certain contended points. The right of the magistracy to do this cannot be doubted; for the moment a community of Christians permits the civil authority to regulate its concerns, they must be content to be subject to its dictates, whether in faith or in discipline. This naturally excites a revulsion. The pastors are accused of apostacy from the faith, not as it is in Jesus, but as it is in Calvin. The result here we must leave to time to determine: but the true Christian will be thankful that he can have no concern in these disputes. His religion is formed according to the fashion of the altar prescribed by God himself. If any implement is used to form and fashion the stones, the altar is profaned. So in a Christian community,

where the voice of human authority enters, it will influence the men of this world, but cannot affect the servants of the holy Jesus.

In the Popish world something of the same kind occurs. The concordat between France and the Pope must come under the discussion of their approaching parliament, and then it will be seen by the language of the speakers, what is the degree of reverence now paid in that kingdom to the pretended Holy See. The French have been the great supporters of this see, and been distinguished by their bloody persecution of the Protestants: yet their adherence to it has not been of so completely servile a manner as in many other nations. They have always claimed what are called the rights of the Gallican church, and of these they are extremely tenacious. As to the question of religion, and the connexion between the concordat and the Scriptures, to this they will pay as little regard as if they were Protestants: yet their debates will bear an appearance of this matter being of a very sacred nature, and to be treated with a degree of awe and reverence peculiar to it. In this they resemble their post boys, who still keep up the form of bowing at every cross they pass, and some with more or less apparent devotion; yet all passes in their minds as a matter of course, and no more touches the heart than the horrible language frequently uttered by the lower classes in this country. It may be, however, that this concordat may lead to a more intimate acquaintance with the subject; for, notwithstanding the great disregard to religion in France, yet there are several who think seriously and deeply: and if they should come forward, and lead the assembly to higher researches than what regards the appointment of bishops and archbishops, and the establishment of funds for their support, this concordat may produce very different results than those expected from it. The grand intention is to endeavour to restore what they call religion; in other words, a reverence for the priesthood and a reverence for forms; and by this it is thought that the throne will be better established. But the time is gone by: a trick discovered is not to be played off again upon the same people; and their government is in an awkward situation. They find the want of religion, and that without some degree of influence from it, a people cannot be easily governed. They do not want themselves more of religious spirit than they can keep under controul. In this dilemma they are obliged to take up with the old superstition, convinced that whatever influence it may have, little though it be, will be turned to their account. In this confusion, we shall hope that the Protestants there are not idle, but of their real state we know little.

In contemplating this state of religion the true Christian will not fail to bear in mind the happiness he enjoys in the liberty with which Christ has made him free. He is not at all entangled in the disputes of the world, which are occasioned by the mixture of worldly sentiments with the precepts of the Gospel. He will, indeed, lament the evils that this mixture has introduced, and will therefore be on his guard against every attempt to bring any thing of the same kind into the community to which he belongs, the community of holy men of all nations and countries, who in various times have acknowledged the Holy Jesus as their only Master and Teacher. Hence he will carefully watch every symptom of Rabbinism, the great fault in our Saviour's time, and which has since had so great a part in the affairs of what is vulgarly called the Church. To this spirit of dictation, this attempt to uphold the ark of God with unhallowed hands, to prop it up by vain shows of learning and human tradition, he will strenuously oppose himself, armed with the shield of faith and the sword of the Spirit of God. He is then invincible, and the darts of the adversary fall without effect.

The political state of Europe is far from being settled. In France, the election of representatives is over, and in many places it has been sharply contested. But in no place have those scenes of riot and confusion taken place, which are so common on such occasions in England. The election is in fewer hands upon the whole than with us: but in no place is there so small a body of constituents, as are known in this country; and the electors are taken from that class of life, which are not completely under the nod of any person, whether minister or private individual. Hence the minister has by no means obtained a decided superiority, and in many places the elections have gone contrary to his wishes. The representatives have to decide upon important matters, and the past scenes cannot fail to have produced a due effect. The ultra royalists seem to have but little influence, and the welfare of the country stands therefore a better chance of being consulted.

The States of the Netherlands have been assembled, and the speech from the throne was mild and conciliatory. They are there attending closely to their own affairs, and seem likely to form as good a government as circumstances will admit.

The public has been alarmed with rumours of an attack on Portugal by Spain; differences are known to exist between the two courts, on account of proceedings in

Spanish America, but it is hardly likely that they should produce a warfare, for which Spain is so little prepared. It is said that these differences are to be settled by the holy alliance, and as this is the first matter of importance brought before this doubtful body, the public will be attentive to its actions. In America the mother-country seems to be upon the whole losing ground. In the Southern part its cause is apparently lost, but it is said to be more successful in Mexico. The rumour of a fleet from Russia, keeps alive the idea, that this mighty power may enter into a contest, which it will thus prolong, but most probably without effect.

Germany employs its writers on constitutions, but the effect on the public is not very decisive. Various schemes are talked of to bring that immense country to act under one system; but it is evidently the interest of Russia, that it should be divided among independent states. Prussia has not given its subjects the constitution promised, and a considerable degree of jealousy prevails between the military and the real defenders of the country. It is lamentable to think that so great a portion of our fellow-creatures should dedicate themselves to the art of war; an employment never to be justified but in cases of extreme necessity.

One of the cases not uncommon in despotical states has occurred in the assassination of the Dey of Algiers by his soldiers. As he reigned by the sword, it is no wonder that he should fall by the sword; and one would think that reflections on such an event would make every sovereign feel the insecurity of him who is at the head of a military government. There can be no security equal to that which rests in the confidence of the people; and the charms of despotical power are surely more than counterbalanced by the wretched dependence on the armed men with which it is surrounded. Yet the throne, wherever it is, and however mean it may appear, will dazzle the eyes of men; and the fate of the predecessor does not diminish the excitements of ambition. What effect this tumultuary act of the military will produce, respecting the treatment of Christians, time will discover: but it is to be feared, that the chastisement the barbarians lately received will not produce a change in their minds. It is melancholy to consider that a country formerly so rich, and so well cultivated, should have fallen into such wretched hands; but it is in the order of Providence, that fertile lands should become desolate for the wickedness of its inhabitants.

## NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

### Sermons.

**Unitarianism the Essence of Vital Christianity: A Sermon preached at George's Meeting, Exeter, July 10, 1817, before the Western Unitarian Society and the Devon and Cornwall Association.** By John Kenrick, M.A. 8vo. 1s.

**A Series of Sermons on Various Subjects of Doctrine and Practice.** By the Rev. George Mathew, A.M. Chaplain to the Right Hon. the Earl of Bristol; Alternate Morning Preacher of the Parish Church of St. James, Westminster; Alternate Evening Preacher at the Magdalen Hospital; and Vicar of Greenwich. 2 vols. 8vo. boards, 11. 1s.

**Sermons on the Doctrines and Duties of the Christian Life.** By the late Mr. Archibald M'Lean, of Edinburgh. To which is prefixed, a Memoir of his Life, Ministry, and Writings, by W. Jones. 8vo. with Portrait, 10s 6d. boards.

**The Variation of Public Opinion and Feelings considered, as it respects Religion; a Sermon, preached before the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Sarum, on his Visitation, held at Devizes, on Friday the 15th of August, 1817.** By the Rev. G. Crabbe, LL.B. Rector of Trowbridge, in the Diocese of Sarum. 1s. 6d.

**Two Sermons on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.** By the Rev. Charles Coleman, M.A. M.R.I.A. 1s.

**A Visitation Sermon, preached at Oxford, Aug. 29, 1817.** By F. Haggett, D.D. Prebendary of Durham. 1s. 6d.

**The Nature and Tendency of Apostolical Preaching considered; a Sermon, preached at St. Michael's Church, Bath.** By the Rev. W. Dealtry, B.D. Rector of Clapham, &c. 1s. 6d.

### National Distress.

**Suggestions for the Employment of the Poor of the Metropolis, and the Direction of their Labours to the Benefit of the Inhabitants; with Hints on Mendicity.** By H. B. Gascoigne. 1s.

**Considerations on the Poor Laws.** By John Davison, M.A. Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. 8vo. 4s.

**Remarks on the Plans and Publications of Robert Owen, Esq. of New Lanark.** By John Brown, Minister of the Associate Congregation, Biggar.

### Miscellaneous.

**Man's Dignity, or the Rights of Conscience, briefly asserted: A Poem. With an Appendix, containing Extracts from the Writings of the late Robert Robinson.** By Onesimus. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

**Collections towards a General History of the Systematic Relief of the Poor, &c. at all Periods, and in all Countries; with Observations on Charity, its proper Objects and Conduct, and its Influence on the Welfare of Nations.** By J. S. Duncan, Fellow of New College, Oxford. 8vo. 7s.

**The Basis of National Welfare; considered in reference chiefly to the Prosperity of Britain, and Safety of the Church of England: with an Examination of the Parliamentary Reports on Education, the Police, the Population of Parishes and the Capacity of Churches and Chapels: and a further Illustration of the chief Facts noticed in "The Church in Danger:" in a Second Letter to the Right Hon. the Earl of Liverpool, K.G.** By the Rev. Richard Yates, B.D. F.S.A. Chaplain to his Majesty's Royal Hospital, Chelsea; Rector of Ashen; and Alternate Preacher to the Philanthropic Society.

**A Journal of the Proceedings of the British Embassy to the Emperor of China.** By Henry Ellis, Esq. Secretary of Embassy and Third Commissioner. 4to. Maps and Plates. 2l. 2s.

**Personal Observations made during the Progress of the British Embassy through China, and on its Voyage to and from that Country, in the years 1816 and 1817.** By Clarke Abel, Physician and Naturalist to the Embassy. 4to. Maps and Engravings.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE.

The EDITOR must make it an ABSOLUTE RULE that *all communications to him shall be addressed to him at the PUBLISHERS*; of communications sent in ANY OTHER WAY, the Editor does not pledge himself to take any notice.

Some articles in *Intelligence*, as well as other departments of the Work, are again unavoidably postponed.

W. B.'s Verses were received.

The Criticism on John xii. 31 is received: we gladly accept the offer of the papers promised in continuation.

Mr. Steward, late Unitarian Minister, now Trinitarian Minister, at Wolverhampton, has sent us a Vindication of his conduct, which will appear in the next Number.

In our next we hope to be able to discharge a long-standing debt of justice by a brief Memoir of the late Rev. Jeremiah Joyce.