

THE  
**Monthly Repository.**

No. CXLVII.]

MARCH, 1818.

[Vol. XIII.

**BIOGRAPHY.**

*Memoir of the late William Russell, Esq.*

**W**ILLIAM RUSSELL, Esq., whose death was announced in the last Number, [p. 141,] was born at Birmingham, on the 11th November, 1740. He was formerly concerned in the exportation of the manufactures of Birmingham and Sheffield, to Russia, Spain and the United States of America, with which last country his family before him had been long connected. The records of the town of Birmingham will bear witness to the numerous objects of public interest to which his efforts were directed, such as the improvement of the adjacent roads, the better paving of the streets, the erecting an hospital, and forming a public library. On all affairs of importance he took a diligent and zealous part, and such was his ability as a speaker and his knowledge as a man of business, that he was frequently invited to preside at the meetings of his townsmen. For many years he was an active magistrate for the county of Worcester, as some time after his marriage, which took place in 1763, he had fixed his residence in that county, at Showell Green, within two miles of Birmingham.

Mr. Russell was rendered more particularly conspicuous by his strenuous and undaunted support of civil and religious liberty, his efforts to assist in obtaining the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, and his intimacy with that great philosopher and most excellent man Dr. Priestley, who, in his *Memoirs*, published in 1806, p. 94, thus speaks of Mr. R.: "On my removal to Birmingham commenced my intimacy with Mr. William Russell, whose public spirit and zeal in every good cause can hardly be exceeded. My obligations to him were various and constant, so as not to be estimated by sums of

money. At his proposal, I doubt not, some of the heads of the congregation made me a present of two hundred pounds, to assist me in my theological publications;" and p. 98, "I have been minister here between seven and eight years without any interruption of my happiness, and for this I am sensible I am in a great measure indebted to the friendship of Mr. Russell."

This friendship exposed Mr. R. to the effects of a spirit of intolerance then prevalent, and marked him as a victim for party rage, at the riots in Birmingham, in 1791, from which he was one of the principal sufferers. During these disturbances, the intrepidity of his character shewed itself on several occasions. By his courage and presence of mind he preserved his own house from destruction for three days, and only left it to go to the relief of his family. Had he been supported by the magistrates, as he earnestly solicited from the commencement of the riots, there is scarcely a doubt but almost all the mischief that ensued would have been prevented. His house being burnt, he repaired with his family to London, and immediately waited on Mr. Pitt to claim the interference of government. He frequently spoke of this interview, as evincing on the part of Mr. Pitt a desire to restore tranquillity and grant indemnity to the sufferers. Shortly after the riots Mr. R. retired from business, and lived for some time in the vicinity of Gloucester; but not being able to bring the extensive concerns he had carried on in America to a satisfactory conclusion, and having considerable claims on the state of Maryland for paternal property detained during the American war, he resolved to visit that country, and accordingly embarked with his family, two daughters

and a son, in August, 1794. He did not, however, arrive in America till September, 1795, having been taken prisoner soon after sailing from Falmouth, by a French squadron, and detained in Brest harbour, notwithstanding the immediate intercession of the American minister.

Many interesting circumstances might be related respecting his capture, detention and subsequent stay for a few months in France; but this would be going beyond the bounds of the present sketch. It would also be transgressing the limits prescribed to enlarge on his residence in America, where he continued almost five years, and was gratified by the notice of the most distinguished characters there, and chiefly by that of the founder of American independence. This illustrious hero he visited at Mount Vernon, after he had retired there from public life. A friendly intercourse followed between them, and several of General Washington's letters remain amongst Mr. R.'s papers.

Mr. Russell's family being less partial to America than himself, he complied with their desire to return to England, but determined himself to take France in his way, to visit an estate which had been assigned to him by an American gentleman who was largely indebted to him; there he intended to remain only a few months, but war breaking out, he was prevented from joining his family in England, and though he was beyond the age of the proscription then issued against the English, (May, 1802,) yet all the favour he could obtain was permission to retire to his property in Normandy, where he continued during the whole war, only disturbed by some occasional alarms as to his personal safety. His benevolent disposition procured him, in the neighbourhood of Ardennes, the appellation of "*Le père des pauvres*." The situation he was in afforded him, indeed, the means of being extensively useful amongst the surrounding poor, who had very scanty means of relief from their great distress: of this distress he was accustomed to draw a most feeling picture.

On the return of peace, Mr. R. hastened, with his son, &c. to revisit his native country, where he landed on

26th October, 1814. He was now 74 years of age, and though his day of activity was over, yet he retained, in a surprising manner, that strength of constitution and vigour of intellect which he formerly enjoyed. Had there been no other obstacle, his increased deafness would alone have prevented his entering again into public life, at the same time that it essentially curtailed those social pleasures he was so well qualified to partake of and to impart; but he never permitted the mortifying consequences of this infirmity to depress his spirits; his convivial powers were still great, and by a constant and quick attention to the lips of persons speaking, he had learnt to comprehend what was said with surprising facility.

As the power and inclination to occupy himself in the busy concerns of life diminished, he betook himself with more ardour to the comforts of religion, and rejoiced incessantly that he had been alive to them in his earliest youth, as well as through all the varying scenes which had succeeded. He was a great advocate for family devotion, which he constantly practised, and now employed much of his time in composing a set of prayers for this purpose, of which he had a few manuscript copies made for his particular friends. Never did truer piety emanate from a more entire conviction of the truth of Christianity, and a more absolute dependence on its promises. This was strikingly apparent on the bed of death. When all around him was fading away, and he felt himself gradually but certainly withdrawing from existence, he was at this moment not only resigned and complacent, but almost joyful; firmly persuaded he was about to undergo a happy change, and that the assurance would be verified in his case as in that of all mankind, that Jesus Christ was the Resurrection and the Life. Since his return from France, he had spent more than three years at Upton-upon-Severn, in the bosom of his family and friends, who, while they deeply lament his loss, reflect with satisfaction on the tranquillity of his latter days, and especially of his last moments. His illness was short, and fortunately attended with little bodily pain. He expired on 26th January

last, at the Hyde, near Upton, the residence of his son-in-law, James Skey, Esq., and was buried in the family vault at St. Philip's Church, Birmingham, on 3rd February; but very few of his former friends survived to attend him to the grave.

February 12, 1818.

T. R.

*Memoir of the late Rev. Thomas Astley.*

[Concluded from p. 85.]

SOON after his removal to Chesterfield, Mr. ASTLEY engaged in the education of young gentlemen, whom he received into his house as boarders. For the fulfilment of the duties of this very arduous and deeply responsible occupation, he was admirably qualified by the extensiveness and solidity of his acquirements; and especially by the happy manner he had of communicating instruction, together with the great amiableness of his temper. His services in this capacity were highly valued, anxiously sought after, and are affectionately remembered.

In December, 1775, Mr. Astley married Phebe, the only daughter of Joseph Wilkinson, Esq., of Birmingham.\* By her he had five sons and four daughters: and never were the pious fortitude and resignation of the true Christian more strikingly manifested, than in the exemplary manner in which he sustained that great trial, the loss of children. Two of his children, a son and daughter, died in their childhood; and two others, a son and daughter, died, the former aged 22 years, the latter at the age of 19.

In the spring of the year 1777, circumstances, connected with the increasing reputation of his school, rendered it expedient for him to remove to Dronfield, a village about five miles distant from his congregation. The inconvenience, however, which necessarily attended his residing so far from his professional engagements, was not permitted by him to prevent the faithful and conscientious

discharge of his duties as a christian minister. These he always considered as of the first importance; and as such he would not allow himself to perform them with carelessness or indifference. Indeed, his talents and character as a minister of religion were so highly and justly appreciated, that he was frequently sounded on behalf of congregations who were without ministers, as to his disposition respecting a change of situation: but his modesty always led him to distrust his fitness for undertaking any more weighty charge; and his contented, unambitious temper, forbade the desire of change.

Following the order of time, it may here be observed that, as a scholar, Mr. Astley's attainments were held in such great estimation, that, in the year 1779, he was strongly solicited to accept the classical professorship in the academy at Warrington. The invitation of a "Special General Meeting of the Trustees of the College" to fill this department, was communicated to him by T. B. Bayley and T. C. Worsley, Esqrs., as "the general and hearty wish of the Trustees;" accompanied by expressions of the warmest approbation on the part of the two other tutors, Drs. Aikin and Enfield, and by assurances of their cordial friendship, assistance and support. But though this invitation was given in the most gratifying manner, his great diffidence, together with some domestic considerations, induced him more than once to decline it.

Mr. Astley continued to reside at Dronfield, till the spring of 1784, when the cares attendant upon an increasing family, together with the discharge of his professional engagements, induced him to relinquish a boarding school, and to reside again in Chesterfield. His design now was to have limited his attention, as an instructor of youth, to his own children: but the solicitations of the parents of some few of his pupils who had not finished the intended course of education under his care, prevailed with him to retain *them* for a year or two longer; and the request of other friends in Chesterfield induced him to receive under his care a few young gentlemen as day-scholars. He seldom, and never from choice, had more

\* Of this gentleman, as a contemporary with Mr. Bourne, a short account was published, on the communication of Mr. Astley, in the "Memoirs of the Rev. Samuel Bourne," by Joshua Toulmin, D. D.



than ten or twelve of these under his care. About this number he continued to instruct till the year 1800, when he entirely gave up the engagements of a school, and devoted himself to the exercise of his ministerial functions. These he continued to perform with great acceptableness, till the summer of 1813, when the infirmities of age led him to resign (not without reluctance both to himself and many of his hearers), a profession to which he had been strongly attached, and in the exercise of which he had been a truly useful and highly respected character during a period of more than half a century.

He was immediately succeeded by the Rev. George Kenrick, (now of Hull,) who, however, only remained at Chesterfield till the commencement of the year 1815. From that time till September of the same year, when the Rev. Robert Wallace became their pastor, the congregation at Chesterfield were for the most part supplied by ministers from a distance. But, occasionally during the interval, Mr. Astley officiated amongst them with almost his wonted vigour and collectiveness. The period of active usefulness was, however, nearly past, and after a gradual and silent decay of the powers of nature, he departed this life on the morning of the 15th of October, 1817, having completed his 79th year. He was interred October 20th, in the vault belonging to his family, in the parish church of Chesterfield. On the following Sunday the Rev. Robert Wallace preached a sermon suited to the occasion, from which he has obligingly permitted the following extract to be added to the preceding imperfect sketch.

"From the few opportunities of intercourse with Mr. Astley, which my recent removal to this place has afforded me, I am not prepared to enter into that minuteness of description, in which I might otherwise have felt a melancholy pleasure: nor, indeed, is my testimony required to the uniform excellence of his private character, to his attainments as a scholar, or to his eminent qualifications as a public teacher of religion. In the capacity of a christian minister, all who knew him can bear witness to the uncommon faithfulness and diligence by which his life was distin-

guished. He attached a very high degree of importance to scriptural studies; and made all his attainments subservient to the elucidation of that sacred volume, which contains the words of everlasting life. Religion was with him a matter of the deepest personal interest; and the opinions which he held on many of the disputed doctrines of Christianity, though differing widely from those entertained by the majority of his fellow-christians, were not embraced and acted upon till they had undergone a careful and minute examination. But, though much of his time and labour was regularly devoted to the acquisition of scriptural knowledge, he was far from being inattentive to the other duties connected with his profession. In preparing his pulpit exercises, he was a model of regularity and accuracy. His subjects were happily chosen, and the strain of his preaching was for the most part practical, though interwoven with occasional allusions to that system of religious doctrine, which he had made the object of his early and deliberate choice, and in the belief of which he had been confirmed by the study and reflection of succeeding years.\* His prayers were highly animated and devotional; free from all vain repetitions and affected phraseology. His piety was of a liberal and rational kind, and had its seat in the understanding and the heart. His charity for those who entertained views of Christianity different from his own was unlimited and universal. He always made suitable allowances for the prejudices of education, and appreciated the good qualities of his friends, without regard to the distinctions of sect and party. Wherever there was talent or learning to excite admiration; wherever there was virtue to secure respect; wherever there was distress to call forth sorrow, or indigence to demand relief, the appeal was never made to his heart in vain. The meritorious always received from him their due meed of praise; the ignorant uniformly profited by his counsel and experience; the sons and daughters of affliction derived consolation from his sympathy, and the

---

\* "Mr. Astley's sentiments, with regard to religious doctrines, were strictly Unitarian."



poor found in him a liberal benefactor and a generous friend. In his family circle he was beloved and revered; from his congregation he met with much respectful attention; and in his intercourse with the world, his conduct was so correct, and at the same time so modest and unassuming, as to give you at once a complete idea of the Christian and the gentleman. In short, to adopt the language of Mr. Radcliffe, in summing up the excellencies of Dr. Lardner's character, 'When I consider his ardour for truth, yet tenderness for error; his learning mixed with so much diffidence and humility; his zeal tempered with so much prudence; and his faith accompanied with so much benevolence; when I observe the simplicity of his

deportment, his uniform and unaffected piety, his attachment to his divine Master, and goodwill to mankind, I cannot help saying, 'This was the disciple whom Jesus loved: '\* and, when this is said, all further panegyric would be idle and vain."

R. A.—H.

\* "The above eulogium has been already applied to the character of the Rev. T. Lindsey, (of whom, I need scarcely add, it was not less truly descriptive,) in a sermon by the Rev. J. H. Bransby, on the death of that venerable confessor and eminent 'servant of God;' and likewise interwoven in the discourse of the Rev. Robert Aspland on the same occasion."

R. W.

## ORIGINAL LETTERS.

[Communications for this department are earnestly requested. Autographs shall be returned, when it is so desired.]

No. 1.

From Rev. Theoph. Lindsey to Mr. (afterwards Dr.) W. Harris.

Piddletown, April 13, 1763.

DEAR SIR, AND MY GOOD FRIEND,

**I** SHOULD have sooner acknowledged yours had I not been hindered in my purpose of looking over Madame Sevigné's Letters before I wrote to you. I have gone through the six volumes, and noted the few things relative to your subject, and should have sent them this post, but that I am prevented by an ugly cold which these north and easterly winds have given me, and which seems not likely to leave me till they go away; but they shall be sent as soon as I can transcribe them, and, in the mean time, I send this to quiet my own mind for not answering yours sooner. We were glad to hear yourself and Mrs. Harris were both well; we have reason to be thankful for the same great blessing, for my ailment is nothing but what the French call *un rhéum de santé*, and I bless God my wife is perfectly well. She joins me in every good wish and compliment to yourself and Mrs. Harris and niece. I have had no letter from London

lately, so that I know nothing but what the public press tells us, and by the last of them Lord Bute has actually resigned. Whatever the North Briton has thrown out against him, some friends of mine tell me he does not deserve it, and that any obnoxious measures he may have been led into, have been through the suggestion of others, and particularly of one whom you Honiton people, in the last Salisbury journal, have expressed your spleen against. Lord H——n never was to go to Ireland nor Lord N——nd. Lord Harcourt was certainly to have been the man before the late resignation; who it may be now, is not, perhaps, easy to say. My prayer, in which you will join me, is for concord and unanimity in pursuit of the public good amongst our governors, which was surely never more wanted than at present.

I hope Mr. Hollis is well; to my shame I have not wrote to him since I saw you: but I am unwilling to interrupt his moments that are so valuably employed, unless I have something worth his attention. I have been taken up lately with reading Hume's History of the Tudors and of Great Britain, which we borrowed;

an agreeable insinuating writer, but most partial in his representations both of character and sentiments.

I hope you don't want the books you were so good as to lend us; however, we shall ere long have satisfied ourselves with them, and they shall be sent you. The week after next we go upon a visit to a friend in Blackmore, for about ten days, who is just now returned from London, after having been confined there half a year by the rheumatism. I know of no other excursion of more than one day that I shall make during the summer, except into Devonshire, for I reckon on our seeing each other at our homes, as well as at some third place during the fine season. Whatever situation any friends of mine may be in, I shall never desire nor solicit for any thing more than what may give an opportunity of seeing more frequently, and with more ease, one or two friends beside yourself, and of being more at liberty than I can be at present, of doing what I think might be more useful than haranguing always to a country parish. But this ~~QES~~ ———, and, in the mean time, I bless God we *want no thing that is good*. And now, farewell; expect a letter from me again in a post or two, after which I shall wish to hear of and from you.

Your sincerely obliged and affectionate

THEO. LINDSEY.

No. 2.

*From the Same to the Same.*

*Monday Morning,  
Oct. 31, 1768.*

DEAR FRIEND,

AND whom I greatly esteem and have reason to do so, and whose mutual regards I shall ever wish to cultivate; I sent you a letter on Monday last, the very first opportunity after my coming here, to tell you of my speedy removal hence, and to propose to you a meeting at Bridport. By not hearing from you, I conclude either that you are not well, or that my letter has never reached you; either of which I shall have reason to regret, as it will deprive me of the satisfaction of seeing you. As I cannot, therefore, now look for an answer, and my time is very short, going

away hence the latter end of this or the beginning of next, I can only present you and Mrs. Harris with mine and my wife's most cordial regards, with desiring that I may sometimes be favoured with a line from you, and in hope of which you shall soon receive a letter from me and our new address. Had not our removal been so sudden and unexpected, both my wife and I should have waited on you this very season. Farewell, every good attend you.

Yours,

T. LINDSEY.

Could you conveniently send, by the coach, the book or two which you have of mine? But if you want them you are welcome to them.

The time when the next letter was written appears, by the matter of it, to have been immediately after Mr. and Mrs. Lindsey's arrival at Archdeacon Blackburne's, subsequent to their quitting Piddletown.

No. 3.

*From the Same to the Same.*

MY DEAR AND MOST ESTEEMED FRIEND,

AFTER many perils and dangers and delays and interruptions from violent colds, I can at length sit down for a few minutes, and tell my friend that we are well, and trust that he and Mrs. Harris are so, and shall hope soon to hear that so it is. I can, with the greatest truth, say, that never did any thing of the kind give me the like regret, as to be obliged to quit the West without seeing you. I told you of my wife's tears on the occasion, and which have been renewed since, and which gave me great satisfaction; for she says that except our father-in-law, Mr. Blackburne, whom you resemble, there is not any one for whom she has a more affectionate regard. We are at present with him, our new habitation not being quite in order to receive us; happy to have such friends to be with and so near the spot. Mr. Blackburne charges me with all imaginable regards, and wishes to smoke a pipe with such a man as yourself, for which he would ride many miles. But he desires me to tell you, that he hopes you may some time or other find occasion to do justice to Archbishop Abbot, whom you have a little injured, and who was as honest and

upright a champion for civil and religious liberty as Maister Laud was the contrary: but to come nearer home to ourselves, who would not be grieved that the best of causes should be hurt by being in bad hands, or such hands as have most indiscreetly given a handle to raise the rational odium against them? If it might but fare well with him in the next world, we would wish him out of this, rather than that he should live to do harm in it. But yet I think him a better man than some others with fairer pretences. Extract of a letter to-day: "A letter was sent to Wilkes to attend the duty of the House. His answer, that if they wanted his life, he would attend. To-day, it is said, he has had a relapse, and is in a dangerous way. If he recovers he is to be ousted. For if he is expelled, then his creditors come upon him, and it is no where believed his friends will pay 2 or £3000 a-piece for him.

"Something is advertised to-day at least under the name of the Essay on Woman. *This*, Kidgell well deserves, who is well roasted for his dirty officiousness. It appears that very great sums of money were offered to the printer for a copy of the aforesaid. It is believed, that when Wilkes's affair is over, there will be nothing more to be done in parliament, nor any opposition there, so sure are the present powers of a majority."

I am sure you are pleased with your fellow-labourer, Mrs. Macaulay, I trust she will prove a noble counterblast to your Humes and Smollets, the latter of whom, I was told here, was educated amongst the Jesuits and is a concealed Papist.

I have an account to-day of a new translation of the Bible coming forth, by a Quaker, which is said to be better done, in many respects, than our own. I have now done for the present; when you write I desire to know how Mr. Munckley does, and desire you will present my compliments to him, if he be one of your correspondents. I dare say you have seen the New England Controversy betwixt the worthy Dr. Mayhew and Apthorpe. Mr. Blackburne repents now of the pains he took, and the success he had in the collection for the colleges in America. My wife

joins in every kind and friendly regard and wish for you and Mrs. Harris, and all yours,

With your

T. L.

— at the Rev. Mr. Archdeacon Blackburne's, at Richmond, in Yorkshire.

No. 4.

*From Mrs. Macaulay to Dr. Harris.*

Bath, December 17, —

DEAR SIR,

I HAVE now spent ten days at Bath, and the neither seeing you nor hearing of you, alarms me for your health and welfare; since a week before I set out from London, a letter was written by my direction, (being at that time in bed with a fever,) to inform you that my journey to Bath was hastened by my illness, and claiming your promise to give me a meeting. In this letter was inclosed another, which you would have received before, but for a mistake in the direction. I am extremely mortified that I have missed the pleasure of your conversation whilst at Bath, but hope to hear that my disappointment is not occasioned by your ill health, or the ill health of your family, to whom I desire my compliments.

I am, dear Sir, your most sincere friend and humble servant,

CATH. MACAULAY.

No. 5.

*From Dr. Harris to Lord Barrington.*

[Lord Barrington was a fellow-student with Dr. Harris, at Mr. Grove's academy at Taunton. The following letter, (which well deserves attention at a time when a general election must soon take place,) which is in Dr. Harris's hand writing, appears to be an answer to an application, after his Lordship was in administration, to influence the people of Honiton to vote for a ministerial candidate. This was probably a rough draught, as there is no signature to the letter.]

MY LORD,

Your kind reception and recommendation of my book are highly acceptable to me, and I return you my humble thanks for them. Will your Lordship pardon me if I presume to ask why you are surprised at my



not having declared for Sir William Yonge? I have little knowledge of him; have not the most distant obligation to him; am no way inclined to meddle with election matters, (being, I think, wholly unqualified,) nor was I ever asked for my vote by him. I love to be quiet, to disoblige none, nor make enemies of any, which I cannot help doing if I interfere. I must add also, that I perfectly disapprove of the measures taken on all sides in this borough to procure votes, which are scandalous and illegal, and have a tendency to nothing but the debauching the manners of the people, and entailing poverty on them and their posterity. I cannot, therefore, with honour act, and I intend to give my voice for none of the candidates. However, Sir William has always had my best wishes. I have no way prejudiced him, though I could have done it more than most here, and he

will have the voices of almost all who are under obligations to myself and uncle, the number of which is not small. I know not what your Lordship may think of these reasons: they seem to me at present conclusive, and my conduct must be regulated by them. I have neither ambition to gratify, nor avarice to satiate. Happy in obscurity, I want nothing, I desire nothing; all I aim at is to live independently, to act uprightly, and promote truth, virtue and liberty, by every honest and honourable method. Pardon, my Lord, this freedom in an old acquaintance, used, as you well know, from early youth to speak his mind, and yet untaught to flatter! and believe me to be, with great truth,

Your Lordship's, &c.

*Sent to Lord Barrington, December 1, 1753.*

---

## THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN LOCKE AND LIMBORCH, TRANSLATED, WITH HISTORICAL NOTES.

---

*The Correspondence between Locke and Limborch, 1685—1704.*

(Continued from p. 88.)

No. 5.

*John Locke to Philip a Limborch.*

*Rotterdam, Mar. 8, 1687.*

MOST REVERED, BELOVED AND ADMIRERED FRIEND,

WITHOUT referring to the doctrine of fate and absolute predestination, I have experienced how the beginnings of transgression insensibly produce a necessity of offending. Urgent business of another kind prevented my answering your friendly letters of the 9th and 14th February, as soon as I received them. But though the conclusion of that business, by the departure for England of the person with whom I was engaged, seems to afford me leisure enough for writing letters, yet I cannot find my accustomed liberty of composition. Hindered by other affairs I have had the misfortune, unconsciously, to fall into this crime of silence, till it has increased by time, as shame has, at last convinced me. Thus it is, that

once ensnared, we accumulate transgressions, and the diffident and the daring are equally entangled in their vices. You see in what a condition I am, and unless you would have me believe that all things occur by unchangeable necessity, you ought to overlook this my neglect, that our former free intercourse may be renewed.

Concerning the German theology of the Fathers, I am entirely of your opinion. There always was, and always will be a large number of German writers, and there are few among such a multitude, who do not discover that they were born in the same climate. But it is no wonder that I think like you on this subject. I will confess farther, that I have consulted your secret characters, and that you have observed this. Be on your guard, and, above all, excuse my silence, lest I should tease you with loquacity, since you find me possessed of your secrets. "*Scire volunt secreta domûs.*" You know what follows, "*atque inde timeri.*" These magical powers are, indeed, to be little trusted, as too plain,

by which I am not a little delighted, since they spring from a source so agreeable and praiseworthy, and bring to my knowledge, what above all things I desire to know. I now discover how my mind, ruled and governed by a certain sympathy, can harmonize with yours. O that I could also become wise by the same means. To confess a truth, I use your characters, though inexpertly, but I am glad to advance so far. I wish that may be the case on other subjects. I acknowledge your genius, to the guidance of which I freely resign myself. I thank you much for all your care and labour bestowed on letters, books, and my other affairs. How willingly would I amply repay them! Farewell, and regard me as

Yours affectionately,  
J. LOCKE.

No. 6.

*John Locke to Philip à Limborch.*

*Rotterdam, May 16, 1687.*

WHAT can be done with a man who is neither able to sing nor prepared with an excuse? To what purpose can I use the liberty you allow me, without powers sufficient, properly, to employ it?

Your delightful style, replete with beauties, powerfully invites to read, repeatedly, whatever you write, so that when I would take up my pen, and give you something of my own in return, I am greatly disheartened and deterred. Though it becomes a grateful mind to offer some reply to the witty and agreeable communications of a friend, yet in an intercourse by letters it seems rash, and scarcely decent to return the rough-hewn for the polished, the rustic for the refined, the vile for the precious.

You, therefore, in vain, give me liberty of writing, a gift truly estimable in its kind, but unless you can make me partaker of your genius, quite unavailing. For, in vain you accuse my tardy use of this freedom, who have the ready and just defence that it becomes not the dull to be loquacious, nor to return brass for gold, so that in as much as I am free, I seem liberal in not employing my freedom. I know your disposition, I know your ingenuous temper, and how ready you are from good-will to ac-

cept whatever is offered. This is no small praise of one so capable of judging in all cases, though the worst excuse possible for his correspondent. Yet sustained by that confidence I again venture to interrupt your more worthy pursuits. If, in so doing, I am committing a fault, I will not accuse my fortune, which would be a most unworthy excuse, but yourself, who are so unwilling to use restraint and coercion, whose humanity, benevolence and politeness, compel me to feel and acknowledge that I ought to express my gratitude, though aware that I am unequal to the task.

If you will proceed with me on such conditions, I shall be most eager to read your letters, though inclined to make my replies tardily, and from necessity, rather than inclination. You cannot avail yourself of my excuse, therefore pray write to me as largely as possible. You will otherwise hear me complain grievously, that you withhold, from a friend in need, what is in your power to bestow, and what you are bound, because you are able to give him. If I were now beginning to cultivate a mutual friendship between us upon such unequal terms, I could scarcely bring my mind to propose them. But as, from the commencement of our friendship, we have so proceeded, that you have been prompt to render me all the offices of benevolence, which I have too slowly and partially acknowledged, you must now excuse my confirmed, though bad habits, in which you find nothing new nor intentionally disrespectful.

You see what sort of a man you have for your correspondent. Yet, though faulty, I would not appear quite ungrateful. And do I not, indeed, express some gratitude, while I love and admire in you that virtue, in which I confess myself deficient? In this matter I ask you to grant me an excuse which I cannot allow myself.

But enough of myself; I pass to your more important concerns. I am not a little angry with your printer for delaying so long your learned and valuable work. I hope, as the summer advances, the printers will be warmed into diligence. I also rejoice to hear of the Treatise, by Episcopius.\* Concerning another Trea-

\* Limborch is said to have possessed

tise,\* of which you require from me some account, to confess the truth, I should have informed you sooner, but I hoped before this time to have been at Amsterdam, and have there enjoyed the pleasant intercourse of my friends, especially of yourself, without which even these days of spring would not pass agreeably.

Farewell, most excellent friend, and regard me, as you have obliged me to be,

Your most devoted,  
J. LOCKE.

No. 7.

*John Locke to Philip à Limborch.*

*Rotterdam, Sept. 11, 1687.*

IS it not a sufficient triumph for your talents to have conquered the Jew,† unless, by means of the same work, you entirely subdue one most attached to you among Christians? You assail us, I own, with different weapons; him you attack with arguments, me you hold captive with benefits. From such weapons neither of us can escape. I certainly must acknowledge myself bound to you for ever. For what can I repay to one who is not satisfied with heaping benefits on me unless he farther endeavour to make me appear worthy of them; who detracts from his own reputation to set off mine; and wishes

the MSS. of his relation. See *Nouv. Dict. Hist.* IV. 115.

\* The *Essay*. See note (\*) p. 86.

† *Don Balthasar Orbio*, a Spanish Jew, whose parents outwardly professed themselves Roman Catholics. The son was a physician at Seville. Accused of Judaism, he suffered horribly in the Inquisition. After three years, being discharged, he became Professor of Medicine at Toulouse, still outwardly adhering to the popish religion. He, at length, removed to Amsterdam, where he was circumcised, took the name of Isaac, and professed Judaism. Limborch had first a personal conference with the Jew, who afterwards addressed to him three papers on the subject of the christian religion. These, with his own replies, Limborch published, in 1687, under this title, *Amica Collatio de Veritate Religionis Christianæ, cum erudito Judæo*. A Roman Catholic biographer praises this piece as *excellent morceau pour cette partie de la Théologie*. *Nov. Dict. Hist.* IV. 115. Orbio died this same year. See *Letter No. x. infra*.

me to partake of praises to which I have no claim? You, I confess, by your friendly courtesy, can more easily lead me at your will, than the other with all his metaphysics. Yet expect not ever so far to persuade me, that I should acknowledge your promptitude in sending me the first copy, to be an attention by any means my due. I put the whole, both the gift and your speed in bestowing it, to the account of your friendship and good-will. You, perhaps, such is your kindness, thought it right to present him with the work first of all, whom you knew, from a taste he had of it, to be very anxiously expecting this Dissertation, and to seek a repetition of his pleasure by studying it afresh. I readily acknowledge the justice of this feeling; nor can you present this volume to any one by whom it has been equally desired, or to whom it can be more acceptable. No one shall see it, for three days and more, as you directed.

I highly approve your courtesy to the Jew, though, I suspect, when he reads it, he will not so much credit the good designed for himself, as rejoice that his book has fallen into such hands as yours. Of the notice at the foot of your letter, to say much in few words, I grieve that you should have been, for three days, so near and yet too distant for an interview. But I ought to bear it patiently, satisfied that I have him for my friend, whom so many esteem.

I pray you, salute for me, most respectfully, your excellent wife, your colleagues, and the rest of our friends. Farewell, and regard me as

Your most affectionate,  
J. LOCKE.

No. 8.

*John Locke to Philip à Limborch.*

*Rotterdam, Sept. 23, 1687.*

MOST EXCELLENT FRIEND,

YOU are really too severe an exactor of your own services to your friends, yet equally disposed to excuse their negligence. Thus you accuse yourself of delay, even to him whom you have proved to be of all men the most dilatory. I am, therefore, unwilling the axiom should be adopted by you, which you unluckily apply to your last, *nothing is worse than a dilatory friend, whether you refer to yourself,*



or, (as you may sometimes do with more justice,) to me. For though very slow, I will claim a place not quite the last among those who are faithful in the cultivation of friendship. You will judge if this language savour of arrogance. You bestow upon me undeserved praises, and if I once allow myself to regard them as merited, how high may I not exalt myself!

That decree of the Synagogue evidently appears to me to have been craftily published by the Jews, that their champion may have something to say to others, though he can give no answer to you. This, I think, was done for the express purpose of his retiring from the contest without the loss of his honour, and, as much as possible, without ruining the cause. I know not whether your mode of argument would be pleasing to some conceited Christians, who approve nothing but what they do themselves; but I scarcely think it will please the Jews, who will thus find themselves more embarrassed by you than they have been by those opponents, who, assimilating the christian religion more to theirs, could not so readily find in it what they might justly oppose to the Jewish Creed.

Ever since I received your *first* book, (for you are so bountiful that I must distinguish,) I have been so constantly indisposed, that I have not yet been able to apply myself to peruse it. But as I am now daily amending, I trust I shall not long be without that pleasure. In the mean time, accept my best thanks. And now, I trust, you will agree with me, whom you have delighted with this double tribute of your regard, that this production of the Jew is barbarous as to the style and substance. But concerning your own, if you say any thing, you ought to reflect and acknowledge how much I have profited by you. Such in truth is the case. But I will no longer contest the matter with you, lest you should refuse to send me a third book.

I never found those letters from M. Le Clerc, which you mention as enclosed in yours. I hope there will be some means of sending them from Amsterdam, and that I shall soon receive them. I pray you make my respects to him, to your wife, and to

our mutual friends, and regard me, most excellent friend, as yours,

Very affectionately,

J. LOCKE.

No. 9.

*John Locke to Philip à Limborch.*

*Rotterdam, Oct. 20, 1687.*

MOST EXCELLENT FRIEND,

AMONG cordials, and, as we call them, restoratives, I find nothing so efficacious as the kindness of my friends. I feel myself very much refreshed by your last letters. I should have replied to your first some time since, could I have ventured to state any certain opinion respecting my health. For often when I have thought myself quite recovered, a relapse has suspended me between the pressure of disease and the hope of amendment, so that I have deferred writing to you till, from the trial of a few days, I could promise myself to be again recovered. This delay called forth your last letter, full of friendship, and brought a remedy more pleasant and powerful even than that which you so kindly and carefully sent me from Dr. Veen by Helmont; though it was in vain, for the servant-maid carelessly overturned the phial and spilt all the contents. But I hope to have no farther occasion for remedies, for though I sometimes feel slight symptoms, I am willing to regard them not as threatenings of a disorder coming on but the remains of one passing away. I scruple not to write to you so minutely, because nothing less would satisfy your kind solicitude on my account. I am very glad your complaint was removed by so small a loss of blood. Use, I pray you, that remedy, though with great caution. When you feel some oppressive weight, either of the head or stomach, you must immediately fly to bleeding. If you neglect this advice, there is more to be apprehended for you, a healthy man, than for me an invalid. We valetudinaries are a sort of hypocrites, who stop short of the mark to which we seem continually tending. I owe much to you, to your colleagues, and my other friends at Amsterdam, nor can I hope to live long enough to acknowledge such benevolence, yours especially, as it deserves. Of this, however, be assured, that, insignificant as I am, I am en-

tirely yours. I pray you, salute for me, most respectfully, the Veens, the Guenelons, and all friends, and assure them that they have been my best physicians, as their good wishes have done for me more than all other remedies. Make my most respectful

remembrance to your excellent wife. Adieu, and that I may remain in good heart, continue your kind regards to your most obliged and affectionate

J. LOCKE.

## MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

### *Close of a Sermon, on a late Melancholy Occasion.*

*Jeremiah ix. 23, 24.*—"Thus saith the Lord, let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches: but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord which exercise loving-kindness, judgment and righteousness in the earth, for in these things I delight, saith the Lord."

**T**HE preacher, having endeavoured to illustrate the folly, ingratitude and iniquity of an over-weening confidence in those qualifications and gifts of Providence mentioned in the text, namely, riches, strength, worldly and religious wisdom; together with some other external advantages and accomplishments which may be included in them; as beauty and wit, gracefulness of manners, or eloquence of speech, which are too often the subjects of vain-glorious boasting; the fatal effects that must ensue from such a conduct, both here and hereafter; and the duty of referring every thing to God, from whom we have received all our talents and capacities of enjoyment, who hath conferred these favours upon us with the most gracious intentions, who hath manifested his divine power, wisdom and goodness, the exercise of his "*loving-kindness, justice and righteousness,*" in the works of nature, providence and grace; and who will hereafter more fully display the effects of these excellencies and perfections, in the face of an assembled universe—thus proceeds:

The importance of the disposition which we have been recommending, and the salutary consequences of fulfilling the duties enforced upon us by the admonition of the inspired prophet, are brought into full view before us, in contemplating the recent, afflic-

tive and awful event, which hath taken place in our land. The death of a young person of either sex, but lately in the full possession of health and activity, is at all times a subject of surprise, of melancholy and of regret: but, the death of a female, in *such* circumstances, a female of such exalted rank and dignified prospects, affects not only the pious and attentive, but even the careless and inconsiderate, with thoughtfulness and dismay. The good man is awe-struck at this signal visitation of the Most High; and the wicked stands aghast! not knowing how soon his day may come. But, if her moral character was as exalted, considering her age and experience, as her rank in the scale of society; our regret upon this occasion will be prodigiously increased, and our affliction justly acquire the nature of deep and poignant anguish! And, that her moral character was thus excellent and exemplary, I assume as *a fact*, because, long before her last illness, it was a matter of *public notoriety*, which no one ever called in question, which no one ever pretended to controvert. The follies and vices of the great, it is impossible to conceal: calumny and envy are ever on the watch to discover, and rumour, with her hundred tongues, to proclaim them. If, therefore, there had been any spot or stain in the general character and conduct of the deceased Princess, we must have been acquainted with it. But here she stands acquitted, and may I not say *unrivalled*? I do not say *unrivalled* as a female, but as a female in so exalted a station. I shall not insist, in this view, on the fulfilment of her *filial duties*, in circumstances of extreme turmoil and difficulty; nor on her exemplary conduct as a wife; a relative to the first family in the king-

dom; a member of that high social circle, with which she occasionally intermingled; a mistress, a neighbour or a friend; for many virtuous women have excelled in these respects,—but confine myself to a brief consideration of those positive excellencies and perfections pointed out to us in the text, and which are not always to be met with in persons of exalted stations.

First, then, this “elect Lady,” for so I may justly call her, in the language of St. John, without any imputation of flattery, or vain and empty adulation, this amiable Princess was entirely free from “*glorying in her riches*,” for she appeared to be absolutely delivered from pride, selfishness and avarice, which so often accompany their possessors. In her younger years we never heard of any querulousness or discontent at the portion of earthly goods assigned her; and, since she became a wife, in unison with the disposition and practice of her august and beloved consort, she ministered freely, according to her ability, and even far beyond the common standard, to the wants of the poor and needy. Nor was she content with giving of her abundance, but she afforded, also, her personal presence and inspection in particular cases: far removed, in her ideas, from the suggestions of a spurious and frigid philosophy, which would persuade us that there need be no miserable and destitute person in this highly favoured kingdom, she had learned of her Saviour, that “*the poor we have always with us*,” that the poor were to be found—the virtuous and industrious poor, not only in obscure and remote corners of the land, but even under the auspices of princes, and the full sunshine of royalty! She knew this, and she acted accordingly. “*When the ear heard her, then it blessed her; and when the eye saw her, it bare witness to her!*” Much of this we know, and there is probably much more of the kind, of which at present we know nothing. She appears to have early imbibed a proper notion of the nature and design of wealth, and to have been solicitous to employ it to the best purposes, and thus to make to herself, “*friends of the earthly mammon*,” as of that which will shortly recede from us, or we from it. She was easy of access, and possessed, in an eminent

degree, “*the ornaments of a meek and quiet spirit*,” I mean, the exercise of it; for it is said, that her natural disposition was vivid and ardent: if so, the actual regulation of it, in the general course of her conduct and behaviour, was the more to her praise: for there can be little merit where there is little temptation; no victory where there is no resistance.

Secondly, in natural talents and abilities, and in external qualifications, this exalted personage was also eminent. She appeared to have possessed the usual share of health, strength and animation, common to her age and sex, and to have excelled in those lighter accomplishments which we naturally expect to meet with in females of rank and dignity; and, if not distinguished by dazzling beauty, she possessed the strongest claims upon our affection and regard, from that “*law of kindness which was upon her lips*,” the attracting expression of her countenance, and the amenity of her behaviour and address. We do not expect the great to speak to us in the same familiar manner as our equals, but if they behave with austerity and superciliousness, we justly accuse them of pride, and of an inexcusable ignorance of the true and proper equality of man. But nothing of this kind was to be found in her, whose loss we now deplore. Sensible that riches, rank and dignity are of little avail, any farther than as they promote the welfare of society, she proceeded in the even tenor of her way, with modest steps, bearing her faculties meekly, not antedating, or unduly anticipating her future prospects, but fulfilling her present duties; blessing and being blest.

But farther, thirdly—besides the possession of excellent natural abilities and external accomplishments, we have reason to believe that the Princess had her full share, for her years, of *acquired knowledge*, not only of general knowledge, but of political, commercial and historical knowledge; in a word, that knowledge of the world, and the things that are therein, which, while we are in it, we should all endeavour to attain in different degrees, and which is indispensably requisite in those “*to sit in the high places of the earth*,” and who are apparently destined to be the rulers of



states and kingdoms. She was fond of *study*, and devoted much of her time to reading, and to the improvement of her talents. Thus it appeared that she possessed "*wisdom*;" not that kind of short-sighted wisdom, which, when combined with an undue attachment to the things of time and sense, is "*foolishness with God*," but the true *justifiable* wisdom of this world;—without being proud of it, without *glorying* in it, but rendering the glory to "*the Giver of every good and perfect gift*."

That she did not rest here, but added to all "*religious wisdom*," is further evident, from her preferring a life of comparative solitude, with the chosen partner of her joys and sorrows, and a few select friends, to the bustle and parade of public life in courts and assemblies. Had she been a votary of vanity, or of a premature ambition, this would not have been the case. Pomp and publicity are necessary, in a certain degree, in high stations, but they were not immediately necessary to her, and therefore she wisely declined them. To her penetrating mind, "*the post of honour was a private station*." So the summer sun does not at once overtake the darkness of the night, but veils his bright beams in a radiant cloud, or sends before him as his harbinger, the lucid twilight, from which he gradually emerges on our astonished view, diffusing joy and gladness all around him.—But *this* bright sun is set, ere it was yet day, and shall appear again on our horizon no more for ever!

But, that the amiable subject of our meditations was in the possession of *religious wisdom*, is still further manifest, from her punctual observance of the *Lord's day*, her regular attendance on religious duties, her promotion of religious and moral education among the poor, and her private studies of this kind. These facts are so well authenticated, that they require no further proof. Her example was good, and she promoted the cause of virtue by her example; and wherever the outward expressions of religious wisdom are combined with virtuous practice, we necessarily conclude the character to be perfect, in its measure and degree, and render it all that homage and respect, which it so justly deserves at our hands.

Such a character, my friends, and in such circumstances, speaks to us all, in language the most clear and explicit. It animates us while living, and even from the confines of the tomb it hath power to charm! It speaks to *the young*, to guard them from the snares of vice, and a false confidence in the things of earth and time, and to encourage them in the paths of piety and virtue. It speaks to *the aged*, for, if so much has been done "*in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry?*" It speaks to *the rich*, to warn them of the instability of their earthly possessions, and to stimulate them to the most active exertions in the cause of public virtue and prosperity, of humanity and benevolence; and to *the poor*, to shew them *the folly* as well as the iniquity of the passions of envy and malignity, fretfulness and repining, by furnishing a striking and awful instance of *the natural equality of man*, in all the leading circumstances of his being. It speaks emphatically to the august family with which she was more immediately connected, and especially to her royal parents, and to her deeply afflicted and affectionate consort, now in a situation of mind, which I dare not touch upon! *Their* afflictions are peculiar and sacred; may the most sacred consolations be with them and abounding! And it speaks emphatically to *the nation at large*; to rulers and senators, and statesmen and politicians, as well as to the great body of the people; for our loss may be regarded as a national calamity, and a national *visitation*, though we have no authority to pronounce it a national judgment. Be zealous and active, O ye governors of our Zion, in cherishing and defending the genuine principles of that civil constitution, which ye have sworn to preserve and maintain! "*Mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces, and repair her foundations*," that she may continue to be—I will not say, "*the arbiter of surrounding nations*," for that is a groundless and unwarrantable assumption;—but, that she may be a joy and a praise throughout the whole earth; and a bright pattern for imitation, as well as a permanent source of consolation and happiness to her own people, unto the latest generations!

"In this great work, it would have been *my* delightful employment to have

assisted, had providence continued me in life; but he hath been pleased to cut short my days in the midst, and to remove me to the unseen state, where, I trust, according to the terms of his gracious gospel, I shall receive my part and portion, in new and brighter scenes, throughout a blissful immortality!"

Surely, we may suppose that *these* were in part, at least, the sentiments which passed through her mind in the last moments of her earthly being, when, with a countenance beaming with hope and resignation, she stretched forth her feeble hand to her beloved husband, and said,—"*Is there any danger?*" And may we not also conceive on the solemn occasion, some messenger of peace, some herald of the skies, commissioned to descend, and to relieve her fainting spirit with this reply—"Yes, there *is* danger, but it will soon be over!—But there is another danger, from which you are happily delivered! You shall '*not be hurt of the second death*'! You have early dedicated yourself to your Maker and to your Redeemer, and during the short course of your earthly pilgrimage, have fulfilled the purposes of your creation: you might naturally have expected a longer continuance in life, and far more extensive usefulness; but the ways of Providence are inscrutable to mortals! In former seasons of deep and poignant anguish, you have often breathed forth this prayer, '*O that I had wings like a dove, for then would I flee away, and be at rest!*' You are now about to realize these devout aspirations: leave this imperfect scene, these confines of temptation and trial and sin and death, and ascend with me into the mansion prepared for you; and, in due season, you shall be fitted for more sublime employments, for the society of angels and glorified spirits, and the vision of the eternal Jehovah! For you know him who hath said, '*Blessed are the pure in heart, they shall see God.*'"

Islington,

February 15, 1818.

SIR,  
UNDERSTANDING that the tomb of DR. JAMES FOSTER, in Bunhill Fields, has been for some time past in a very dilapidated condition, some friends to the memory of this great man are desirous of restoring it. I beg leave to state, that the Rev. Sampson

Kingsford, of Canterbury, the Rev. Thomas Morgan, Mr. John Treacher, Mr. Stanger, and myself, are ready to come forward with our contributions, whilst Mr. David Eaton, and Mr. Cordell of Bishopsgate-street, will obligingly receive subscriptions, however small, for this purpose. Mr. William Titford and myself having inquired into the expense, find it will amount to about *twenty pounds*, and any surplus shall be given to the Unitarian Fund.

It will be remembered that DR. JAMES FOSTER was an eloquent General Baptist minister, who conducted a Sunday Evening Lecture at the Old Jewry, for twenty years, and whom Pope has thus so pointedly eulogized in his Satires,—

"Let modest Foster, if he will, excel  
Ten metropolitans in preaching well!"

His *Defences of Revelation*, also, were most judicious and satisfactory, whilst his conscientious avowal of *Unitarian* principles, under very trying circumstances, in the west of England, previous to his settlement in London, does honour to his zeal and integrity. His spirit, indeed, was truly independent and liberal.—"I always had," says he, "I bless God, ever since I began to understand or think to any purpose, large and generous principles, and there never was any thing, either in my temper or education, which might incline me to narrowness and bigotry, and I am heartily glad of this opportunity which now offers itself, of making this public profession, that I value those who are of different persuasions from me, more than those who agree with me in sentiment, if they are *more serious, sober and charitable!*" This is a noble declaration, warranted by the soundest dictates of reason, as well as sanctioned by the precepts of pure and unadulterated religion. An infuriated bigotry has disfigured and despoiled the largest portion of Christendom.\*

DR. FOSTER died Nov. 5, 1758, in the 56th year of his age, of an illness brought on by an attendance upon the amiable Lord Kilmarnock to the scaffold on Tower Hill. The melancholy

\* See *Sequel* (fourth edition) to the *Sketch of the Denominations of the Christian World*.

business agitating his tender and sympathizing spirit, terminated at length in his dissolution. I shall only add the mention of a fact, perhaps not generally known to your readers, that the tombs of the truly excellent Watts and Doddridge, have been lately repaired by the generosity of their friends; and the admirers of the character as well as of the writings of the learned, pious and benevolent Dr. JAMES FOSTER, will not, I am persuaded, be less ready in paying a similar token of regard to his memory. Even the wandering Tartars are said to entertain so great a reverence for the dead, that retiring however rapidly before an invading enemy, they are sure of making a stand when they reach any one cemetery, determined, at all events, to preserve the sepulchres of their ancestors from destruction. J. EVANS.

SIR, Feb. 26, 1818.  
**I** EXTRACT, *verbatim*, from the New Annual Register, the following passage, which is among the "Principal Occurrences in the Year 1783," and given under the head of *Paris*, Dec. 16:

"Three young gentlemen being at a tavern on a Sunday, at Charlemont, in Auvergne, in a state of intoxication, took a wooden crucifix that happened to be in the room, and thrusting a spit into it, made the crucifix turn before the fire, for which offence they were all three broke alive on the wheel, after having their wrists cut off by the common executioner." *New Ann. Reg.* IV. 64.

If this really happened, as there is no reason to doubt, what must have been the government of France, and how worthy of destruction, even though it might boast of being *legitimate*?

J. O. U.

*Dr. John Jones on the Introduction of Christianity into Rome, as stated by Josephus.*

SIR, Feb. 15, 1818.  
**I**T is a remarkable circumstance in the history of the christian religion, that no account has been transmitted to posterity, by what means, and at what time, it was first introduced into the metropolis of the empire, and how was laid the foundation of a church, which in all ages made so conspicuous, though melancholy a figure among the

other churches of Christendom. And this phenomenon seems to have led a late writer to question the genuineness of the letter which the Apostle addressed to the Roman converts. The following passage of Josephus affords some important information on this interesting subject. "A Jew resided at Rome, who, having been accused of transgressing the laws, fled from his country to avoid the punishment which threatened him. During his residence at Rome, he pretended to unfold the wisdom of the Mosaic laws, in conjunction with three other men, who in every way resembled himself. With these associated *Fulvia*, a woman of rank, that had become a convert to the Jewish religion, and whom they prevailed upon to send, for the temple of Jerusalem, presents of purple and gold. These they received, and appropriated to their own use; which, indeed, was their motive at first in making the request. Tiberius (for he was informed of this by his friend Saturninus, the husband of *Fulvia*, at her earnest request) commanded all the Jews to be expelled from the city. The men, to the amount of four thousand, were forced into the army by order of the senate, and sent to the island of Sardinia. But most of them being determined to preserve their laws inviolate, refused to enlist, and were put to death. And thus, because of the wickedness of four men, the Jews were driven from the city." *Ant. Jud.* cap. xviii. c. 5, §. 3. On this passage I shall make a few remarks.

1. The distresses here spoken of as endured by the Jews, took place about four years after the resurrection of Jesus: for Josephus presently notices the removal of Pilate from the government of Judea, which took place a little before the death of Tiberius.

2. In his work against Apion, Josephus, when speaking of the law of Moses, meant that law as improved and spiritualized by Jesus Christ. This is certain, that he means the same gospel, "by the wisdom of the Mosaic laws," the language used by him in this place; which is, indeed, a proper designation of it, the gospel being the internal meaning of the law, separated from its external grosser parts. The Jew, therefore, whom he characterizes as wicked in every respect, was a pretended teacher of



Christianity, he being, as we shall see reason to believe, one of those impostors known under the name of Gnostics. His associates appear from the context, to have been the priests of Isis, who being similar to himself in character, united with him for similar motives.

3. The Jews who were expelled from the city, forced to enlist, or put to death, must have been, for the most part, believers in Jesus. Here, therefore, we have the extraordinary fact, on the authority of the Jewish historian, that a few years after the resurrection of the founder, Christianity was introduced into Rome, and so prevailed as to occasion great disturbances, and to attract the notice and interposition of government.

4. The conduct of the emperor and senate towards the Jews on this occasion, was not only cruel and unjust, but quite contrary to the usual policy of the Romans, who had hitherto tolerated all nations in the exercise of their respective rites. The Jews were exempted by law from the duty of serving as soldiers. But on this occasion they were compelled to enlist, and in case of refusal, put to death.

For this extraordinary severity, extraordinary causes must have existed. The causes were the prevalence of spiritual Judaism, the disputes and tumults which it hence occasioned, the charges brought against the converts that they intended to dethrone Cæsar, and raise a prince of their own to universal empire. This serious charge, which was too much countenanced by the yet mistaken views of the believers in Jesus respecting the nature of his kingdom, was made by Sejanus, who was minister of Tiberius, and the determined enemy of all the Jews. But this wicked minister fell a victim to his ambition; and the event proved very auspicious to the authority of the gospel. For the causes which led the emperor to hate Sejanus, naturally occasioned a change in his opinion and conduct towards the Jews, who from the first, perceiving the treachery and ambition of that minister, gave his measures all the opposition in their power. Tiberius, therefore, from being a persecutor, became their friend: he restored to their violated rights such of the Jewish nation, whether believers or otherwise,

as were at Rome, defended them from calumnies, and moreover, sent an edict to all the provinces, in which the respective magistrates were commanded to protect them in the full exercise of their privileges. These important facts are thus stated by Philo: "All nations, though prejudiced against the Jews, have been careful not to abolish the Jewish rites; and the same caution was preserved in the reign of Tiberius, though, indeed, the Jews in Italy have been distressed by the machinations of Sejanus. For after his death, the emperor became sensible that the accusations alleged against the Jews in Italy were lying calumnies, the mere inventions of Sejanus, who was eager to devour a nation that alone or chiefly would, he knew, be likely to oppose his impious designs and measures. And to the constituted authorities in every place, Tiberius sent orders not to molest in their several cities the men of that nation, excepting the guilty only, (who were very few,) and not to suppress any of their institutions, but to regard as a trust committed to their care, both the people themselves as disposed to peace, and their laws, which, like oil, inure them to order and stability." II. 569.

Though the early christian writers had the strongest motives for passing over in silence the transactions at Rome, noticed by Philo and Josephus, they could not help adverting to the edict of Tiberius in favour of the Christians. Tertullian, in his Apology, (c. v. p. 6,) has a passage, which is thus translated by Lardner, (VII. 232,) "Tiberius, in whose time the Christian religion had its rise, having received from Palestine an account of such things as manifested our Saviour's divinity, proposed to the senate, and giving his own vote as first in his favour, that he should be placed among the gods. The senate refused, because he had himself declined that honour. Nevertheless, the emperor persisted in his own opinion, and ordered, that if *any* accused the Christians, they should be punished."

Though Tiberius might have received from Pilate an account of the miracles and resurrection of Jesus, he could not have received an assurance of his innocence; because Pilate had at this time sanctioned his death, as a pretended king of the Jews, and an

enemy to Cæsar. It is true, that the governor was sensible of our Lord's innocence, and confessed it. But this confession was made to the Jews, made before the sentence was passed, and made as a motive to divert their malice against the accused. But after he had ratified his condemnation, Pilate would acknowledge his innocence no longer, much less would he send an assurance of it to Cæsar, because this would be to condemn himself, as a cruel and unjust judge. It is evident, therefore, that the emperor had some knowledge of Jesus, through a channel very different from Pilate. Besides, he knew that the believers in Jesus were accused; and he knew also that the accusation was false: and as this accusation was no other than a charge of treason, for which their leader, as king of the Jews, had already suffered in Judea, nothing short of personal knowledge, nothing but the notoriety of the sentiments and conduct of the Christians at Rome, could convince him of its falsehood. The narrative of Tertullian implies, therefore, that there were, even at this early period, Christians in Italy and Rome, though Tertullian, from a motive hereafter to be stated, designedly omitted to mention them.

Eusebius, in his Eccles. Hist. Lib. ii. 2, has given the same history nearly in the words of Tertullian. And Orosius, towards the beginning of the fifth century, hath thus more fully stated the fact: "Tiberius proposed to the senate, that Christ should be made a god, with his own vote in his favour. The senate moved with indignation, that it had not been, as was usual, proposed to them to determine respecting the reception of his religion, rejected his deification, and *decreed by an edict, that the Christians should be banished from the city*, especially as Sejanus, the prefect of Tiberius, most obstinately resisted the reception of his faith."

There the inference drawn above from the words of Tertullian, is stated in direct terms by Orosius, namely, that in the days of Tiberius, Christians were so numerous at Rome, as to attract the notice of the government. But though Christ had at this time many followers at Rome, they must have been chiefly JEWS; his gospel being not as yet announced to the

Gentiles, unclogged by the rite of circumcision; nor was the Christian name as yet in existence. It is evident, then, that the men whom Philo and Josephus called Jews, are by Tertullian and Orosius called Christians.

The testimony of these writers is corroborated by Philo, to whose narrative they seem more particularly to refer. The two former suppose the sufferers to be Jews, though they call them Christians;—to be *accused* Jews;—to be accused by *Sejanus*;—accused towards the *close* of Tiberius's reign;—and to be *unjustly* accused; and these particulars are contained in the words of Philo, who goes farther, and hints at the nature of the accusation: "The prefect knew that they were enemies to his impious designs," that is, his design of usurping the empire. He, therefore, with the usual adroitness of wicked ministers, charged on them the treason of which he was himself guilty. The account of this noble author, who was a spectator of all the transactions, implies, moreover, that Tiberius at first, as was most natural, believed the charge; but that his eyes being soon opened, he became the protector of the people whom, a little before, he had grievously molested. The christian fathers left the first impression of Tiberius's resentment unnoticed, and they mention only his subsequent conduct in behalf of the Christians.

Now, if Tiberius, as Philo, Tertullian and Orosius assert, put an end to the persecutions of the Christians, causing an edict to protect them, to be sent to all the provinces, what should we expect to be the effect of such a measure, as soon as it had time to be known, and to operate in Judea? What but the effect stated in the following simple narrative: "Then had all the churches rest throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria, and were edified and multiplied?" Acts ix. 31.

This event took place about the time when Tiberius died; and the description which Philo gives of the state of the Roman empire on the accession of *Caligula*, implies that the repose of the churches proceeded from this edict. "What person," says he, "on beholding Caius, when, after the death of Tiberius, he had assumed dominion over every land and sea; which

dominion held every country, east, west, north and south, in tranquillity and order; which united every province in social harmony, blended together in congratulating the return and in enjoying the blessings of universal peace; who, I say, on seeing this felicity under Caius, which it exceeds the power of words to describe, could not be filled with ecstasy at the sight?" If then such was the happy state of every city, of every place in the Roman empire, in consequence of the measures above-mentioned, adopted by Tiberius, the churches in Judea, Galilee and Samaria, must have *shared* in the general blessing, and derived their repose from the regulations which produced it.

Eusebius also represents the tranquillity of the churches as proceeding from the same cause. "Tiberius," says he, (Eccles. Hist. Lib. ii. 2,) "threatened death to such as accused the Christians; this being suggested to his mind by Divine Providence, that the doctrine of the gospel, having the beginning of its race clear from obstruction, might freely run through every land." Dr. Lardner, indeed, has entirely overlooked the operations of this edict; and he supposes the *rest* in question to arise from the distress which the Jews endured by the mad attempt of Caligula to place his statue in the temple of Jerusalem. But the supposition is inadequate, and utterly foreign to the effect to be accounted for; and it implies, withal, the severest reflection on the disciples of the benevolent Jesus. For it implies, that they were so unfeeling, so destitute of regard for their brethren the Jews, so unconcerned for the great cause for which they suffered, as to enjoy rest at a time when the whole country was involved in one scene of horror and devastation; to be *comforted* and *edified*, when men, women and children lay on the ground with their breasts bare to receive the sword of the tyrant. Lard. I. 97.

Josephus represents those of the Jews who enlisted, as sent into the island of Sardinia. But Suetonius asserts, in more general terms, that they were sent into provinces of a severe climate. Some of them, no doubt, were conveyed to *Great Britain*, where at this time existed military stations; and to this island those vic-

tims of cruelty and injustice must have brought with them the name and doctrine of Christ. And this will account for the following passage of *Gildas*, which I extract from *Camden's Britannia*, Gough's edition, page 50: "In the mean time," writes he, "the island exposed to the severest cold, and, as it were, in the extremity of the earth, out of the reach of the visible sun, was first, under *the reign of Tiberius*, favoured with the true sun, shining not in the material firmament, but from the highest heavens, before all time, enlightening the world with his beams in his appointed time, i. e. Christ by his precepts."

The most respectable and competent of the early fathers confidently affirm, that Great Britain was blessed with the gospel from the earliest period; and Philo, who witnessed its rapid and early diffusion, asserts, that it had then been conveyed through every part of the habitable globe, even in his days.

JOHN JONES.

SIR,

Feb. 24, 1818.

I HAVE a small volume, published in 1671, and entitled, "The Present State of the United Provinces. Collected by W. A., Fellow of the Royal Society." I mention the work for the sake of this concluding paragraph to Ch. xxiv. *Of the different Religions in Holland*:

"Besides all these religions, there is a certain assembly held at *Rinsbourg*, ten or twelve times a year, where every one that will, has the liberty of making an exhortation; it is called the *Assembly of the Free-minded*. There are many others that sit at home reading the Scripture, and never come to any church, except it be out of curiosity. The *Arianisme* has those that profess it. In a word, any body may follow his own opinion, but not profess it with a publick worship. There are *Atheists* enough too." 2d Ed. pp. 343, 344.

The concluding sentence deserves little credit. The charge of *Atheism* has been generally vague and ill supported, and too often nothing better than a calumny against those religious persons who refused to worship *the great Diana* of some nominal Christians. Those who "never come to church," were probably reputed he-



reties, too thinly scattered over the country to have any besides family worship. But my curiosity is excited to know more of this *Assembly*, whose title is so prepossessing, especially as appearing in the middle of the 17th century.

### OTIOSUS.

*The Nonconformist.*

No. III.

*On the Conduct of the Quakers, as distinguished from that of other Nonconformists, in the Reign of Charles II.*

**F**EW pages of history are so rich in instruction as those which relate to the ecclesiastical affairs of England during the seventeenth century. There was in that period an extraordinary developement of character, talent and opinions, which places in theatrical contrast the noblest and the basest passions; the purest religion and grossest superstition; deeds of glory and of infamy; patriotism, treachery, persecution, fanaticism, servility and martyrdom. They should be studied by the bigot, the tyrant, the demagogue, the enthusiast, to mend their hearts; and by those of opposite characters to correct and enlarge their minds. The subject of this paper, although not immediately connected with the most prominent or important facts of those eventful times, is yet far from being destitute of interest and utility.

Presbyterianism was the oldest of our Nonconformist sects, and the worst. It had the most glaring faults of Episcopacy without their palliations. It was as avaricious, but not so splendid; as arrogant, but not so imposing; as proud, but not so dignified; as persecuting in its spirit, but not so imperial in its constitution. It appears to still greater disadvantage by the side of the Independents, Baptists and Quakers. Their patriotism was purer, as they could not have in view the emoluments of an Establishment; and their conduct was more consistent, as they allowed the liberty which they claimed, and were its advocates when they prevailed, as well as when they suffered. All were doomed, however, to wring the dregs of the cup of persecution by one of the most perfidious, unfeeling and unprincipled sovereigns that ever a country degraded itself by

acknowledging; and in the manner in which these trials were borne, there are some particulars by which the Quakers were honourably distinguished, not only from the Presbyterians, but from the other denominations also.

The Act of Uniformity did not affect the Quakers; nor however unjust and disgraceful that Act might be, was much of the sufferings of other Dissenters caused by it, but rather by the revived persecuting Statutes of Elizabeth, the Bills against Conventicles, and the Five Mile Act. By these, and the Test and Corporation Acts, all were involved in privation and misery.

The execution of these oppressive measures was peculiarly severe upon the Quakers, inasmuch as they could not avail themselves of some means, and would not of others, by which many eluded their penalties. Their garb and manners distinguished them from the rest of the community, and marked them out conspicuously for every petty minister of legal vengeance to shoot his arrows at. Nonconformity was branded in their foreheads. They spoke its language, and wore its uniform. Others might, and did, shelter themselves by occasional compliances; but for them there was no medium between apostasy and manly endurance. Their conviction of the unlawfulness of oaths was the cause of a heavy burden of exclusive and uncommiserated suffering. A sturdier conscientiousness was never exhibited in the world than numbers of them displayed, when, after long imprisonment, the oath of Allegiance was tendered as the condition of liberation, and they quietly returned back to their prisons. When other charges failed, every upstart Justice could commit them for contempt of court, for standing covered before his Worship. Incredible were the persecutions sustained for persisting to say *thee* and *thou*, and not bending or uncovering to superiors.

That this was a foolish obstinacy about trifles, ought not to be objected by those who admire the seceders from the church, on account of the use of the surplice, and of the cross in baptism. In both cases there was the same impetuous conviction of duty, and the same reference of apparent trifles to important principles. The

currency of servile language indicates political degeneracy. The freedom of a People may be not very inaccurately estimated by their plainness of speech. America has less complimentary phraseology than England, and England less than France. The simplicity of the Quaker dialect was considered by their enlightened members as a protest against the increasing servility of the age, and an assertion of the natural equality of man.

Their writers claim for the sect in general the credit of a degree of firmness and consistency, not shewn by other Dissenters. This claim is advanced in the following passage, by Elwood, and it is fully confirmed by Neale, who was by no means disposed to do more than justice to the Quakers, but who puts much more strongly the charge of temporising against other denominations.

"They having no refuge, but God alone, to fly unto, could not dodge and shift to avoid the suffering; as others of other denominations could, and in their worldly wisdom and policy did; altering their meetings, with respect both to place and time, and forbearing to meet when forbidden, or kept out of their meeting-houses. So that of the several sorts of Dissenters, the Quakers only held up a public testimony, as a standard or ensign of religion, by keeping their meeting duly and fully, at the accustomed times and places, (so long as they were suffered to enjoy the use of their meeting-houses;) and when they were shut up, and Friends kept out of them by force, they assembled in the streets, as near to their meeting-houses as they could. This bold and truly christian behaviour in the Quakers disturbed, and not a little displeased the persecutors; who, fretting, complained that the stubborn Quakers brake their strength; and bore off the blow from those other Dissenters, whom as they most feared, so they principally aimed at. On the other hand, the more ingenious amongst other Dissenters, of each denomination, sensible of the ease they enjoyed by our bold and steady suffering, (which abated the heat of the persecutors, and blunted the edge of the sword before it came to them,) frankly acknowledged the benefit received; calling us the bulwark that kept off

the force of the stroke from them, and praying that we might be preserved, and enabled to break the strength of the enemy: nor would some of them forbear (those especially who were called Baptists) to express their kind and favourable opinion of us, and of the principles we professed; which emboldened us to go through that, which but to hear of was a terror to them."

This passive fortitude; this opposition of moral principle to physical force, and of the power of endurance to that of infliction, is a more difficult and useful, and ought to be a more illustrious heroism than that of active conflict. It has commonly the success it so well merits. The first converts made by George Fox, are said to have been the men employed to scourge him in prison; and his followers have obtained larger concessions from the legislature than those who had, and might again have appealed to the sword.

As if the infamy of Charles would not have been complete by the violation of his general promise of a Toleration in the treatment of this unoffending Sect; in their imprisonments, in confiscations, banishment and murder, lingering and barbarous murder by bad usage in loathsome jails, he gave it a blacker dye by a particular promise to one of their leaders, (R. Hubberthorn,) that none of them should suffer for their opinions or religion; "you have the word of a king for it," said the royal hypocrite. They soon found its worth.

The Quakers were more closely united among themselves than other denominations; they adhered more steadily to each other in affliction, and dispensed assistance of every kind with greater liberality. When the Conventicle Act passed, many of the Presbyterian laity deserted their ministers. Other denominations stand charged with neglect of worthy and celebrated sufferers. The Friends well demonstrated that in so calling themselves they made no vain or unwarrantable assumption. When Fox was in prison, during the government of Cromwell, "one of his friends offered himself to the Protector to lie in prison, body for body, in his stead: to which proposal Cromwell answered, he could not grant it, being contrary

to law; and turning to some of his council standing by him, asked, 'which of you would do as much for me, were I in the same condition?' This generous offer was not made merely on account of the importance of their leader's services to the cause, for it was by no means uncommon. Toulmin\* says, "while they were exposed to hatred, contempt and abuse from without, brotherly-kindness and unfeigned charity increased, and connected them amongst themselves. While each seemed regardless of his own liberty, they were zealous advocates for that of their brethren, and almost incessant in their representations to those in authority of the sufferings of their friends; going so far in their charity, as to offer themselves freely, person for person, to lie in prison instead of such as they apprehended were in danger of perishing through the length or extremity of their confinement." The pecuniary assistance which they rendered to each other, at times seemed almost to amount to a community of goods. Those who were left at liberty made every possible effort to alleviate the sufferings of their brethren in confinement: and made their kindness more effectual by the systematic manner in which it was exercised.

This union deserves attention, because its bond was not, as among all other parties, a common faith. Whatever may be their present state, they had then no creed. Their discipline, as Penn expressly declares, related only to conduct, to holiness and charity; and as to imposing upon one another any practice regarding faith and worship, he says, that it "is never to be done or suffered or submitted unto." This is true Christian Liberty. It gives that mental freedom to the individual which was withheld both by Reformers and the leading Nonconformists. Many advocates for religious liberty think they have done enough when they have secured it for societies. It is supposed that these have a right to make what laws, and fix what terms of membership they please. And so they have, merely as societies, but not as christian churches. They are guilty of ecclesiastical tyranny, of persecution, when they ex-

communicate a member, which must generally produce a serious diminution of his social comforts, merely for change of opinion. There was probably a great variety of opinion on doctrinal points amongst the early Quakers, and no small admixture of heresy. That many were Unitarian may be inferred from the fact, that Penn was challenged to name a single Quaker who prayed to Christ. He replied that he had himself; but such a challenge would not have been given unless it had been notorious that it was not uncommon amongst them to withhold divine honours from the Son. G. Whitehead, in a public disputation with Vincent and other Presbyterians, when the latter inquired, "Whether they owned one Godhead in three distinct and separate persons?" replied that "God did not use to wrap his truths in heathenish metaphysics, but deliver them in plain language:" and refused to use any but scriptural terms. Probably the majority of them were Sabellians. At any rate, they were the only Christians of that day who could change their opinions without being disowned by their party.

They could feel and exert themselves for other sufferers, as well as those of their own denomination. Their universal charity was conspicuous on several occasions, especially in procuring from Charles an extension of the pardon granted some of their own body, to many of other sects. Whitehead, who interested himself for this purpose, observed, "our being of different judgments and societies did not abate my sympathy or charity, even towards those who, in some cases, had been our opposers." This was a very mild way of referring to, and a very noble return for, the persecutions which they had endured from Nonconformists. From this guilt, the Baptists were not wholly free; but the Independents and Presbyterians were deeply culpable. They united in the infamous attempt of the divines (an attempt graced with the names of Baxter, Nye and Goodwin), to violate one of the first principles of the Republican Constitution, by explaining the article, securing liberty of conscience to all who professed faith in God by Jesus Christ, so as to exclude Quakers from toleration, with some other sects more deservedly

---

\* Supplement to Neale.



obnoxious. Cromwell repeatedly interfered on behalf of the Quakers, but the spirit of persecution was too strong for him. The Independents indulged it in gross violation of the laws, especially in two memorable cases: the committal of Gorge Fox to Derby goal by two Independent Justices, one of them a preacher: and the brutal treatment of two females at Oxford, who were publicly whipped, by order of Dr. Owen, then vice-chancellor of the university, for no offence but that of public exhortation, and in spite of the refusal of the mayor to legalize the sentence by his seal and signature. Such facts reflect lustre on their refusal to aid the attempt of Sir George Booth in favour of Charles, though lured by splendid promises, and on their uniform charity to their own former persecutors, when suffering under a common persecution.

Every man who believes and loves the principles of Nonconformity, must read with pain and shame of the numerous attempts made by the Presbyterians and others to obtain a Comprehension, and turn away to dwell with complacency on a Sect which neither could nor would make any such endeavours, nor even accept, if offered, what was by them so greedily sought.

With regard to one difference between the conduct of Quakers and that of other Sectarians, it is not easy to decide which pursued the course best adapted to secure, or rather recover, the religious liberties of the country. They did not join in the common outcry against the Catholics, nor does it appear that they particularly objected to that universal Toleration, against which others protested, under the apprehension that it was only introductory to a popish establishment and civil tyranny. The Dissenters sacrificed their own liberties to their dread of popery. They were tools with which the Church of England armed itself in the time of danger; but which were broken and trampled upon in the hour of triumph. Had they seconded the efforts of the court for universal religious liberty, it must have been obtained. It is by no means clear that this would have been followed by the transformation of the Protestant hierarchy into a Papal

one. For that measure they might have reserved their union with the church, in opposition to the court, which would probably have been not less successful than in fact it actually was under less favourable circumstances; and then, whether the Stuarts had remained, or William been introduced, they would have bequeathed to their posterity the high privilege of religious freedom, instead of the contemptuous boon of Toleration from that Church which they saved from destruction. They might be right in opposing the entrance of Popery, *in limine*; but the probabilities just hinted at should be considered before the Quakers are censured for not actually abetting them. They honourably concurred in not admitting the dispensing power of the sovereign.

The backwardness of the Quakers on this subject, cannot, in justice, be ascribed to ignorance or indifference about the civil rights of Englishmen. Of these they had occasion to make frequent and manly assertions. Barclay's Dedication of his Apology to Charles, has been deservedly admired and quoted, as a rare instance of plain dealing with a sovereign. We are reminded of Peter before the Sanhedrim, or Paul at Philippi, by the reply of Francis Howgill to the magistrates of Bristol, who commanded him to leave the city immediately. "We came not in the will of man, nor stand in the will of man, but when He shall move us to depart who moved us to come hither, we shall obey; we are free-born Englishmen, and have served the commonwealth faithfully, being free in the sight of God from the transgression of any law: to your commandments we cannot be obedient; but if by violence you put us out of the city, and have power to do it, we cannot resist." George Fox refused liberation when offered in the shape of a pardon, and demanded a fair trial. It would be unpardonable not to allude to the behaviour of Penn and Mead upon their trial, and impossible not to estimate it as one of the noblest stands ever made against arbitrary power in a misnamed court of justice.

Pennsylvania is a glorious monument of the unrivalled superiority of the Quakers in the clear conception and

practical adoption of the great principles of religious liberty. America is the country of experimental legislation. The Puritan colonies of New England disgraced themselves by fanaticism; and even the constitution framed by Locke for Carolina, has restrictions on the liberty of public worship, as it required the union of seven families to legalize a sect; while Penn freed the public profession of religion from all limitations whatever.

From this brief review of those particulars in which the conduct of the primitive Quakers differed from that of other Nonconformists, it appears that they are eminently entitled to the honourable notice of the historian of Dissent. It has been common to speak harshly of their enthusiasm. Their pretensions to inspiration were absurd enough; but they were neither insincere nor peculiar. The Quakers of the present day, though highly respectable, cannot, I apprehend, be placed in so advantageous a contrast with other sects, as their predecessors. In one particular, they have varied from themselves remarkably. Now they are the least, as then they were the most eager proselytists. This is to be lamented. They did much good by their zeal, and it is curious to observe how many of their converts were in the more elevated and dissipated classes of society. Many also of their most celebrated members and preachers had been military men.\* The celebrated Elwood carried something of a chivalrous spirit into controversial warfare, and like a gallant duellist offered his adversary the choice of weapons, contending, *ad libitum*, in prose or verse. Had the Quakers retained their original zeal, it would have been highly useful to the community, not merely by the increase of a valuable body of religionists, but by influencing public opinion on many important moral subjects. They might have preserved our country from a part at least of the guilt it has incurred by the needless and profane multiplication of oaths, and by that love of war which has deluged the world with blood, and brought upon ourselves so many calamities.

F.

\* As Lilburne, D. Barclay, Hubbertorn, Ames, Barnardistone, Gibson, Dewsbury.

Feb. 12, 1818.

SIR,

HAVING lately had occasion to look pretty minutely over the early official returns of the ecclesiastical benefices originally reported to the governors of Queen Anne's bounty, as competent for augmentation, I was struck by observing the following instances in the list of the Chester diocese, stated as having their incomes *dependent on Dissenters*. The cases referred to are,

"1. Ringey; a donative in the deanery of Frodsham: valuation, nothing certain, and in Dissenters' hands.

"2. Horwich; a chapelry in the deanery of Manchester: valuation, interest of 190*l.*, trustees for which being Dissenters, refuse to give an account, and pay the curate nothing.

"3. Chobent; in the deanery of Warrington; in the hands of Dissenters, nothing certain."

It seems, I own, an extraordinary case, and is a still more unaccountable circumstance, considering the very existence of parochial endowments as prior to the origin of any dissenting societies, how any portion of the ecclesiastical revenues (however inconsiderable its amount) should have become connected with, or subject to, dissenting trusts. No account of the places in question, that I have been able to discover, throws the smallest light upon this singular peculiarity. It is probable that some of your northern readers may have it in their power to supply some notices of these heterogeneous endowments, and if so, the communication of them through the channel of the Repository would be esteemed a favour.

V. M. H.

Feb. 9, 1818.

SIR,

AMONG the *Sydney papers* are preserved several letters from "Algernon Sydney to his Father, Robert, Earl of Leicester." In one of them, dated "Frankfort upon Maine, Sep. 8, 1660," speaking of the ignorance of the *priests*, he says,

"The most eminent men amongst them, learn to understand *English*. Their libraries are full of *Baxter*, *Burroughes*, and other English puritan sermon-books, and out of them they preach. I was acquainted with one

*Brokman*, in Denmark, who had been in England; he hath all the books of that kind, that have come out these twenty years; knows nothing but what he learns by rote out of them, and by their help is grown so eminent, that about two months since, he was promoted to the best bishoprick in Denmark, next to that of Roskyld."

This anecdote, which represents the English Nonconformists as contributing to *fit up* a Danish bishop, may be worthily transferred to your columns, from the midst of those high concerns of State among which I have discovered it.

#### SELECTOR.

SIR,

IT has been often stated as an argument against the doctrine of the Trinity, that Trinitarians can never hope to convert the Jews. This argument, which has been often controverted, may, perhaps, receive some confirmation from the following remarkable passage from a Jewish tract, entitled, "*Nizzachon Vetus*," published in 1680, and written, as the editor with great probability points out, in the 12th century. In this tract are many mistakes concerning our Christian Scriptures, and much unworthy abuse and groundless calumny; but such arguments are urged against certain supposed doctrines of the gospel as cannot be confuted. A believer in a trinity in unity would not find it easy to make a satisfactory reply to the following passage, particularly to the Jew's inquiry, who was all the time in heaven, and who it was that governed the world, when God was three days dead in the sepulchre? *Nizzachon Vetus*, p. 152.

"Amplius quæram aliquid ex te, mi christiane; agedum, responde mihi. Tu affirmas filium natum esse ex visceribus Mariæ; dic dum igitur, num Pater et filius immundus juxta cum filio, an vero solus filius in ventre delituerit? Si dicas solum ibi fuisse filium, quæso annon ipsa se mutuo destruent verba tua? Cum contendas divinitatis personas nulla unquam ratione à se invicem posse divelli. Quod si dicas tres in utero extitisse atque ibi fuisse nutritos, necesse est concedas, quod etiam tres cum hominibus versati sunt, ac tres fuerint suspensi. Quis vero toto illo tempore in cœlis erat? Quo-

niam divisionem nullam admittunt. Quis item per id triduum, quo sepulti erant, orbem gubernabat, cum nemo ex iis aut in cœlo aut in terris degeret?"

"I will ask another question of you, O Christian, come, answer me. You assert that the Son was born of Mary, tell me then, whether the Father and the unclean Son," by this strange expression I suppose is meant the Spirit or Holy Ghost, "together with the Son, or was the Son alone in the womb? If you say that the Son only was there, do not your assertions contradict each other, since you say, that the persons of the Deity cannot in any manner be separated? But if you say that the three were in the womb, and were together nourished there, you must grant that the three were all among men, and that all the three were hanged upon the cross. But who was in heaven all that time, since they cannot be divided? Who also, during the three days during which they were buried, governed the world, since no one of them was alive either in heaven or on earth?"

T. C. H.

London,

Jan. 16, 1818.

SIR,

IT cannot have escaped the observation of any persons who are accustomed to read with attention the periodical and other publications of the *assumed* orthodox writers in the present day, how frequently and earnestly they endeavour to inculcate on their readers, that Unitarianism is perpetually on the decline: nor will those who have perused the popular discourses of Dr. Chalmers "*On the Christian Revelation*," viewed in connexion with the *Modern Astronomy*," have forgotten the remark in the preface of that work, concerning Sir Isaac Newton, of his abetting "the leading doctrine of a sect, or a system, which has now nearly dwindled away from public observation."

The Eclectic Review has commenced its labours for the present year, with a long and rather elaborate critique on "*The Geneva Catechism*;" prepared by the Pastors of Geneva, for the use of the Swiss and French Protestant Churches," and a work entitled, "*Considérations sur la Divinité de Jesus Christ; par Henry Louis Empaytar, Genevois*;" in which the writer, in a



mixed tone of sorrow and of anger, has poured forth his lamentation over the alarming defection of the reformed churches of France and Germany from what he considers the peculiar doctrines of revelation. It is curious to observe in a work, which has not been backward to unite in the assertion before referred to, that Unitarianism was not only decaying, "but ready to vanish away," the acknowledgment of the fact that at Geneva, more especially, whose "church was once the glory of the Reformation," even there it is, "that during eighty years, Arianism and Socinianism have been gaining ground." "The fact to which we have adverted," says the Reviewer, p. 4, "stands, unhappily, in no need of verification, and it is one in which no Protestant, by whatever ordination he may hold, ought to feel himself otherwise than personally concerned, that there has taken place, to a most alarming extent, a tacit or more open abandonment of the doctrines of the Reformation, among the reformed churches of France and Germany. The poison of infidelity has, indeed, tainted the sources of instruction, and has thus insinuated itself through every vein of society. Deism, either in the garb of infidel philosophy; or disguised under the specious form of *Socinianized Christianity*, is found serving at the altar, presiding in the college, and lecturing from the professor's chair!!"

A charge is afterwards alleged against the pastors of Geneva, that for a long time they endeavoured to evade the accusation of their *supposed* sentiments being at variance with their public formularies, and prudently refrained "from the open promulgation of opposite doctrines." This new Genevese Catechism, however, (it proceeds,) "is a proof, that the lamentable period has arrived, when it is found no longer expedient to conceal the deterioration of religious sentiment, or to submit to the restraints of the *antiquated phraseology of orthodoxy*. 'In the New Genevese Catechism,' remark our English Socinians, 'there is not only no exposition or defence of the doctrine of the Trinity, but not even an allusion to it. The Genevese pastors,' it is added, 'are on the high road of reformation, and their next Catechism may not merely omit, but openly expose pre-

tended orthodoxy.'\*" Such is the language of triumph held by the *illuminés* of our own country, in reference to the very circumstances, the anticipation of which gave so much satisfaction to the patriarch of Ferney, and his worthy compeers."

A few quotations from the Catechism are then given, and its difference in some points from that of Ostervald briefly noticed; and finally, it is represented as an "extremely curious publication, if they may describe as a literary curiosity so lamentable a specimen of the perverted ingenuity of human wisdom. The best idea of it will be given (says the writer) by presenting a summary of its contents in a negative form, from which it will be fully seen, that Unitarianism consists in *not* believing." P. 9.

The following is the negative summary of the Reviewer: "It does *not* teach the necessity of revelation; it does *not* teach the fall of man, or the depraved condition of his nature; it does *not* teach the necessity of a propitiatory sacrifice for sin, or the love of the Father in sending his only-begotten Son into the world to become that sacrifice for us; it does *not* teach the eternity and Deity of that Word who became flesh, by whom all things were made, and who upholdeth them by his power; it does *not* teach that we are washed from our sins in his blood, justified by his righteousness alone, and accepted through his advocacy with the Father; it does *not* teach us supreme love to Jesus Christ; it does *not* teach the proper Deity of the Holy Spirit; it does *not* teach that a spiritual change must take place in the human soul, in order to turn the heart to the love of God, nor that divine influence is alone adequate to effect that change, nor that the sanctification of the soul is by the operation of the Holy Spirit, nor that all our spiritual strength and sufficiency are to be derived, through faith, from Christ alone: it omits, in fact, every doctrine peculiar to revelation; every doctrine by which the faith of the Reformers was characterized; every doctrine which gives to christian morality its superiority in point of adequate motive and spirituality of requirement; and every doc-

---

\* Mon. Repos. April, 1816, p. 235.

trine which constitutes the solid basis of a sinner's hope." Pp. 9, 10.

It is quite unnecessary to point out to your readers the unfairness (to use no stronger term) of some of the charges contained in the above sweeping clause of the Eclectic Reviewer; it is, however, well calculated to deter timid persons, who pay implicit deference to the assertions of the writers in that work, from an impartial and candid examination of the disputed subjects; though I presume not to say that such was the intention of the writer of the above article.

The displeasure of the Reviewer is further excited against "the venerable company of the pastors of the Church of Geneva," that, in order to carry into effect "the extirpation of the Christian doctrine," the confession of faith formerly in use has disappeared; and "the Liturgy, as well as the venerable translation of the Holy Scriptures, has undergone correspondent *improvements*." It is also stated, that, "out of a hundred and ninety-seven printed sermons, preached by the pastors of the Genevese Church during the last fifty years, not a single one is to be found, which contains a confession of belief in the divinity of Christ." The last quotation which I shall give from this article, is the passage in which the writer bewails the *prostrate* state of the Church of Geneva. "With solemn, with deeply solemn feelings does it become us to contemplate this melancholy crisis of a church once esteemed as the mother church of the Reformation, to which the other reformed churches did not scruple to give the title of Protestant Rome, now the very hold of infidelity. To these feelings, if suffered to take their natural direction, how beautifully appropriate were the language of invocation employed by Milton: 'Thou, therefore, that sittest in light and glory unapproachable, Parent of angels and men! Next thee, I implore, omnipotent King, Redeemer of that lost remnant whose nature thou didst assume, ineffable and everlasting love! And thou, the third subsistence of Divine infinitude, illuminating Spirit, the joy and solace of created things! *One Tripersonal Godhead!* look upon this thy poor and almost expiring church, and leave her not thus a prey.'" Pp. 11, 12. It may appear strange to your readers, after

perusing the above, to be informed that in the review of another article, at p. 59 of this same number of the Eclectic Review, an attack is made on the devotions of Socinians, in which it is stated to be manifest and flagrant, "that these persons find it impossible to express *their* views, and *their* feelings, in the terms which sufficed to,—which were selected as the most significant from the stores of a very copious language, by the first teachers of Christianity." I fear not contradiction in avowing my firm conviction that the very reverse of the above charge is the fact. The phrase, *ONE TRIPERSONAL GODHEAD!* and the usual doxologies of Trinitarians, are expressions, "which not only do not occur in scripture, but are manifestly of a different stamp from any thing we there meet with: not only the words are not the same; the *style* is not the same; the direct impression produced by them, is of a different kind." It is the excellence, to me it is a proof of the truth, of Unitarianism, that not only its devotional exercises, but its doctrines, may be clearly expressed in the very words of scripture, and that no other form of composition can add to the clearness and force with which they are therein contained; while, on the other hand, the popular creeds of the present day, the productions of synods, councils and assemblies, are full of terms, such as Tri-unity, Essence and Substance, Consubstantiality, Hypostatic Union, &c. which are entirely unknown to the sacred Scriptures. I take the liberty, further, to insert the following extract from a letter of the late venerable Bishop of Landaff, to the Rev. C. Buchanan, on "the expediency of an Ecclesiastical Establishment for British India," contained in the posthumous Memoirs recently published, as it forms a striking comment on the article to which I have here called your attention.

"Whether it be a christian duty to attempt, by *lenient* methods, to propagate the Christian religion among Pagans and Mahometans, can be doubted I think by few; but whether any attempt will be attended with much success till Christianity is *purified from its corruptions*, and the lives of Christians are rendered correspondent to their christian profession, may

be doubted by many. The morality of our holy religion is so salutary to civil society; its promise of a future state so consolatory to individuals; its precepts are so suited to the deductions of the most enlightened reason, that it must finally prevail throughout the world. *Some have thought that Christianity is losing ground in Christendom; I am of a different opinion. Some ascetic doctrines of Christianity derived from Rome and Geneva are losing ground; some unchristian practices springing from bigotry, intolerance, self-sufficiency of opinion, and uncharitableness of judgment, are losing ground; but a belief in Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the world, as the author of eternal life to all who obey his gospel, is more and more confirmed every day in the minds of men of eminence and condition, not only in this but in every other christian country. From this praise, I am not disposed to exclude even France itself, notwithstanding the temporary apostacy of its philosophers from every degree of religious faith. The Christian religion has ever operated to the production of piety, benevolence, self-government and a love of virtue among individuals in every place where it has been established; and it will every where operate more powerfully, as it is received with a more firm assurance of its truth, as it is better understood; for when it is properly understood, it will be freed from the pollutions of superstition and fanaticism amongst the hearers, and from ambition, domination and secularity amongst the teachers.*

To the learning and talent which are frequently displayed in the Eclectic Review, I pay a willing testimony: their uniform defence of the right of private judgment in religious matters, and of civil and religious liberty to all, entitle them to general approbation; but it would be well for them at times to "bear their faculties" more meekly, and to recollect that they do not possess *all* the wisdom of the age; that *their* opinions are not *infallible*; that men of equal genius, piety and learning with themselves, differ widely from them as to what doctrines *really* constitute evangelical truth; and that what *they* consider *orthodoxy* is not necessarily synonymous with *Christianity*. Nor would it diminish the

value or reputation of their work, to study more correctness in the terms they apply to others, and to remember that the epithet *Socinian*, however convenient it may be as a term of reproach, cannot in justice be applied to a body of Christians, (I say not whether large or small,) who disagree with that eminent Reformer on a subject of no less importance, than whether a created being, however exalted, be or be not a proper object of religious adoration.

J. C.

SIR,

Feb. 12, 1818.

THE interesting article on the state of Unitarianism at Geneva from your Correspondent P. T. L., which appeared in the last Number of the Monthly Repository, [p. 22,] must have been perused with peculiar pleasure by your numerous readers. It is certainly a very singular fact, that the hot-bed of Calvinism should have brought forth such an abundant crop of the pure fruits of the gospel; a fact, which, it is hoped, will convey many lessons of useful instruction both to the Trinitarian and the Unitarian. To the former it may present a powerful motive to the careful re-examination of the articles of his creed, and to the exercise of charity towards those who differ from him: to the latter, it will afford an additional evidence of the spiritual energy of the sublime and animating doctrines of his religion, and fresh encouragement to endeavour to accelerate their progress with redoubled confidence and zeal.

These beneficial consequences, Mr. Editor, every consistent believer in the absolute unity and supremacy of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, will rejoice to anticipate from the present state of religious knowledge at Geneva. But that it will enable us, as P. T. L. seems disposed to believe, to decide, whether the *direct* or *indirect* method of communicating truth to the mind be most desirable, is not, I imagine, equally apparent. For, though we suppose that the Genevan pastors have never proceeded beyond the *indirect method*, and believe that their success is no less than it has been represented; still I apprehend it would be difficult to prove from hence, that they have



adopted the most effectual means of extending the blessings of Unitarian Christianity. The ministers of the gospel who cautiously abstain from preaching the peculiarities of Trinitarianism, and merely inculcate the fundamental articles of religion, in which all professing Christians are agreed, cannot certainly be charged with disseminating error; but until human nature be changed, they cannot be supposed to render it every assistance in their power, in its attempts to discover and enjoy the truth. All discoveries whatever, whether of a moral or a physical nature, which are not the effect of mere accident, result from *comparison*; and every idea we can entertain proceeds from the same source. Had we never experienced pain, we could have had no knowledge of pleasurable sensations. Had we never experienced the effects of sin, we could have felt no admiration and love of virtue. Did we not know the tendency of error, we could not have formed the least idea of the value of truth. In short, the existence of what is denominated physical and moral evil is absolutely necessary to apprise us of the existence and nature of good. This constitution of nature, which has been established by the wisest and best of Beings, would lead us to infer, *a priori*, that no Unitarian minister, wherever he may reside, whether in Geneva or in London, whether in the town or in the country, can, to the extent of his power, instruct his hearers in the sublimity and value of truth, unless he bring it into one view with the errors which have falsely assumed its name, and been propagated in its stead. It has indeed been said, that it is the duty of the minister simply to state the truth, and to *leave the people to make the comparison*; and this might be a little plausible, were it evident to all his hearers that the doctrines which he inculcates are directly opposite to what he regards as erroneous. But so far is this from being the case, when he is addressing a Trinitarian audience, that as long as he preaches nothing but “negative Antitrinitarianism,” they can assent to every syllable he advances, and remain in the peaceful possession of all their pernicious errors and absurdities. And even when he is called to officiate

before a mixed congregation of our own denomination, he will find that the most immediate and lasting impression will be made, if he unreservedly expose the nature and tendency of error and iniquity, by contrasting them with the purity and excellence of evangelical truth and righteousness.

But, Sir, independent of this presumptive reasoning, I was not aware that Unitarianism had made such progress at Geneva, as decidedly to recommend that negative method of diffusing the truth by which it is stated to have been established there. The Genevan pastors have been indirectly undermining Trinitarianism; they have never defended its doctrines, but have uniformly insisted upon the fundamental and universally believed truths of religion for more than *two hundred years*: and wonderful indeed would have been the effect had they not succeeded in establishing such principles in the minds of the people, as would disqualify them for a belief in the horrors of Calvinism. But, Sir, had they been influenced by the spirit of a Paul or a Priestley, or had they remembered the zeal of their celebrated predecessor, who not only assisted in establishing the principles of the Reformation in their own city, but most successfully co-operated in more completely disseminating them in France, Italy, Germany, England and Scotland: in less than one third of two centuries they might, in all probability, have become a kind of centre sun in the hemisphere of Christian churches, and have illuminated the whole world with the rays of Unitarian truth.

Nor is it, perhaps, quite correct to say that they have never gone beyond what is now called the indirect method of diffusing the truth. They have been *publicly and repeatedly prohibited*, or have voluntarily *prohibited themselves* from preaching upon the peculiar doctrines of Trinitarianism. This is rather more than negative proceeding, and would doubtless lead to a pretty good understanding of their sentiments. At least, I imagine that one of our English bishops would look in vain for preferment, if, in a charge to the clergy of his diocese, he should strictly prohibit them from preaching,

“1. *On the manner in which the*

*Divine Nature is united in the Person of Jesus Christ.*

*"2. On Original Sin.*

*"3. On the manner in which Grace operates, or on effectual Grace.*

*"4. On Predestination."*

These ideas, Mr. Editor, which occurred to me when reading that part of P. T. L.'s letter, which appears to recommend the "indirect method of insinuating truth into the mind," would not have been intruded upon your notice, had I not afterwards found the same plan of procedure recommended in *The Christian's Survey of the Political World*, [p. 78,] though truly from a very different motive. The writer of that article, in his anxiety to preserve us from the lash of the "common law," would recommend us to *contend for the faith once delivered to the saints*, in such a manner that we cannot "incur the censures even of the Attorney-general"! This is certainly a kind of appeal to the feelings to which Unitarians are now not much accustomed. Most probably it has been suggested by the pains and penalties that were inflicted upon Mr. John Wright for the crime of blasphemy; or by the evils brought upon our cause by the very great degree of attention which he was the means of exciting to our sentiments and characters. Be it so. I am, however, afraid it will not produce the desired effect even upon *him*, should it travel across the Atlantic, much less upon those obstinate spirits among us who seemed to rejoice in the proceedings that were instituted against him. No, Sir, the times are gone by when either the frowns or tyranny of civil authority shall influence the conduct of the faithful ministers and servants of Christ. We will "render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, but unto God the things that are God's." We will *not fear them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do: but I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: fear Him, who after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you fear Him.*

The plain and direct method of defending and propagating truth, appears to me to be of too much importance to be neglected, whatever may be the threats of men in authority, or the feelings of the ignorant and misin-

formed. It recommends itself by innumerable considerations, which it would be impossible to crowd into the space of a single letter. But it is enough to believe that it is not only best suited to the constitution of human nature, and consistent with what we know of the plans of the Divine government, but *authorized*, if not *required*, by the example of Christ and his apostles.

LOUDONIANUS.

Clifton,

March 14, 1818.

SIR,

IN the Monthly Repository for February, [p. 112,] you have inserted a communication from Mrs. Cappe, containing extracts from a letter addressed to her by some unknown friend, upon the subject of my renunciation of Unitarianism. Had the source of this communication been less respectable, I should certainly have been tempted to believe that the letter in question had been a mere fabrication; for, whatever be the kindness of motive by which the writer was actuated, the information which Mrs. Cappe has quoted from it is, in every respect, completely erroneous. No such conversations as are there recorded, or any similar to them, ever took place between my departed friend and myself. It is true, that he recommended to my careful perusal the *whole*, (not the chapters so particularly enumerated in the article alluded to,) of the Gospel of St. John; but I never heard one of the observations, by which this recommendation is stated to have been accompanied, drop from his lips. Neither was my conviction of the truths which I have embraced, effected by the first verse of the fourteenth chapter of that Evangelist, or by any other individual verse, although the fact is so circumstantially stated. You will, I hope, do me the justice to insert these remarks in your next Number.

J. E. STOCK.

SIR,

March 15, 1818.

THE correspondence of the Unitarian Society with the native Unitarian Christians at Madras, may lead to important results. The missionaries will probably take alarm at this incursion of heresy into their domain. They will expect now to be

watched, and, if they practise any of the *fraudes piæ*, to be exposed. Can any of your readers tell whether in translating the New Testament into the Oriental Dialects, they translate from the Received Text, and how they deal with 1 John v. 7, 8; Acts xx. 28; 1 Tim. iii. 16, and other corrupted passages?

R. B.

*Mr. Wright in Reply to Simplex, on the Inefficacy of Unitarianism for Conversion.*

Colchester,

February 5, 1818.

SIR,  
THE article in the last Number of the Repository, [p. 32,] on the *Inefficacy of Unitarianism for Conversion*, signed *Simplex*, appears to me to require some reply; as, though it contains the mere opinion of the writer unsupported by either facts or argument, it may lead some readers to wrong conceptions of the tendency of the Unitarian doctrine, and of the effects actually produced by the promulgation of it. If theological controversialists would be careful to make themselves well acquainted with the subjects on which they write, before they communicate their thoughts to the public, and to express themselves clearly, in unambiguous language, much misconception and needless discussion would be avoided. I am led to make this remark by the perusal of your Correspondent's letter. He seems to have very incorrect views of the subject on which he has written, and applies terms so vaguely as to leave his precise meaning uncertain. The chief difficulty I feel in replying to his assertions, arises from, after several times reading his paper, my being doubtful of the precise ideas he meant to convey by some of his expressions.

If your Correspondent has "for a considerable time past been deeply attentive to the various conversionary efforts" of Unitarians, "and from minute observation of the result of those efforts," is "warranted in the conclusion, that there is some radical deficiency in the" Unitarian system; he ought to have known that neither the members nor agents of the Unitarian Fund Society are exclusively what he would call Socinians; that according to the rules of that institution, adopted from its origin, all who

maintain the exclusive Deity and divine worship of the one God the Father, are included under the name *Unitarians*: he ought also to have known that the name *Socinians* is not only rejected by, but is inapplicable to the body of Christians to whom he refers in his letter: yet he applies it to them at large. I know of no Christians, in any part of this kingdom, to whom the name *Socinians* is applicable. So long as this nickname is given to us, whether by friend or enemy, we ought to protest against it.

From your Correspondent's remarks, I suspect that he is neither so well acquainted with either the doctrines or affairs of Unitarians as he assumes to be. Why does he apply the term *redemption* to the more popular doctrines? Can he, after "deep attention," and "minute observation," "for a considerable time past," be ignorant that Unitarians maintain, and that their missionaries every where preach, christian redemption, though not the falsely reputed orthodox views of it? What can he mean by making the remark, "To convert sinners without a Saviour,—σωτηρ—*Salutifer RESTORER*—seems a hopeless effort"? Does he mean to charge Unitarians with attempting to convert sinners without preaching a Saviour or Restorer? If so, let him bring some proof to support so serious a charge. So far as my knowledge of the matter extends, Unitarian missionaries preach that the living God is the Saviour of all men, but especially of them that believe, and testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world. I wish *Simplex* had pointed out distinctly what he thinks to be the "radical deficiency" in the Unitarian views. Probably it may be some unscriptural, but reputed orthodox dogma; it may possibly be something which Unitarians do actually believe and teach, though he is ignorant of it. If he write again, I will thank him to state plainly wherein he supposes the deficiency to consist. I will thank him also to say what meaning he gives to the ambiguous phrase "atoning Saviour." If he only means a Saviour by whom God reconciles the world unto himself, then Unitarians do not exclude from their doctrines such a Saviour; but if he means a Saviour who reconciled God



to the world, it is readily admitted they preach not such an one, nor do they think the apostles did.

I now proceed to what appears to me the principal thing your Correspondent had in view in writing, which, indeed, he has throughout assumed, and endeavoured to confirm by taking for granted what is not true, and by a false statement of the circumstances to which he alludes. The principle assumed throughout his letter is, "The practical inefficacy of (what are called) Unitarian doctrines for the purposes of conversion." I shall not imitate your Correspondent by merely assuming the contrary, and asserting, as a confirmation of it, my full conviction, arising from many years' observation and experience, on a pretty large scale, of the practical efficacy of Unitarianism for the purposes of conversion. In this letter, however, I must content myself with stating the grounds on which the efficacy, or inefficacy, of Unitarianism should be argued, and on which I am convinced of and prepared to assert its efficacy. If, after I have done this, your Correspondent should think proper to reply, I hold myself engaged to proceed in the further discussion of the subject, which I think of considerable importance.

1. The efficacy of the doctrines preached by the apostles for the purposes of the conversion of sinners of all descriptions, will, on all hands, be admitted; and that we have a true and sufficient account of the doctrines which they preached, by which multitudes were converted, in the book of their Acts, will, I apprehend, be also granted. If then it can be shewn that Unitarian Missionaries (the persons whom I understand *Simplex* to have particularly in view) preach the same doctrines as the apostles preached, without mixing with them others of human invention, the efficacy of modern Unitarian doctrines for the purposes of conversion, will be proved; and if those who preach them fail of success, that failure must be attributed to other causes, not to the inefficacy of the doctrines themselves. I invite your Correspondent to meet me on this ground, and call upon him to shew what doctrines, or doctrine, the apostles preached which modern Unitarians do not preach. In the mean

time, I recommend to his attention the late Dr. Toulmin's excellent little book on the preaching of the Apostles.

2. The efficacy, or inefficacy, of the doctrines believed and taught by modern Unitarians, may be argued on the ground of what appears to be their natural tendency and genuine influence, so far as their tendency, and the influence they are calculated to have, can be judged of by a careful examination, and calm deliberate view of those doctrines, and their suitableness to man, to his moral and spiritual wants, and especially to him as guilty and polluted. On this ground, also, I invite your Correspondent to the discussion; and am willing to enter with him into an examination of the comparative efficacy of the reputed orthodox and Unitarian doctrines, on the ground of an impartial view of the doctrines themselves. It appears to me, that all doctrines must have a tendency, and be calculated to exert an influence, good or bad, and in different degrees; according to their real nature and import, though that tendency and influence may be counteracted, more or less, by a variety of causes: nor can the effects of doctrines visibly appear any further than they are understood and embraced. I also think, that the same powers of mind which enable us to distinguish true from false doctrines, and to understand their real import, qualify us, by an impartial examination, to form a judgment of their tendency, and the influence they are calculated to have on those who can be brought seriously to attend to them.

3. Another ground of deciding on the efficacy, or inefficacy, of the doctrines taught by Unitarians, is, by attending to the effects they have actually produced; but in deciding on this ground, we ought to take a large view of the subject, and not confine our observations to any particular period or country; we ought also to take into view the peculiar circumstances in which Unitarians and Unitarianism have been placed: nor ought we to expect Unitarian doctrines to shew their efficacy where they have not been plainly preached as the doctrines of the gospel. I have but one objection to arguing the point on the ground of what has been done by Unitarian preaching during the last few years; it is that, to many persons,

it would seem too much like pharisaical boasting, and seem too ostentatious, to talk of our own labours and their success. I may be allowed to say, however, that I have known many persons who have been converted by Unitarian doctrines; some from unbelief to the faith of Jesus Christ, many from a state of ignorance to the true knowledge of God, many from error and superstition to the glorious light of the gospel, numbers from gloom and sorrow to joy and gladness, numbers from irreligion to religion, and from sin to righteousness. Should your Correspondent wish to continue the subject, I have no objection, should you, Sir, think proper to admit the communications.

R. WRIGHT.

P. S. I am truly glad Dr. Carpenter has brought the case of the Unitarian Church at Falmouth before the readers of the Repository [p. 28]. I most heartily concur in all that the Doctor has said of the importance and merits of that case. Having twice visited Cornwall as a Missionary, and spent part of several weeks at Falmouth, I speak with the more confidence on the subject, and the more earnestly recommend it to the attention and countenance of the Unitarian public. From what I know of the Unitarians in Falmouth and its neighbourhood, of the unwearied and disinterested exertions of Mr. Philp, their worthy minister, and of the importance of that town, as an Unitarian station, in a considerable district where the fields are already white to the harvest, I have no hesitation in saying, that no case has been brought before the friends of Unitarianism, nor I apprehend is likely to be brought before them, more deserving of their notice and aid, than that of the Unitarian Church at Falmouth.

*Unitarian Views of the Gospel defended.*

SIR,

Feb. 13, 1818.

THE absence of facts to disprove the opinion that there is nothing in Unitarianism calculated to "turn the idolater from his error, or convert the unreclaimed sinner," is thought by *Simplex* [p. 32], to warrant the conclusion that Unitarianism cannot be the religion of the gospel. This conclusion I take upon me to deny.

The apostles preached Jesus as "a

VOL. XIII.

2 B

man approved of God, by signs and wonders which God did by him;" as "the man by whom came the resurrection from the dead;" as "the man whom God had ordained to judge the world;" as "sent from God to bless us by turning away every man from his iniquities;" as "exalted by God to be a prince and a saviour, to give repentance to Israel and remission of sins." This was, then, found sufficient to reclaim the sinner, and convert the idolater; and this was Unitarianism.

The apostolical doctrine of "one God, and one mediator, the man Christ Jesus," continued during the first ages to "rivet the attachment of the common people;" and it was among *them* that the *Platonic* and *Gnostic* systems of a secondary Creator and a pre-existing Christ met with the strongest opposition. When the true traditions were interrupted, men fell into speculation, and resorted to their natural dispositions. The *satisfaction* for sin arose with other innovations of doctrine, and is no more an ancient tradition, than the notion started in the fourth century, of the pre-existence of Christ as a spirit like to God.

The principle of a satisfaction for sin is as old as the sacrifices of the idolaters, who passed their children through the fire to Moloch. "Shall I give my first-born for my transgression," says the prophet Micah, "the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath shewed thee, O man! what is good: and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" vi. 7, 8.

If the *unscriptural* doctrine of *atonement*, in the spurious modern sense, be the cause of missionary success, what does it prove but the rooted disposition in the human heart to worship the creature more than the Creator; and the strength of that opiate to salutary remorse and moral vigilance, a trust in the righteousness of another? The natural fruit of the atonement is Antinomianism; which supplants the moral law by the impunity or impeccable security of a new creatureship in Christ. If by ignorant perversion of the language and views of Scripture, the Antinomian Missionary "gains the hearts of the lower classes;" if "the common people hear him gladly," are we to believe that "here is Christ?"

When the savage drops down in the woods under the raving enthusiasm of the preacher, who announces a God appeased only by the innocent blood, are we to believe that "here is Christ"? When the groanings and prostrations of the sacrificing mass-priest have struck the heart through the senses; when the god-changed bread is elevated in the eyes of bowed adorers, are we to "say unto the cities of Israel, behold your God"?

*Simplex* affirms that the gospel is inexplicable as a whole, and incapable of a consistent explanation of all its parts, without "the grounding mainspring of the atonement."

The Papist will affirm that "the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is inexplicable and incapable of a consistent explanation without the grounding mainspring of *transubstantiation*."

The apostles spoke of *justification*, or a reprieve from the judgment of death, "which passed on all men, even upon those who had not sinned after the likeness of Adam's transgression;" they spoke of Christ undergoing this penalty, though sinless, and thus "being made sin for us," or for our sakes; that he might "become the first-fruits of them that slept," and "quicken those that were dead in trespasses and sins," by the life of his resurrection; thus "washing us from our sins in his blood:" they spoke of the *reconciliation* by which "they that had been enemies through wicked works were reconciled to God;" which was received through Christ; which was declared by him, as from a propitiatory or mercy-seat, set forth by God: but they said nothing of dying incarnate gods, or dying incarnate angels, or of an interposing Saviour: they said nothing of *satisfaction*; they said nothing of *atonement*. If the gospel be, therefore, inexplicable, is it not so from its incongruity with pre-conceived systems of error and superstition? But it is said, "to convert sinners without a Saviour, σωτηρ, salutifer, restorer, seems a hopeless effort."

Where has *Simplex* heard or found that Humanitarians\* discard from their

preaching the doctrine of a *Saviour*? It is the title of him who says of himself, "I am God; and besides me there is no Saviour:" of him "who blots out our iniquities for his own sake, and will not remember our sins;" of him who "saved us according to his mercy:" "the Lord that bought us; ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΣ; that purchased us to himself from the power of sin. If the people cannot yet receive this, it is because "they hear indeed, but understand not; and see indeed, but perceive not."

The Humanitarian worshiper of "the only wise God our Saviour," is not discouraged by the less specious and less noisy spread of the restored apostolic faith. "Many have run to and fro, and knowledge has been increased." It is not possible that primitive Christianity can receive a fair and patient hearing, till the Bible shall be studied without a reference to human systems, and till the people be persuaded to think kindly of God.

EBLON.

Liverpool,

SIR,

January 28, 1818.

THE well-known fact that many chapels which originally belonged to the old Dissenters, have, from various causes, been lost to that connexion, and in many instances become the property of other denominations of Christians, has induced me, in my occasional rides across the country, to inquire into the state of the remaining places of worship in that interest. Passing a few weeks ago through Macclesfield, I was sorry to learn that the trust-deed belonging to the chapel in Back Street, now, I believe, called King Edward Street, had not been renewed at the time it ought to have been. I believe the only remaining trustee, who in course holds the deed, is a very highly respected gentleman of that congregation whose property adjoins, and in fact, through whose property the only road to the chapel lies, and to whom I consider an application only is necessary, to have the

\* I have chosen this word in deference to the scruples of *Simplex*, who wishes to vindicate the title of *Unitarian* to the assertors of the super-angelic scheme with

the atonement. I shall not inquire how far they who formally acknowledge the unity of God's essence, and his claim to undivided worship, yet divide his attributes, are entitled in strictness to be called *Unitarians*,



deed renewed, and a new set of trustees appointed. I wish to ask you, Mr. Editor, from whom the application ought to come? Perhaps a Repository containing this letter, sent to the respectable minister who has, I understand, long officiated there, might be sufficient as I conceive; although, from the peculiar circumstances of the case, he may have been prevented by motives of delicacy from naming it, this public notice of it will be a sufficient sanction for his now doing so, and enable him to transmit to his successor a chapel as completely the property of the old Dissenting interest, as it was when he first entered it, which, I humbly submit, it is his duty to do.

A CONSTANT READER.

*Letters by Mr. Marsom in Reply to Mr. Wardlaw's Arguments for the Deity of the Holy Spirit.*

LETTER III.

SIR,

March 5, 1818.

**B**UT we proceed to consider the arguments of Mr. Wardlaw, founded on other passages of Scripture, in support of his hypothesis. The first of these is Acts xiii. 2, 4: "As they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Spirit said, Separate me (to me, or for me) Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them. So they being sent forth by the Holy Spirit, departed unto Seleucia." His remark on these words is as follows:

"Surely no words could convey the idea of personality more clearly and explicitly than these. The Holy Spirit calls Barnabas and Saul to a particular work; and commands others to set them apart to that work. They are accordingly set apart for him; and they are then sent forth by him."

On this passage I observe, first, that when the Holy Spirit is here said to speak, that this cannot be understood of the Holy Spirit personally, but must be understood of its speaking by the instrumentality of some proper person. The *Holy Spirit said*: how did the Holy Spirit say this? Undoubtedly by the mouth of one of the prophets then present; for it will not be pretended that the voice of the Holy Spirit was ever heard personally speaking, as the voice of Jehovah is said to have been heard by the Israelites at Mount Sinai. Besides the noun

*Spirit*, as we have seen, is not a personal name, and therefore it cannot be designed to represent a person, or to convey the idea of personality. The Holy Spirit is never represented as speaking *individually*, but always as speaking either *by the mouth* of Isaiah or Jeremiah, or some other prophet. Here, therefore, it evidently means no more than that the person uttering these words, spake them under the influence of an immediate Divine inspiration, as the old prophets are said by Peter to have spoken as they were moved by the Holy Spirit: and the writer to the Hebrews tells us, that it was God that spake by those prophets, (not *God the Holy Ghost*, but *God the Father*,) who hath, as it is added, in these last days spoken to us by *his Son*. Will it be contended, that the words in question were uttered by two distinct individual persons, first, distinctly by the Holy Spirit, and then by an inspired prophet, and that those present distinctly heard the two voices? No one, I suppose, would venture to adopt so strange a position, and if any one were to adopt it, most certain it is, that in support of it no evidence could be adduced. They must, then, have been the words of one individual person, and that person could not be the Holy Spirit, unless he appeared personally amongst them, at least by an *audible voice* which they must have heard, and which would have indicated a personal presence. If when the Scriptures use the expressions, "the Holy Spirit spake," or, "the Holy Spirit said," it means, that it did so personally, (as it must, if the ascription of these actions to it prove its personality,) it would set aside as unnecessary the inspiration of the prophets, both of the Old and New Testament; for what necessity could there be to inspire them to deliver that which the Holy Spirit himself personally delivered? But if the words under consideration were spoken by a prophet, they were not spoken personally by the Holy Spirit, and can only be ascribed to it, as that by which that prophet was inspired, and by the *motion* of which he spake.

Secondly, on the words, "Separate me, (or to me,) Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them: So they being sent forth by the Holy Spirit, departed," &c. I observe,

that although it must be admitted that the pronouns contained in it are of the masculine gender, yet it does not follow that those pronouns refer to the Spirit, and are a proof of its personality.

It is a well-known rule, that all pronouns and verbs must have an antecedent noun, either *implied* or *expressed*, agreeing with them, and that antecedent noun may be the immediately preceding, or a more remote one. Masculine pronouns cannot agree with neuter nouns, nor neuter pronouns with masculine nouns. So uniform is the observance of this rule in the New Testament, that a learned writer,\* finding in our present Greek Testaments, in Ephes. i. 14, the masculine pronoun *ὃς*, *who*, following the neuter noun *Spirit*, in the end of the 13th verse, says, (I cite from memory, not having access to the work,) that if the pronoun refers to the Spirit, the original reading must have been *ὃ*, *which*, and not *ὃς*, *who*, but he says, if *ὃς* be the true reading, then the antecedent must be *Χριστῷ*, *Christ*, in the 12th verse. That pronouns have not only remote antecedents, but that they are sometimes *implied* only, and not expressed, will appear from the following instance, 1 John iii. 5: "And ye know that *he* was manifested to take away our sins, and in *him* is no sin;" as also the pronouns *he* and *him*, in verse the second. To these pronouns there is no antecedent in the connexion with which they can agree, except the noun *Father*, who we know cannot be intended in those words. The antecedent to those pronouns, therefore, which is implied, although not expressed in the context, must be *Christ*.

But in the case under consideration we are not under the necessity of appealing to an implied antecedent to the pronouns *I* and *me*; we have the antecedent noun agreeing with the pronouns, (which the noun *Spirit* does not,) in the word *Lord*: "And as they ministered to the *Lord*, and fasted, the *Holy Spirit* said, separate to *me*," that is to *me* the *Lord*. The Holy Spirit is the spirit of the Lord, his inspiration, his influence, by which

he, the Lord, to whom they ministered, made known his will respecting Barnabas and Saul to one of them, who declared it to the rest.

Respecting the expression, "whereunto I have called them," it may be observed, that the calling of persons to any office, or to the enjoyment of the blessings of the gospel, is always, in the New Testament, ascribed to God or to Jesus Christ, but never in any instance is it ascribed to the Holy Spirit. "It pleased *God*," says Paul, "who *called me* by his grace."\* And writing to the Romans, he addresses them as the *called* of Jesus Christ, and he exhorts the Thessalonians to walk worthy of *God*, "who," saith he, "hath *called* you to his kingdom and glory." "The *God* of all grace," says Peter, "hath *called* us unto his eternal glory by Christ Jesus."† These observations, I apprehend, are sufficient to shew, that the several personal pronouns, in these verses, cannot refer to the Spirit, who is not represented here as a personal agent, but as the spirit of a person, the spirit of the Lord by which he spake, and to whom those pronouns (which are in agreement with the noun *Lord*, but not with the noun *Spirit*) must be applied. And this interpretation is confirmed by an observation of Mr. Wardlaw, on the next passage, which he cites to prove the personality of the Spirit.

Acts xv. 28: "For it *seemed good* to the *Holy Spirit*, and to us, to lay upon you no other burden than these necessary things." "To speak," says he, "of any thing *seeming good* to *that influence itself*, is a great deal more than unnatural: it is nonsense. The *influence* was only the indication of the good pleasure of *him* whose *influence* it was. His *gifts* were the intimations of *his will*." Mr. Wardlaw, assuming the Holy Spirit to be a person, is in the habit of using the terms, the *influences of the Spirit*, his operations, his works, &c., but no such language is to be found in the Scriptures. The Holy Spirit is *itself* the *Spirit*, the *influence* of the Divine Being, by which his servants were inspired to know what was his good

\* Poli Synopsis.

\* Galatians i. 15.

† 1 Peter v. 10.

pleasure; it was, as, he expresses it, the *intimation* of *his* will whose influence it was. *It seemed good to the Holy Spirit*, therefore, evidently means nothing more than this, that it appeared to them to be agreeable to the *mind of God*, as well as to themselves, to lay no other burden upon them.

The next passage cited by Mr. Wardlaw on this subject, is Acts xvi. 6, 7: "Now, when they had gone throughout Phrygia, and the regions of Galatia, and were *forbidden of the Holy Spirit* to preach the word in Asia, after they were come to Mysia, they assayed to go into Bithynia: but *the Spirit suffered* them not." Now this can certainly mean nothing more than that they acted under, and were directed by the influence of immediate inspiration, in not preaching the word in Asia, and in not going to Bithynia; for, I suppose, no one will contend that the Spirit personally and verbally forbade the one and hindered the other. We are told in the following verses, that by the *call* of the Lord they endeavoured to go into Macedonia; but what was this *call*, not an audible voice, but they *gathered* from a *vision* that they were so called.

The next proof Mr. Wardlaw adduces\* in support of the personality of the Spirit, is by citing a number of passages where the Holy Spirit is represented as *speaking*. I shall cite one or two of them as a specimen of the rest.

Acts xxi. 11: "And when he (Agabus) was come unto us, he took Paul's girdle, and bound his own hands and feet, and said, '*Thus saith the Holy Spirit*, so shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle, and shall deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles.'" The person who spake these words was Agabus: were they spoken by two different persons? He does not say that he *heard* the Holy Spirit speak these words, or that they were at all *spoken to him*, but he represents the Holy Spirit as at that time *speaking by him*: "Thus saith the Holy Spirit," as much as if he had said, what I now say is not my own, it does not rest on my authority, it is what I am *inspired* to say, and it is that *inspiration speaking* in me.

Acts xxviii. 25: "And when they agreed not among themselves, they departed, after that Paul had spoken one word, 'Well spake the Holy Spirit, by Esaias the prophet, unto our fathers,'" &c. The words referred to are quoted from Isaiah vi. 9, 10, where they are expressly said to be spoken by the *Lord* to the prophet, verse 8: "*I heard the voice of the Lord*," says Isaiah, "saying, and he said, 'Go and tell this people, hear ye indeed, but understand not,'" &c. In John xii. 41, our Lord says they were spoken by *Esaias*. Having cited the words in the prophet, he adds, "These things said *Esaias*." The apostle referring to the same words, says, "Well spake the *Holy Spirit by Esaias* the prophet unto our fathers." Upon which I observe, that those words, in a strict and proper sense, could be spoken by one person only, and that person certainly could neither be Isaiah nor the Holy Spirit, for Isaiah himself says they were spoken by the *Lord*, that they were spoken to *him*, and that he heard them. "I heard the voice of the Lord, saying." And the close of the passage as cited in John, ("And I should heal them,") shews that our Lord understood them to be the words of God; nor is it any where recorded in the prophecy, that Isaiah really said these things to the Jewish fathers, any more than that he really made "the heart of that people *gross*," as he was commanded to do. If, then, the only speaker in this passage is the Lord, how, or in what sense, are they said to be spoken by Isaiah and by the Holy Spirit? The answer is obvious; they are ascribed to Isaiah, because they are contained in the prophecy which he wrote, and because Isaiah wrote those prophecies by inspiration: the Spirit, by which they were dictated, is represented as saying these things *by him*. So David says,\* "The Spirit of Jehovah spake by me, and *his word* (i. e. *Jehovah's word*) was in my tongue." For he adds, "The God of Israel *said*, the Rock of Israel spake to me." Thus, wherever the Spirit is said to speak *by a prophet*, (and it is never represented as speaking personally and independently of a prophet,) the speaker properly



and personally is God, by whose Spirit they spake, and to whom (as in the above passage) the personal pronouns must refer: hence we never read of their hearing the voice of the Holy Spirit, or of the word of the Spirit coming to them, because in every instance, (as we learn from Heb. i. 1,) he who spake by the prophets was God and God alone.

JOHN MARSOM.

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

No. CCCXXV.

*Philosophic Heresy.*

The readers of Dr. Chalmers's Theologico-Astronomical Lectures are aware how much the notion of other worlds being inhabited has interfered with orthodoxy. *Cadonici*, a canon of the cathedral of Cremona, published in 1760, a work which he entitles, *Theologico-Physical Refutation of the opinion of Derham, that the Planets are inhabited by rational Beings*. He sagely assumes that there are only two kinds of reasonable creatures, men and angels, and shews that there is no place in the other planets which either race could occupy. That men like ourselves could not live there is clear: besides, who should have transplanted them thither! The Devil! he could not. God! he would not. It is, therefore, proved that it is impossible that there should be men there.

No. CCCXXVI.

*Fellows' Oath, Trinity College, Cambridge.*

In the statutes given by Queen Elizabeth, of glorious memory, to Trinity College, in the University of Cambridge, (says Dr. Clarke, *Introd. to Scripture Doctrine*,) the following oath is appointed to be taken by every Fellow in the Chapel, before his admission: *I, N. N. do swear and promise in the presence of God, that I will heartily and steadfastly adhere to the true religion of Christ, and will prefer the authority of Holy Scripture before the opinions of men; that I will make the word of God the rule of my faith and practice, and look upon other things which are not proved out of the word of God, as human only;—that I will*

*readily, and with all my power, oppose doctrines contrary to the word of God; that in matters of religion, I will prefer truth before custom, what is written before what is not written, &c.*

No. CCCXXVII.

*Heretical Proverb.*

Amidst all the reproaches cast upon heretics and heresiarchs, they may comfort themselves that they have commonly escaped the charge of stupidity. Bayle, in his account of Arminius, says, that a proverb in France to denote a blockhead was, *He will brouch no heresies*. The converse of this has never been framed into the proverbial character of a man of genius: the most orthodox would account it an ambiguous compliment to a man's understanding to say of him, *He believes the Athanasian Creed*.

No. CCCXXVIII.

*Literature and Science in Turkey.*

The little proficiency made by the Turks in subjects of a mathematical, geographical and political nature, arises from the want of encouragement on the part of the government. Law and Theology alone occupy the attention of the students in the colleges, or *médressés*. *Acquisitions of knowledge are not discouraged by the Koran*. "The ink of the learned," said Mahomet, "and the blood of martyrs are of equal value in the sight of Heaven." But the general improvement of the empire has been retarded by the custom of confining within the walls of the Seraglio the hereditary princes of the Turkish throne, and thus secluding them from the world, and shutting out the means of acquiring knowledge. Literature seems to have met with more encouragement and protection from the Sultans of former ages. "Be the support of the faith and protector of the sciences," were among the last words of Osman the First, to his successor Orkhan. In the sermon entitled *Koutbe*, a divine benediction is implored on the orthodox Caliphs who were endowed with learning, virtue and sanctity.

There are thirty-five public libraries in Constantinople, none of them containing less than 1000 manuscripts; in many are found more than 5000. The collection in the two libraries of the Seraglio exceeds 15,000 volumes.

At the time when the Greeks were driven by their conquerors from Constantinople, the latter might certainly be ranked among barbarous and uninformed nations; but the Greeks of the nineteenth century are not warranted in applying the contemptuous expressions of their ancestors to the Turks of later times, who have cultivated some parts of literature, particularly those relating to their own history, with great success, and have, probably, more real merit than many of the Byzantine writers.

The use of the press was first introduced in Constantinople in the reign of Achmet the Third (in 1727); but in the interval of time which has since elapsed, the copies of few works of distinction and name have been multiplied by it. This is owing, according to the opinion of Sir William Jones,

to the difficulty of understanding the classical writings of the Turks, without more than a moderate knowledge of Persian and Arabic. Manuscript volumes are also preferred to printed works. The French were accustomed to send to them books published in oriental types, but only a small number was purchased. Characters formed in writing are considered as more pleasing to the eye, and as capable of being connected and combined in a more beautiful manner, than in printing. There are, it may be added, many hundred scribes and copyists, who would lose all means of support, if books could be circulated at a cheap rate by the press. *Memoirs relating to European and Asiatic Turkey; edited from Manuscript Journals, by Robert Walpole, M. A. 4to. 1817, pp. 24, 25.*

## BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

*On Philip. ii. 5—11.*

SIR, *March 10, 1818.*

**A**S Mr. [Dr.] Jones has totally misstated my argument, [p. 123,] (no doubt undesignedly,) his triumph over it must needs be a short one.

I have no where said, that “the phrase, *form of God*, means the majesty which *Jesus* might have displayed had he employed his miraculous powers for his own aggrandisement;” but that *the glory* of which he emptied himself, meant this: “Being in the form of God” he emptied himself, not of the form of God, but of the glory of it. The common version has, “made himself of no reputation;” and as the word *ἐκενώσε* will certainly bear this meaning, and it is in the spirit of the context, we should have less battling about *words* if it were retained. But “he must have been in the form of God, and in the form of a slave at one and the same time;” he most undoubtedly was so, but not in the same sense. He was in the form of God by actual derivation of power and commissioned authority; or, speaking *spiritually*: he was in the form of a slave to outward observation, and with reference to worldly circumstances, or *humanly* speaking. It would be merely quibbling about terms, to say that a man could not empty himself of that which he still re-

tained, for “empty himself” is plainly a metaphorical expression. If a king travel *incognito*, he divests himself of his dignity, though he still retains it; that is, he divests himself of it in one sense, and retains it in another; he declines the use or display of it; but the dignity is still attached to his person. The *Son of God* might be said to divest himself, not of the form of God, nor strictly of the attributes of that form or likeness, but of the use or assertion of them. The objection, therefore, that if miraculous power constituted the form of God, his divesting himself of this form is not consistent with fact, falls to the ground. *Christ* was in the form of *God*, or invested with peculiar majesty of power, in what respected the objects of his heavenly mission; but he emptied himself of the glory of it in what respected himself *personally*. When he cast out lunacy or raised the dead, he was visibly, and by virtue of operation, in the form of God: when he “had no where to lay his head,” he was still in the form of God, but *outwardly* in that of a slave: when he “was taken from prison and from judgment,” he was still in the form of God; but to outward eyes in that of a slave: he did not assume the glory of that form of God, which he would have done had he called upon his

*Father* for “legions of angels.” He *emptied himself* of it. He was in the likeness of *men*, or *other men*, as I have proved from Judges xvi. 7; and being found in fashion as a man, or a *common man*, he endured the sufferings of a malefactor.

The whole passage, viewed through this medium of interpretation, is in close dependent connexion; and it is a strong objection to the rendering of your Correspondent, that this continuity of argument and illustration is broken and disturbed by the introduction of foreign topics and remote allusions. “Being in the likeness of men, and *in structure proved to be a man*, he humbled himself.” The being found in the voluntary condition of a common man, or submitting to the sufferings of a common man, is an instance of self-humiliation; the having a proper human body is not in point or to the purpose. What has the introduction of the heresy of the *Phantomists* to do here? What possible connexion has it with the argument, to be told in the midst of exhortations to “have the same mind as was in *Jesus*,” that he was in corporeal structure, physically and properly a man? What possible relation has “the being found *in structure as a man*,” with efficacy of example?

Your Correspondent is even reduced for the support of his hypothesis, to change the drift and purpose of the apostle’s exhortation, and to keep out of sight that he was inculcating a lesson of humility, with which certainly Christ’s having a proper human body has nothing to do; though his descending into a human body from a higher state of existence, according to the *Gnostic* and *Platonic* systems, *might* be relevant. Your Correspondent, not, I am persuaded, with any disingenuous view, but from the pre-disposing bias of a favourite system, expounds the preceding words of the apostle thus: “Let each of you have in view, not his own interest only, but that of others;” though I cannot see how this makes for his supposition of refuting the *Docetæ* more than the received sense. Let the reader, however, look back to ver. 3, “Let nothing be done through strife or *vain glory*; but in *lowliness of mind* let each esteem other better than themselves:” which is followed

in ver. 5, with, “Let this mind be in you, which was in *Christ Jesus*;” and he may possibly be enabled to judge *who* are to be classed among the “mistaken expounders.”

It is assumed by your Correspondent, that the *transfiguration* and the *crucifixion* have a close connexion; but he has not attempted to meet the argument drawn from the *transfiguration of Moses* on mount *Sinai*. “The Jews,” he says, “expected their *Messiah* to continue immortal on the earth;” and the transfiguration, the symbol of *Christ’s* future glory, was, it seems, calculated to confirm the apostles in this belief; against which *Jesus* guarded them by prophetically directing their attention to his *crucifixion*. “The object of the transfiguration,” we are further told, “was to inculcate, on the one hand, the *evanescence* of *Moses* and the law, and the perpetuity of *Christ* and his gospel on the other.” The voice from the cloud, whence the splendour also came, might, indeed, do this; but it is a most unfortunate position that the splendour also was so intended, for *it vanished away*; while the countenance of *Moses* had continued to shine, even after he had descended, and while speaking to the people he “put a veil on his face.” *Jesus*, therefore, is supposed to say, “you perceive that my gospel will be *perpetual*, because the radiance which is the symbol of it is *evanescent*.”

As to the vanishing splendour being meant to shew that his earthly immortality was not intended, I can see no necessary link of connexion between visible splendour and immortality. If the Jews expected that their *Messiah* would be immortal, there is no reason to suppose that they expected him also to have a luminous body: it does not, therefore, appear why this persuasion of the disciples, if they had it, should have been confirmed by the visible irradiation of the person of *Jesus*. When “the skin of *Moses’s* face shone,” and continued to shine after his descent from the mount, the *Jews* drew no such inference respecting *Moses*; nor *any other* inference, than that he had stood in the presence of *God*, whose symbolical glory still rested upon him. If to be “in the form of *God*,” refer to the splendour on the Mount, and if it mean also, “to be immortal, and



live for ever," then visible splendour is made the symbol of the immortality of him on whom the splendour rests; and *Moses*, who was equally arrayed with personal glory, was in the same peculiar sense as *Christ* "in the form of God;" which he is no where said to be, but only *a God* in the general sense of a commissioned prophet. If to be immortal is to be in the form of God, all those who sleep in the dust will be equally "in the form of God," when they awake to immortality. But from the phrase, on which I have before remarked, and which your Correspondent repeats, of *Jesus* "assuming this divine and splendid form," it should seem that the splendour is not supposed to symbolize *future* glory only, but *previous* glory, and natural or essential immortality. This cannot consist with Scripture, which declares of the "Blessed and only Potentate," that "he alone hath immortality." He who "was dead and is alive," could not be immortal; for we have nothing to do with the heathen philosophy of dying *bodies* and surviving *men*.

Though the *Jews* expected their *Messiah* to be immortal, they expected him, as appears from *Justin's* dialogue with *Trypho*, to be also *a man*. They would have no idea of the *Christ*, or the Son of God, assuming a divine form, by his own will, and as his natural attribute. They never supposed that he would possess *two natures*; which, notwithstanding the decrees of councils to the contrary, can only mean *two persons*. *Jesus Christ*, with respect to his *nature*, was no other as the Son of God than he was as the Son of man, for he would otherwise be *two persons*; but the apostles tell us only of *one person*, "the man Christ Jesus;" who was "*called* the Son of the *Highest*," and the Son of Man; who is described in the prophetic visions of *Daniel*, as "brought in the clouds of heaven to the *Ancient of Days*," was one and the same with the *Son of God*, in all the qualities that constitute *one person*: he was not *two persons*, but *one*; the same in his whole identicalness of being with him who "was in the form of God;" "the image of the invisible God;" "the first-born of every creature;" not by likeness of *essence*, which would make him a *second God*; not by generation or production before the lower creatures;

but as the medium of the very word of God, the wisdom and power of the *Father*, and as the "first-begotten of the dead;" the prince of life, or leader to immortality. The *transfiguration*, therefore, revealed no proper essential glory, no pre-existent light which had been hidden under the veil of humanity, nor was it *assumed* by him who "could do nothing of himself." There are then no grounds for believing that the *crucifixion* was made an antitype to the *transfiguration*, for the purpose of refuting the *Gnostics*, and proving the *two natures* in the *one Christ*.

The question, Sir, is now sufficiently before your readers, and I take my leave of it. I cannot think that the new exposition of *Dr. Alexander* can be made tenable, even by the learning and ingenuity of *Mr. [Dr.] Jones*:

Si Pergama dextrâ  
Defendi possent etiam—hâc defensa fu-  
issent.

C. A. E.

SIR,

March 3, 1818.

SOME years since, I bought at an old book-stall, "*Syntaxis Græca—Johannis Posselii*," from which I copied the following, which may assist in removing the obscurity of Philip. ii. 6.

*Regula.*—

Græcis usitatum est conjungere nomen et verbum, ita ut verbo quasi neglecto, nomen reddendum sit, quoties hæc forma sermonis transfundenda est, ut

Ποιεῖσθαι φασιν—apparere

Ποιεῖσθαι μεταβαῖν—transire.

Quod si verbum pro verbo reddere velis, erit inepta versio, abhorrens à consuetudine linguæ Latinæ: facere apparitionem, facere transitionem.

Hanc Græcam consuetudinem loquendi imitatus est Paulus, Philip. ii. 6.

Hæc ad verbum expressa admodum obscura sonant: "Qui, cum esset in formâ Dei, non rapinam arbitratus est esse aequalem Deo." Sed sententia est—non rapuit æqualitatem Dei: posuit enim, ἡγησασθαι ἀρπαγμον pro ἀρπαζειν, rapere—similis phrasis extat Heb. x.

If you can have access to the Syntax, I think you will find more examples; at all events, you may insert the above in your most valuable Repository.

S. A. B.

## REVIEW.

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

ART. I.—*On the Origin and Vicissitudes of Literature, Science and Art, and their Influence on the present state of Society.—A Discourse delivered on the opening of the Liverpool Royal Institution, November 25, 1817.*  
By William Roscoe, Esq. 4to. pp. 79.

**T**HIS discourse has been called forth by the opening of another of those magnificent literary institutions, the establishment of which does so much honour to the town of Liverpool. We are referred to a document which does not accompany the discourse, for a detail of the objects and plans of the Royal Institution, but we can gather from what is mentioned of them, that they comprise public lectures on literature, science and morals, and even the patronage of the fine arts, which have not hitherto, we believe, been included among the objects which such associations as this have attempted to promote. The office of addressing an assemblage of persons who were devoting a portion of the wealth acquired by commerce to the encouragement of letters and the fine arts, could not have been more properly devolved than on the historian of the Medici, to whose influence and example his native town has been so much indebted for the literary taste by which it is characterized. Of the three topics which the title of this discourse announces for discussion, the first, the *origin* of literature, science and the arts, is the least fully discussed, as it is, indeed, the least capable of a statement upon positive and historical grounds. The second, their *vicissitudes* is treated more at large, and various hypotheses are stated, which ingenious men have proposed to account for the varieties and fluctuations which the history of literature has exhibited. That of the progressive degeneracy of mankind receives a brief but decisive confutation. In the following elaborate and splendid passage, Mr. R. considers the opposite opinion,—that of the inherent tendency of the human mind to improvement.

“ In direct opposition to this dispiriting idea of the declining condition of our nature, others have entertained an opinion,

that the human race is in a regular and progressive course of improvement, and that every age of the world is more enlightened than that which preceded it. As a proof of this, they point out the early state of each nation, and trace its progress from barbarism to civilization, from civilization to refinement. Instead of bowing down before the mighty names of antiquity, and acknowledging an inferiority of intellect, they pretend to avail themselves of the knowledge of former times, and suppose that by uniting with it the still more important discoveries of the moderns, the circle of knowledge is enlarged, and the conveniences, and even the elegancies of life rendered much more attainable than at any former period. Under these impressions, they scruple not to express their contempt for every former state of society, and their high opinion of that in which they have the happiness to live. Not, however, content with the eminence at which they have arrived, hope spreads her wings, and launches into the realms of conjecture; and the confidence of having done much, gives the assurance that we shall accomplish more. Without wishing to damp this ardour, it may be proper to observe, that if we are to judge from the experience of past ages, we shall scarcely be allowed to conclude that such regular, or progressive improvement, is the characteristic of the human race. If such were the fact, it must of course follow, that nations once civilized never again become retrograde, but must continue to rise, till they attain their highest degree of perfection. But where are the countries, in which letters and arts have made an uninterrupted progress? Or where have they, for any great length of time, been even stationary? Is India still the fountain of knowledge? And can she boast of her sages, the oracles of wisdom, who attract inquirers and disciples from distant regions? Is the condition of Egypt improved by the flight of three thousand years? Or have her pyramids been surpassed by the labours of subsequent times? What was Greece once? What is she now? Characterized in the first instance by whatever was bright in genius, rich in intellect, excellent in art;—in the latter, by whatever is degraded and servile in human nature. Contrast republican with papal Rome. Examine the names that grace the rolls of antiquity, from the first to the second Brutus, and ask, whether the inhabitants of modern Rome will be as well known at the distance of two thousand years, as their illustrious predecessors. Alas, the scene is changed! and for century after century

the peasant and the slave have trampled on the dust of heroes, as unconscious of their worth, as the cattle that crop the herbage on their remains. Such is the boasted improvement of the human race; such the permanency of knowledge in nations where she has once established her seat! The tree perishes; and the transplanted scions will, unless they be carefully fostered, experience in their turn a similar fate." Pp. 18—21.

To some of the questions which are here proposed, as if it were impossible to answer them otherwise than by a negative, we are disposed, nevertheless, to reply in the affirmative. We know no reason whatever for believing that India is not now the fountain of as much knowledge as she ever was, or that her sages are less wise and oracular than in the days of Pythagoras. It is true, indeed, that other nations resort to this fountain, not to drink of it in the pious belief that it rises from the centre of the earth, or descends from the forehead of Brahma, but with the unerring line of philosophical investigation, to detect its shallowness; yet the stream itself flows as copiously as in former times. The obligations of the Greeks to the oriental philosophy are very much overrated. What there is of Egyptian, Persian, or Indian in the Greek philosophy, is precisely what is the least valuable. Gratuitous theories of the origin of all things from this or the other element of matter, mystical allegories and fanciful analogies respecting the nature of God and of the soul, Metempsychosis, Pantheism, Idealism; these are the points of affinity between the Greek and Oriental doctrines; but the manly, practical philosophy of Socrates, the penetrating analysis of Aristotle, the systems of Zeno and Epicurus, which, though requiring to be tempered by a mixture of each other, and both to be completed by truths unknown to their founders, yet contain so much valuable elucidation of the motives of action and the rules of duty; all these are of native Grecian growth, and for these alone has posterity any obligations to own to the Greek philosophy. Again, we must express with great diffidence a contrary opinion to Mr. Roscoe's, on a point of Italian history; yet we cannot help thinking that the annals of papal Rome are far from exhibiting that intellectual inferiority to the times of the republic, which his argument

supposes. *Regere imperio populos* has been equally the object of pontiffs and of consuls; the motive of both about equally ambitious; the means chosen with about equal scrupulosity; but if the magnitude of the conception, and the powers of mind requisite for carrying it into execution, be compared, the subtle dominion by which papal Rome held the consciences of Europe in subjection, appears to us a far greater proof of intellectual power, than the triumphs of the Republic. When we hear of soldiers mounting guard with umbrellas under their arms, in a city which formerly sent out legions to conquer in the sands of Africa and the morasses of Germany, we are apt to infer a degeneracy as great in other respects as in military qualities; but the conclusion would be unfair under a government essentially unwarlike, and which uses soldiery only for purposes of state.

Before we can consent, with Mr. Roscoe, to "dismiss the idea that there is in the human mind an inherent tendency towards improvement," the conclusion which he draws from the facts mentioned in the extract, we must take the liberty of making some distinctions and limitations, which he would, probably, admit, although he has not stated them. To judge of the *tendencies of the mind*, we must consider it as detached from the influence of those external and adventitious circumstances, which make no part of its own nature, though they powerfully controul the operation of its powers. Now we do not recollect a single instance in the history of literature, in which it has degenerated, unless through the influence of bad social institutions, or foreign conquest. It does not, indeed, exhibit one scene of unvarying splendour; the highest powers of genius are only bestowed at intervals; extraordinary success leads to an imitation, which produces feebleness and inferiority; particular circumstances may encourage a disproportionate cultivation of some one faculty of mind, or department of literature, in particular periods; but these are no examples of retrogradation; let the mind be only left to itself, and after an interval, the length of which we cannot calculate, because we know not the law according to which intellectual power is distributed to mankind,



other poets, philosophers and historians arise, of equal merit with their predecessors. After producing Dante, Boccaccio and Petrarca, Italy seemed to labour under a sentence of barrenness till the age of Ariosto and Tasso, and again a long interval elapsed, to Metastasio and Alfieri. After Chaucer, no English poet of celebrity appeared till Spenser and Shakespeare: from the time of Pope till that of Southey and Scott and Moore and Byron, what a dearth of poetical genius our literature exhibited! Yet surely our national intellect was not retrograde. If the imaginative and creative part of literature thus disproves the tendency of the mind to remain stationary, those in which improvement is the result of the collection of facts, and the comparison and examination of ideas, prove its tendency to be progressive. We can, therefore, by no means admit Mr. R.'s position, except in this sense, "that the human mind, controuled as it is by circumstances, does not exhibit that uniform progression which might be expected from its own nature and powers." Even the limited concession thus made to the opponents of the doctrine of perfectibility must be still further reduced by the observation, that it is the tendency of literature itself to remedy those imperfections in social institutions, by which its progress has been retarded.

There still remains a formidable objection derived from the vicissitudes to which literature has been subjected in consequence of political revolutions; and the darkness which followed the downfall of the western empire, is commonly alleged as a most decisive instance of intellectual degeneracy. Various attempts have been made to evade the force of this objection. Frederic Schlegel, in his *Lectures on the History of Literature*, delivered at Vienna in 1812, expresses his opinion, that we exaggerate the barbarism of the dark ages. Madame de Staël, in her eloquent work on *Literature*, boldly denies the fact. "On compte dans l'histoire plus de dix siècles pendant lesquels l'on croit assez généralement que l'esprit humain a rétrogradé. Cette objection que je regarderois comme toute puissante si elle étoit fondée je la réfute d'une manière simple. Je ne pense pas que l'espèce humaine ait rétrogradé pendant cette époque; je

crois au contraire que des pas immenses ont été faits dans le cours de ces dix siècles et pour la propagation des lumières et pour le développement des facultés intellectuelles." Ch. viii. Vol. I. This immense progress appears to consist chiefly in the mixture of the people of the north with those of the south, the result of which has been an intellectual character, comprising the excellencies of both. We fear there is more fancy than truth in this favourite idea of hers; as far as we can trace the primitive population of Europe, Greece, Italy and Scandinavia appear to have been peopled by the same tribes, so that there could scarcely exist that radical diversity between the barbarians and those whom they invaded, which she supposes. We can see no other reason, as far as the interest of the inhabitants of the Roman empire was concerned, why it was necessary they should be blended with the barbarians, than that this was the requisite preliminary to the formation of those new systems of policy, which have proved so much more favourable to the progress of civilization, than even the freest republics of ancient times. But in respect to the barbarians themselves, a most important purpose was attained, and one which it seems could have been attained in no other way. The civilization which the Roman could communicate, had reached its term; if a bold and fortunate commander sometimes carried his arms beyond the Rhine, the Danube and the Euphrates, these acquisitions were made to be abandoned. The people which needed and the people which possessed civilization, could mingle no further by the conquests of the latter; peaceful intercourse was not agreeable to the habits of either; there seemed, therefore, no method remaining, but that the progress of conquest should be inverted. In reading ancient history, we are very apt to make ourselves parties to the feeling with which the Greeks and Romans regarded all foreign nations as the mere materials of their triumphs, and to forget that these barbarians were members of the same great family from which the people who despised them had been called at an earlier hour to civilization and knowledge, waiting their turn to be admitted to these benefits. In this equalization of light,

a considerable portion of it was no doubt extinguished, because the nations could not mingle but in hostility, and the invaders were too rude to embrace at once all the improvements to which their conquests introduced them. Yet no sooner was the shock past, and the new settlers obtained undisputed possession, than they began to apply the knowledge which the change had made accessible to them, to their own refinement, in a very humble measure at first, no doubt, but gradually with such success, as not only to replace all that they had begun by destroying, but very far to surpass it. What has been considered as a great retrogradation of the human species was in fact, therefore, the necessary process of extending to a large portion of it, the improvement which had been made by another; the mind is still progressive, if the species at large be taken into the account, and the apparent exception ceases to be such, when we place ourselves in the point of view from which the Deity contemplates the vast family of his children.

Yet it must be confessed, that if the universal diffusion of civilization were to be attained only by the frequent renewal of the misery and ignorance, which were the immediate fruits of the fall of the western empire, such an order of Providence could not be regarded without pain. But we have no reason to apprehend any such events; the darkness of the middle ages arose from causes which we are morally certain can never recur. The countries which sent forth the swarm of emigrants, and those which lie eastward from them to the very verge of America, have become a part of the political system of Europe, whose arts and sciences must ultimately make their way through this vast extent; so that there scarcely remain any but the barbarous tribes of central Asia, from whom any obstacle to the progressive civilization of our hemisphere, can even be conceived to arise, and few will think this danger very imminent. In America, the savage nations are continually propelled or absorbed by the advance of European settlers, and Africa asks only to be delivered from the troublers of her peace. Colonization, commercial intercourse, and though last, not least in honour, nor we would hope in efficacy, the labours

of philanthropy, are accomplishing that diffusion of knowledge over the globe, which, in past ages, was the result of bloody revolutions, and the most melancholy vicissitudes in the prosperity of states.

The remainder of Mr. Roscoe's essay contains many eloquent and just remarks upon the connexion of literature and the arts with national greatness. We will endeavour to compensate to our readers for having so long detained them from him, by quoting the concluding passage, which deserves to be impressed on the heart of every one who possesses the means of mental cultivation.

“The great end of all education is to form the character and regulate the conduct of life; and every department of it must be considered merely as auxiliary to this purpose. Experience, however, shews that it is one thing to acquire the knowledge of rules and precepts, and another to apply them to practice; as a mechanic may possess the implements of his profession, without having acquired the skill to use them. The same observation applies, perhaps yet more strongly, to all those precepts which are intended to influence the moral character, and regulate the conduct of life. For this purpose, various systems of ethics have been formed, by which the rules of moral duty are laid down in the most explicit and satisfactory manner: nor has there, perhaps, been any neglect in inculcating these systems on the minds of our young men, who, in many instances, study these works as an essential part of their education, and become no unskilful disputants on their most important topics. But between the impressing these systems on the memory, and the giving them an operative influence on the conduct and on the heart, there is still an essential difference. It is one thing to extend our knowledge, and another to improve our disposition and influence our will.\* It seems, then, essentially necessary to a complete system of education, that the principles of moral conduct, as laid down by our most distinguished writers, should be enforced and recommended to practice by every inducement that instruction and persuasion can supply.

---

\* “It is well observed by a celebrated foreign writer, that ‘a cultivated understanding without a good and virtuous heart, taste and information without integrity and piety, cannot produce happiness either to ourselves or others; and that so circumstanced, our souls can reap only everlasting shame instead of honour, from our acquirements.’” *Gellert, Moral Lessons*, I. 262.

"It is therefore my earnest wish, that in addition to the various scientific and literary subjects already proposed by this institution, a series of lectures should be delivered on the formation of the character and the conduct of life; intended to exemplify the rules of morality, and to enforce the practice of them, not merely by a scientific elucidation, but by a practical view of the affairs of the world, the consequence of a neglect or performance of the various duties of life, by the influence of the feelings, the dictates of conscience, and above all, by the sublime sanctions of the *religion* we profess. By these means, and by these alone, the various acquisitions made in every department of science or taste, will be concentrated in one point, directed to one great object, and applied to their proper purpose—the illustration and perfection of the human character." Pp. 77—79.

K.

ART II.—*Anecdotes of the Life of Richard Watson, Bishop of Landaff: written by himself, &c.*

(Continued from p. 137.)

**T**HE Bishop attributes his taking leave of the University to the state of his health, which was injured by application to study and college-business for nearly thirty-three years: but he avows, indiscreetly we think, that this was not his only motive for retirement. He says,

"In truth, had my health been better, I should have felt little inclination to persevere in my studies in the manner I had done. I could not bring myself to vote as a minister bade me, on all occasions, and I perceived that such was the temper of the times, or such was the temper of the man, nothing less than that would secure his attention. I saw this to be the case then, and I then and at all times disdained complying with principles of government so abominably corrupt. I once talked a little to the first Lord Camden on this subject; and he plainly told me, that I had better go to Cambridge and employ myself in writing books, than pretend to follow my own judgment in political matters; that he never knew any man who had attempted to do it, except one very *honest* man, who was little valued by any party,—Sir Joseph Jekyll."—P. 187.

Men's judgment and taste are widely different, and ours may be wrong; but we should have thought that there was a pleasure in literary and scientific pursuits, not to be heightened by the smile or lowered by the frown of a first lord of the treasury,

and that the neglect of the court would have been a good reason for a more devoted application to books, and none at all for flying from libraries to farm-yards. Would not Dr. Watson's practical reasoning seem to imply, that the interests of a prime minister are identical with one's own intellectual improvement, and that he may be punished for his neglect of us by our turning the back upon knowledge? Yet no man knew better than our biographer, that very different arts from those of a student are prized by ministers of state.

A vacancy in the see of Carlisle, in the year 1787, excited the hopes of Bishop Watson's friends, but furnished another proof of his want of interest at court. The following anecdote shews that there is a more powerful recommendation to the episcopal bench than public services, namely, parliamentary interest:—

"About a month before the death of the Bishop of Carlisle, a relation of Sir James Lowther had preached the Commencement Sermon at Cambridge. Mr. Pitt happened to sit next to me at church, and asked me the name of the preacher, not much approving his performance. I told him report said, that he was to be the future Bishop of Carlisle; and I begged him to have some respect to the dignity of the bench whenever a vacancy happened. He assured me, that he knew nothing of any such arrangement. Within two months after this, Sir James Lowther applied to Mr. Pitt for the Bishopric of Carlisle, for the gentleman whom he had heard preach, and Mr. Pitt without the least hesitation promised it. This was one of the many transactions that gave me an unfavourable opinion of Mr. Pitt; I saw that he was ready to sacrifice things the most sacred to the furtherance of his ambition. The gentleman, much to his honour, declined the acceptance of the Bishopric, which Mr. Pitt with true ministerial policy had offered him." P. 189.

Neglected and dispirited, the Bishop retired to an equal distance from Mr. Pitt and from his diocese, (where, it should be said, there was no palace for his residence,) and, becoming a considerable land-owner in his native county of Westmoreland, devoted himself with assiduity and success to agricultural pursuits. Yet in his seclusion, and especially in his occasional visits to the great world, he was sometimes reminded of his uncourtly principles and habits. There is no



little display of character in the following anecdote:

“ Though levee-conversations are but silly things in themselves, and the silliest of all possible things when repeated, yet I must mention what happened to myself at the King’s levee, in November, 1787. I was standing next to a Venetian nobleman; the King was conversing with him about the republic of Venice; and hastily turning to me, said, ‘ There, now, you hear what he says of a republic.’ My answer was, ‘ Sir, I look upon a republic to be one of the worst forms of government.’ The King gave me, as he thought, another blow about a republic. I answered, that ‘ I could not live under a republic.’ His Majesty still pursued the subject; I thought myself insulted, and firmly said, ‘ Sir, I look upon the tyranny of any one man to be an intolerable evil, and upon the tyranny of an hundred to be an hundred times as bad.’ The King went off. His Majesty, I doubt not, had given credit to the calumnies which the court-insects had buzzed into his ears, of my being a favourer of republican principles, because I was known to be a supporter of revolution principles, and had a pleasure of letting me see what he thought of me. This was not quite fair in the King, especially as there is not a word in any of my writings in favour of a republic, and as I had desired Lord Shelburne, before I accepted the bishopric, to assure His Majesty of my supreme veneration for the constitution. If he thought that in giving such assurance I stooped to tell a lie for the sake of a bishopric, His Majesty formed an erroneous opinion of my principles. But the reign of George the Third was the triumph of Toryism. The Whigs had power for a moment, they quarrelled among themselves, and thereby lost the King’s confidence, lost the people’s confidence, and lost their power for ever; or, to speak more philosophically, there was neither *Whiggism* nor *Toryism* left; excess of riches, and excess of taxes, combined with the excess of luxury, had introduced universal *Selfism*.” Pp. 193, 194.

In this year (1787) Dr. Watson sustained a great loss by the death of the Duke of Rutland, in Ireland; and expressed his feelings in a panegyric on the deceased Viceroy in the House of Lords, for which he was personally thanked by the Prince of Wales, who heard it, and who took this occasion of inviting the Bishop of Landaff to his acquaintance.

In 1788, Dr. Watson was elected a Fellow of the American (Massachusetts) Academy of Arts and Sciences.

He published this year a tract, entitled, “ An Address to Young Persons after Confirmation.” A large edition was soon sold. The Society for promoting Christian Knowledge wished to have the tract, but it was sold to the bookseller. An arrangement was afterwards made by the author, which allowed the Society to print the “ Address,” but they had by this time discovered, through the sagacity of Bishop Horsley, that it contained heretical passages, and would therefore print only a part of it. This Dr. Watson refused to permit, and here the matter ended. He dismisses the subject with saying of Horsley, “ His political principles were to me detestable, and his theology too dogmatical, though he was certainly a man of talents.” P. 233.

A passage in the tract concerning the operations of the Holy Spirit was animadverted on by the late Mr. Ashdown, in two Letters to the Bishop, who took no notice of them at the time, but makes a remark or two in this volume, which suffice at least to shew his candour, or rather indecision. One of these will arouse the Horsleys and humbler bigots of the day: “ If it shall ever be shewn that the doctrine of the *ordinary* operation of the Holy Ghost is not a scripture doctrine, Methodism, Quakerism and every degree of enthusiasm, will be radically extinguished in the Christian church; men, no longer believing that God does that by more means which may be done by fewer, will wholly rely for religious *instruction*, consequent *conversion*, and subsequent *salvation*, on his word.” P. 234.

A letter addressed from Calcutta to the Bishop, on the subject of a Protestant mission in Bengal, which he has inserted into these memoirs, leads him to make some reflections on the subject of missions to the Pagans, which we think worthy of being extracted:

“ I do not, indeed, expect much success in propagating Christianity by missionaries from any part of Christendom, but I expect much from the extension of science and of commerce. The empire of Russia is emerging from its barbarism, and when it has acquired a stability and strength answering to its extent, it will enlarge its borders; and casting an ambitious eye on Thibet, Japan and China, may introduce, with its commerce, Christianity into these

countries. India will be christianized by the government of Great Britain. Thus Christian monarchs, who aim at nothing but an increase of their temporal kingdoms, may become, by the providence of God, unconscious instruments in propagating the spiritual kingdom of his Son. It will not be easy for missionaries of any nation to make much impression on the Pagans of any country, because missionaries in general, instead of teaching a simple system of Christianity, have perplexed their hearers with unintelligible doctrines not expressly delivered in Scripture, but fabricated from the conceits and passions and prejudices of men. Christianity is a rational religion; the Romans, the Athenians, the Corinthians and others, were highly civilized, far advanced in the rational use of their intellectual faculties, and they all, at length, exchanged Paganism for Christianity; the same change will take place in other countries, as they become enlightened by the progress of European literature, and become capable of justly estimating the weight of historical evidence, on which the truth of Christianity must, as to them, depend." P. 198.

On the Regency Question, at this time agitated in Parliament, the Bishop sided with the opposition, and delivered a speech in the House of Lords, which is in great part preserved in this volume. It is not unworthy of the compliments which it drew forth. The Chancellor (Thurlow) in his reply said, in his coarse way, "The Bishop has given us his advice, and I know not but that something may be made on't;" and the Duke of Portland told the Bishop, that "the speech was looked upon, by one side of the House at least, as the best which had been produced."

Dr. Watson gives the following character of Thurlow :

"The Chancellor, Thurlow, was an able and upright judge, but as the Speaker of the House of Lords he was domineering and insincere. It was said of him, that in the cabinet he opposed every thing, proposed nothing, and was ready to support any thing. I remember Lord Camden's saying to me one night, when the Chancellor was speaking contrary, as I thought, to his own conviction, 'There, now, I could not do that; he is supporting what he does not believe a word of.'" P. 221.

The Bishop's vote on the Regency Bill did not advance his interest at court :

"The restoration of the King's health

soon followed. It was the artifice of the minister to represent all those who had opposed *his* measures, as enemies to the King; and the Queen lost, in the opinion of many, the character which she had hitherto maintained in the country, by falling in with the designs of the minister. She imprudently distinguished, by different degrees of courtesy on the one hand, and by meditated affronts on the other, those who had voted with, and those who had voted against the minister, insomuch that the Duke of Northumberland one day said to me, 'So, my Lord, you and I also are become traitors.'

"She received me at the drawing-room, which was held on the King's recovery, with a degree of coldness, which would have appeared to herself ridiculous and ill-placed, could she have imagined how little a mind such as mine regarded, in its honourable proceedings, the displeasure of a woman, though that woman happened to be a Queen.

"The Prince of Wales, who was standing near her, then asked me to dine with him; and on my making some objection to dining at Carlton House, he turned to Sir Thomas Dundas, and desired him to give us a dinner, at his house, on the following Saturday. Before we sat down to dinner on that day, the Prince took me aside, explained to me the principle on which he had acted during the whole of the King's illness, and spoke to me, with an afflicted feeling, of the manner in which the Queen had treated himself. I must do him the justice to say, that he spoke, in this conference, in as sensible a manner as could possibly have been expected from an heir apparent to the throne, and from a son of the best principles towards both his parents. I advised him to persevere in dutifully bearing with his mother's ill-humour, till time and her own good sense should disentangle her from the web which ministerial cunning had thrown around her.

"Having thought well of the Queen, I was willing to attribute her conduct, during the agitation of the Regency question, to her apprehensions of the King's safety, to the misrepresentations of the King's minister, to any thing rather than to a fondness for power." Pp. 225, 226.

At the dinner to which the preceding extract refers, the Duke of York and a large party were assembled with the Prince of Wales and the Bishop; and in the hearing of all, the Prince stopped the Bishop, who was declaring his purpose to retire from all public concerns, and said, *No, and mind who it is that tells you so, you shall never retire; a man of your*

*talents shall never be lost to the public.* The Bishop subjoins to his account of this conversation, and the remark is not unmeaning, "I have now lived many years in retirement, and, in my seventy-fifth year, I feel no wish to live otherwise."

Few passages of the memoirs will be more interesting to our readers than that which follows:

"The Duke of Grafton published, in the course of the spring, (1789,) a pamphlet, entitled, '*Hints to the New Association,*' and recommending a revision of our Liturgy, &c. Notwithstanding the intimacy with which I then lived with His Grace, I knew nothing of this pamphlet, nor who was the author of it; for his name was not put to it till several months after it had been published. When I did know who was the author, I greatly rejoiced that a person of his rank had ventured to propose a reform in one of the points respecting the church, which I had long ago recommended.

"In February, 1790, two pamphlets were published in opposition to the Duke's Hints. I wrote an hasty reply to these attacks upon a nobleman whose zeal for Christianity, instead of censure and obloquy, deserved the praise of all good men. I took a large and liberal view of the subject, thinking it better to do that, than to give a printed answer to every petulant remark of the two pamphleteers, though one of them, I have no doubt, was the production of a bishop, if not both. In this tract I had said, that the French government, in order to secure its stability, must, perhaps, think it expedient to pay from the public purse, not only Catholic but Protestant teachers of Christianity. This wise and equitable measure was adopted by Buonaparte, when he re-established the Gallican church in 1802, and it ought long ago to have been adopted in Ireland.

"When I had nearly finished my reply, the Duke of Grafton, to whom I sent each sheet as I composed it, wrote to me in the kindest manner, begging me to consider whether I would venture to publish it: every Christian, he said, ought to think himself obliged to me for it; but he was certain I never should be forgiven it. I thanked His Grace for his kind attention, but told him, at the same time, that no interested consideration should hold me back. How, said I to him in my letter, how shall I answer this at the tribunal of Christ—*You saw the corruption of my church, you had some ability to attempt a reform, but secular considerations choked your integrity—if I should now undo what I have done?* I accordingly pub-

lished the pamphlet, under the title of, '*Considerations on the Expediency of revising the Liturgy and Articles of the Church of England; by A Consistent Protestant.*' Though my name was not affixed to this publication, and every precaution was taken to conceal its author, yet it was very soon generally attributed to me.

"I had at the time some conversation with the Duke of Grafton on the propriety of commencing a reform, by the introduction of a bill into the House of Lords, for expunging the Athanasian Creed from our Liturgy; and we had, in a manner, settled to do it: but the strange turn which the French Revolution took about that period, and the general abhorrence of all innovations, which its atrocities excited, induced us to postpone our design, and no fit opportunity has yet offered for resuming it, nor probably will offer itself, in my time. In answer to a letter from the Duke of Grafton, in which, among other things, he informed me, that Dr. Priestley had publicly said, that he *knew* the pamphlet here mentioned was written by the Bishop of Landaff, I sent the following note:—

"*Dr. Priestley cannot know the author; on the day I dined at Lord Lansdowne's, there were present Kippis and Price, and many Dissenters: the conversation once turned on the subject of the pamphlet, and it is possible that my mode of expression, which no doubt was particularly marked, might give an hint to those gentlemen. But I really am little concerned about the matter; and, if I thought that owning it, in the present state of the business would not impede, rather than promote the progress of the good cause we have in hand, I would not, from any private consideration, shrink from putting my name to it. The reasoning of the pamphlet you sent me is perfectly just, but prejudice cannot be subdued by reason. I remember a Lambeth chaplain once maintaining, in the divinity schools, the necessity of excluding Dissenters from public offices; I pressed him with proper arguments; at length he was forced to acknowledge, that the greater the integrity, and the greater the ability any man had, the more unfit was he for a public office, if he did not think in every point with the Established Church. There I let the dispute end: it was impossible to rise higher in the scale of absurdity.*

"*I concur with your Grace in wishing the motion (respecting the expunction of the Athanasian Creed from the Liturgy) to be made, and notice of making it to be given in the way you mention. No distance or business shall hinder me from appearing in my place in the House of Lords, on the day the point shall be debated, and standing up with my best abi-*



lity in support of your motion. You thought of mentioning the subject to the Archbishop of Canterbury; I consider that as a candid proceeding, suited to the importance of the subject; and I suggest to your Grace's consideration a circumstance, of which you can form a much better judgment than I can—whether it would not be proper to mention it to the King in the first instance. The Windsor anecdote would induce me to think that the King would have no objection, and his concurrence would facilitate the measure; but if he should object, it may then admit of deliberation, whether, in *foro conscientie*, your Grace should proceed. I cannot flatter myself that any little publications of mine can have been instrumental in turning your Grace's attention to religious studies; but I am happy in the event of your application. A future state is the most important consideration that can affect a human mind, and if the gospel is not true, of that state I can have no expectation.

'I am, &c.

'B. LANDAFF.'

"The Windsor anecdote here alluded to, was told me by the late Dr. Heberden:—the clergyman there, on a day when the Athanasian Creed was to be read, began with '*Whosoever will be saved,*' &c., the King, who usually responded with a loud voice, was silent; the minister repeated in a higher tone his '*Whosoever:*' the King continued silent; at length the Apostles' Creed was repeated by the minister, and the King followed him throughout with a distinct and audible voice." Pp. 240—244.

In the beginning of 1792, Bishop Watson published the Charge which he had delivered to his clergy in the preceding June; in this Charge he had touched upon unpopular subjects,—the advantages likely to result to society from the French Revolution, and the injustice and impolicy of the Test and Corporation Acts. The Charge was at first wholly misrepresented, and copies of the misrepresentations, he says, were handed about at the tables of bishops and judges. He gave it to the public to silence calumny. The relation of this incident leads him to descant, which he does with great ability, upon the subject of the exclusion of Dissenters from civil offices and trusts by the aforementioned Acts. The following is a manly and eloquent reply to the argument from fear:

"But it is thought, that were the Test and Corporation Acts repealed, the Dissenters would get a footing in some of the

boroughs returning members to parliament. The Dissenters have, at present, a considerable influence in many boroughs; but there is little probability that, were all legal obstacles to their eligibility to public offices removed, they would ever be able to overcome the influence of government, the influence of the aristocracy, and the influence of the church, in the majority of the boroughs in this kingdom. But admitting so very improbable an occurrence to take place, what then? Why, then a majority of boroughs would return Dissenters to sit in parliament. Dissenters are allowed to sit in parliament at present; the danger then, such as it is, arises not from Dissenters having seats in parliament, but from the number of Dissenting members being increased. But that the number of Dissenting members should ever be so far increased as to constitute a majority of the House of Commons, is to me quite an improbable circumstance; I think it a far more likely event that, all restraints being removed, the Dissenters will insensibly become Churchmen. Suppose, however, even that improbable circumstance to take place, and that a majority of the House of Commons has ceased to be Churchmen—what then? Why, then the House of Commons may present to the House of Lords a bill for changing the Constitution of the Church of England into that of the Church of Scotland. Be it so—what then? Why, then the House of Commons will compel the House of Lords to agree to such a bill; this does not follow; I know not any legal or probable means of effecting such a compulsion; but for the sake of coming to a conclusion, let it be admitted, that at some distant period, of which no man can form a reasonable conjecture, the House of Lords would, by compulsion or choice, agree with the House of Commons, and that the King would agree with them both, in establishing Presbytery in the room of Episcopacy—what then? Why, then the present form of the Church of England would be changed into another! And is this all?—this the catastrophe of so many tragical forebodings; this the issue of so many improbable contingencies; this the result of so much unchristian contention; this a cause for continuing distinctions by which the persons and properties of peaceful citizens are exposed to the fiery zeal of a senseless rabble? A great Protestant nation does not return to Popery; a great Christian nation does not apostatize to Paganism or Mahometanism; it simply adopts an ecclesiastical constitution different from what it had before. What is there in this to alarm any man who liberally thinks with the late Dr. Powell, that there is nothing in the regimen of the Church of England, or in that of the

Church of Scotland, repugnant either to the natural rights of man, or to the word of God: *Ecclesiastici regiminis in Anglia et in Scotia constituti, neutra forma, aut juri hominum naturali aut verbo Dei repugnat*” Pp. 261—263.

The Bishop, who, notwithstanding his strong dislike of Mr. Pitt, is sometimes careful not to load him with the whole demerit of all his measures, hints (p. 259), that his opposition to the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts may have been in subservience to the opinion of ANOTHER.

In January, 1793, the Bishop published a sermon, entitled, “The Wisdom and Goodness of God in having made both Rich and Poor; with an Appendix, respecting the then circumstances of Great Britain and France;” designed to correct the false notions prevailing amongst the common people respecting liberty and equality. This sermon procured him a good reception at Court.

“The King (at his levee) complimented me in the warmest terms, in the hearing of the then Lord Dartmouth, on (he was pleased to say) the conciseness, clearness and utility of this little publication; and the then Archbishop of Canterbury afterwards informed me, that His Majesty had spoken to him of the publication in the same terms, two months before.

“On this occasion when the King was praising what I had written, I said to him, —‘I love to come forward in a moment of danger.’ His reply was so quick and proper that I will put it down, —‘I see you do, and it is a mark of a man of high spirit.’ His Majesty’s reception of me at his levee, to which I went once, or at the most twice a year, was always so complimentary, that notwithstanding the pestilent prevalence of court duplicity, I cannot bring myself to believe that he was my enemy; though he has suffered me to remain, through life, worse provided for than any bishop on the bench. I owe nothing to the crown but the bishopric of Landaff, and that has never paid the increase of expense incident to my change of station.” Pp. 270, 271.

He adds, in high-toned censure, which will grate upon the ears of such as are used only to the dulcet strains of common-place loyalty,

“An hatred of the Whigs has, I think, shewn itself during the whole of the reign, and I probably have come in for my share of it; for I have never made any secret of my opinion; that the same principles

which placed the House of Brunswick on the throne of these kingdoms, are necessary to keep it there: and that all attempts to introduce into this great country the miserable despotism of the petty principalities of Germany, from whence our kings generally take their wives, would end in the deserved disgrace and ruin of those who make them.” P. 271.

To his honour we record that Bishop Watson, on the 25th of January, 1793, supported, in an eloquent speech, which he has here inserted, the motion of the late Duke of Bedford for a negotiation with France for peace. He had been told by one of his brethren, that his vote would incur His Majesty’s displeasure, but he was not intimidated, and was the only bishop that was not. (P. 271.) This speech for ever separated the Bishop from the political party of which the Duke of Portland was considered as the head, and with which he had been until now connected.

Our author published in this year a Charge and two Sermons, in defence of Christianity, and in the following year (1796) his “Apology for the Bible,” in reply to Paine. Of this last admirable work, to which thousands yet living owe unspeakable obligations, he modestly says, “This little book, I have reason to believe, was of singular service in stopping that torrent of irreligion which had been excited by his (Paine’s) writings.” P. 287. He adds, that David Dale had permission to print 3000 copies to be distributed amongst his workmen, and that many thousands besides were printed in England and Scotland, and sold at a small price, without any profit or wish of profit to himself.

The Bishop inserts a letter (pp. 293—298) which he addressed to Mr. Pitt, in April, 1797, on the subject of finance: he flatters himself that it suggested to the minister the principle of a new system, the raising of the supplies within the year. Two months before, he had written to Mr. Pitt on the Poor-laws. It was doubtless patriotic thus to smother his resentment; but it was not impolitic to keep himself in the minister’s eye: and we generally observe him at court or in correspondence with Mr. Pitt soon after any publication of his, such as the “Apology,” which could be rea-

sonably hoped to lay a claim upon ministerial or royal bounty.

In 1798, the Bishop published his celebrated "Address to the People of Great Britain," to raise the spirit of the nation. It was so consonant with the views of the government, that it received their zealous patronage, and was, we believe, circulated gratis from their various offices. The author complains that they printed it without his consent. He published, in the course of the same year, a Charge to his Clergy, which was in unison with the Address, and equally acceptable to the aristocracy and the Court. It was for animadversions on these publications that the late Mr. Gilbert Wakefield was prosecuted by the government and thrown into prison. We cannot withhold the Bishop's account of this affair:

"These publications of mine had excited the displeasure of Mr. Wakefield, (one of the first scholars of the age,) and, unfortunately for himself, he published a pamphlet against them. The administration prosecuted him for some expressions in his pamphlet, which they thought were seditious, and he was fined and imprisoned. I took some pains to prevent this prosecution, thinking the liberty of the press to be the palladium of the constitution; but I did not succeed in my endeavours; nor did the ministry acquire any credit from their over-watchfulness. I received from Mr. Wakefield the following letter:—

'MY LORD,

'As my trial will take place some time from the 12th to the 20th of next month, and Mr. Fox's libel bill makes these causes almost wholly a question of character and veracity, it might be materially serviceable to me, if, from your knowledge of me through Mr. Tyrwhitt and otherwise, you were able to give a favourable opinion with respect to the sincerity and conscientiousness of my conduct in general, without any reference to political and religious sentiments. Your Lordship's answer will much oblige,

'Your obedient servant,

'GILBERT WAKEFIELD.

'Hackney, Jan. 29, 1799.'

"MY ANSWER.

"Great George Street,  
Jan. 31, 1799.

"SIR,

"I cannot think that it will be in my power, how much soever it will be in my inclination, to serve you on your trial, since, to the best of my knowledge, I never either saw or spoke to you in my

life. That Mr. Tyrwhitt did esteem you I know, and I have no reason to believe that he does not continue to esteem you; but on this point I cannot speak with certainty, not having seen Mr. Tyrwhitt for several years. Of one thing I am well persuaded, that Mr. Tyrwhitt is incapable of esteeming any man whose moral character will not bear the strictest scrutiny. I join with the world in admiring your talents: I have not the shadow of ill-will to you on account of your attack on my pamphlet, and shall sincerely rejoice at your being extricated from your present difficulty.

"I am, your obedient servant,  
R. LANDAFF."

(Pp. 305, 306.)

We have (pp. 307, 308), Bishop Watson's opinion in favour of a plan of Mr. Pitt's, entertained in 1799, and submitted by him to the bishops through the Archbishop of Canterbury, for the sale of the tythe of the country, on the same principle that the land-tax had been offered for sale, the money arising from the sale to be *vested in the funds in aid of public credit*, and the clergy to receive their income from the funds, the income, however, to be adjusted at different periods, according to the price of grain. The plan came to nothing through the politic opposition of the bishops.

The Bishop had, as we have seen, been long favourable to the measure of a legislative union with Ireland, and when it was brought under discussion in parliament he spoke in its favour. The speech is here given. It is highly oratorical. At the conclusion of its delivery, Bishop Horsley complimented the speaker by saying, "that he had never heard such a speech in the House of Lords, and should never hear such another." Dr. Watson owns his satisfaction in receiving this *extorted* praise, but declares that he felt more pleasure in a letter of acknowledgment on the same occasion from the pen of Dr. Joseph Warton, "for he was a scholar, and not only a scholar, but a man of taste, and not only a scholar and a man of taste, but what, at that time, was a rare character indeed, a *genuine Whig*." (P. 327.)

This speech excited much surprise and equal anger in the writers in opposition to the government. One of them, Mr. Benjamin Flower, editor of



the Cambridge Intelligencer, a Journal which had a very wide circulation, and was distinguished for the boldness of its spirit, made some severe remarks upon it, and charged the bishop, on authority which he judged unquestionable, with being a preferment-hunter. The Bishop shall relate the consequence :

"In a few days after I had made this speech, I set forward into Westmoreland. Whilst I was on the road, Lord Grenville brought to the bar of the House of Lords, one Flower, of Cambridge, for having been guilty of a breach of privilege, in publishing something against my speech; what that something was I never deigned to inquire. The punishment inflicted by the House was, as I remember, imprisonment for six months, and a fine of £100. I sent the following letter to Lord Grenville on the occasion; for I thought myself the more obliged to him as I had no acquaintance with His Lordship, and was wholly ignorant that I had been the object of Mr. Flower's abuse :—

"Calgarth Park, Kendal,  
May 10, 1799.

"MY LORD,

"I yesterday learned from the newspapers what has passed in the House of Lords relative to Mr. Flower. I am sensible that your Lordship has taken up this matter from your great attention to the public service; yet I must beg you to allow me the liberty of returning you my thanks for the protection which you have thereby afforded to myself.

"I am an utter stranger to the person and character of Mr. Flower, and wholly ignorant of the magnitude of his offence; I cannot, therefore, with propriety, interfere in soliciting a mitigation of punishment; but if any application should be made to the House for that purpose, I will trouble your Lordship to say, that the Bishop of Landaff, as an individual, will feel much more satisfaction in forgiving the man's malignity, than in avenging it.

"I have the honour to be, &c.

"R. LANDAFF."

"Lord Grenville's Answer, dated Dropmore, May 14, 1799.

"MY LORD,

"I was this morning honoured with your Lordship's obliging letter. In the instance to which it relates, I have only discharged a public duty, but it was with pleasure that I availed myself of the occasion to express my respect for the character of a person, whose exertions in the defence of religion are, I am persuaded, the real cause of the scandalous and unprovoked calumnies against him. If any application

is made to the House, in behalf of Mr. Flower, I will not fail to obey your Lordship's commands.

"I am, &c.

"GRENVILLE."

(Pp. 327, 328.)

By an extract of a letter to the Duke of Grafton, p. 330, it appears that Dr. Watson had written and once shewn to His Grace an Essay on Original Sin, as one of a series of theological essays, designed for publication, but that the work was ultimately abandoned from a hatred of contention, and a persuasion that the freedom of the writer's researches would have exposed him to much censure, and have involved him in most uncharitable altercation with *the ignorant, the intolerant and the orthodox*. The Bishop further avows, that his farming pursuits left him now no "leisure to become learned" enough to do full justice to controverted points in theology.

We pass over many pages relating to agriculture and the Board of Agriculture, in which also, according to the Bishop, Mr. Pitt's little personal resentments have been felt, and come in pp. 340—343, to a letter from Dr. Watson to Mr. Wilberforce, recommending to this pious gentleman, and *through him to his friend Mr. Pitt*, two measures for improving the morals of the people; the first, the building and endowment of new and free churches; the second, (which is stated, as we give it, in italics, the prevention of *the travelling of waggons and stage-coaches on Sundays*. Mr. Wilberforce, in reply, condoles with the Bishop on his being neglected, (a new instance of neglect had just occurred in the Bishopric of Bangor being given to another,) and expresses himself on this account both surprised and vexed. The correspondence leads the Bishop to record other compliments, and to make new protestations of his independence and indifference to Court favours.

At the instance of Mr. Hayley, who was a correspondent of his, the Bishop wrote, in 1797, an interesting letter to the poet Cowper to tranquillize his mind, at that time much depressed. Pp. 346, 347. We are not told whether it produced any or what effect.

There is, in pp. 357—360, a letter to the Duke of Grafton on the subject

of repentance, designed to relieve some "anxiety" in his Grace's mind: the letter is both philosophical and pious: on so common, and at the same time so difficult a subject, few men have written better.

The bishop published another Charge in 1802, to promote the consideration of one of the reforms in the church, which he had proposed twenty years before, the enforcement of clerical residence, on which he had corresponded with Mr. Pitt and Lord Grenville, in the year 1800, and on which also he submitted his opinion by letter to the Lord Chancellor, Eldon, in the year 1803. No attention, he says, (p. 370,) was paid to this last letter, and he interfered no further in the business. He neither thought so highly, he proceeds, of the Chancellor's talents on any subject, nor so meanly of his own, on the subject of ecclesiastical reform, as to judge that it became him to overlook the discourtesy of not answering a letter. The Clergy Non-residence Bill, then in agitation, was, he concludes, passed into an act, which has rather increased than lessened the evil.

[To be concluded in our next.]

ART. III.—*Remarks on the Eternal Sonship of Christ; and the use of Reason in matters of Revelation, suggested by several Passages in Dr. Adam Clarke's Commentary on the New Testament*. In a Letter to a Friend. By Richard Watson. 8vo. pp. 92. Blanshard, City Road. 1818.

MR. WATSON, as well as Dr. Adam Clarke, is an eminent Methodist preacher; and this pamphlet is published at head quarters, under the direction, of course, of the portion of the Wesleyan hierarchy established in London. It is the official sounding of the charge of heresy from the trumpet of the regiment, against the learned doctor, who is yet in honour in the Liverpool district, but can scarcely be expected to maintain his rank beyond another Conference, unless he recant his errors. If he should defend his opinions with ability and spirit, he will not strengthen his own standing, but he may occasion a schism in the Connexion: though we do not think that the time is yet come, when a Methodist of even Dr. Adam Clarke's learning and talents, would be able to lead off

a great number of his associates into the path of free inquiry. In every case but one, the present publication must produce important consequences in the Methodist body: the case which we except is, we admit, very unlikely, but it is possible; it is that of Dr. Adam Clarke's writing a "yea and nay" defence, partly vindicating and partly retracting his heresy, and skillfully covering the controversy with a veil of orthodox phraseology. The event will soon enable the reader to decide upon the justness of our speculations.

Dr. Adam Clarke is charged by his accuser with two outward signs of heretical pravity. The *first* is his denying "the eternal Sonship of Christ," in some of the notes in his Commentary on the New Testament. These (says Mr. Watson, p. 3), have been "the subject of much and serious discussion;" "they have," he adds, "*made some converts*;" and he refers to "a written controversy" concerning them, from which he looks for "*considerable mischief*."

The following passage from Dr. Adam Clarke's notes, will explain both the substance and the mode of his alleged heresy; it will be seen from the passage that the good Doctor thought that he was removing a difficulty from the doctrine of the Deity of Christ:

"If Christ be the Son of God as to his *divine nature*, then he cannot be *eternal*; for *Son* implies a *Father*, and *Father* implies in reference to *Son*, *preceding in time*, if not in *nature* too. *Father* and *Son* imply the idea of generation; and generation implies a time in which it was effected, and *time* also *antecedent* to such generation. If Christ be the Son of God as to his *divine nature*, then the *Father* is of necessity *prior*, consequently *superior* to him. Again, if this *divine nature* were begotten of the *Father*, then it must be in *time*; i. e. there was a period in which it *did not* exist, and a period when it began to exist. This destroys the eternity of our blessed Lord, and robs him at once of his Godhead. To say that he was *begotten* from all eternity, is, in my opinion, absurd, and the phrase *eternal Son*, is a positive contradiction. *Eternity* is that which has had no *beginning*, nor stands in reference to *time*. *Son*

supposes time, generation and father, and time also antecedent to such generation. Therefore, the conjunction of these two terms, *Son* and *eternity*, is absolutely impossible, as they imply essentially different and *opposite* ideas." Note on Luke i. 35.

These reasonings are pronounced by Mr. Watson to be "extremely futile, as, founded upon mere human analogies:" he would prove himself a prodigy if he could shew any other foundation upon which the ideas suggested by the terms *father* and *son* can rest.

Dr. A. Clarke maintains that the phrase "*Son of God*," designates Christ's human nature, and refers to his miraculous conception: this, Mr. Watson denies, and he is much more successful in some of his objections to the Doctor's hypothesis, than in the establishment of his own, which is, that the phrase is "an appellation of Christ's divine nature, with reference to his personal existence in the Trinity, and expressive of one of his peculiar and eternal relations in that personality to God the Father."

The Doctor says, "the doctrine of the eternal Sonship of Christ is anti-scriptural," he can find no *express* declaration in the Scriptures concerning it. True, replies the Remarker (p. 6); but neither is there express scripture for the Trinity ("except it be that in 1 John, so often disputed, and the genuineness of which Dr. Clarke has given up"), nor for the two natures of Christ, nor for infant baptism. He proceeds, however, to quote Scripture in behalf of eternal Sonship, beginning with the phrase, *only-begotten*, John i. 14, 18. Should it be objected that God gave this *only-begotten* to suffer, and that therefore it could not be the divine nature, our author is not thus to be stopped: he answers, (p. 11,) "*If it suffered no pain, it suffered something; of this there are mysterious, and from the nature of the thing, only mysterious indications in Scripture.*"

Mr. Watson's next argument is from the term *Father*. "When" (he says, p. 12) "the awful veil which shrouds the Incomprehensible, is in part withdrawn by the spirit of revelation, and we are permitted at least a glance of the ineffable manner in which he subsists; when the three divine hypostases are exhibited in mysterious distinction and unity, and names are solemnly

given to each, the Father is the high and expressive distinction of the first." This piece of sublimity, original as far as respects the Scriptures, is followed by something exceedingly droll. The first person is the Father of the divine nature; "*but of the human nature of Jesus, the first person is not the Father; for the sacred temple of our Lord's body was produced by the Holy Ghost, the third person.*" (1b.)

From Rom. i. 3, 4, our intrepid Remarker attempts to prove the two natures of Christ, and he decides that the phrase, "according to the spirit of holiness," "is equivalent to *according to his Divine nature!*" (P. 15, note.) He elsewhere (p. 42) contends, that the resurrection of Christ is a proof of his supreme divinity! Does he mean that it is mediately a proof, by proving that he was mortal! He will, perhaps, grant this; for he advances positions and makes concessions, which must startle his more wary polemical brethren. For instance, he cites (p. 44), with seeming triumph, in proof of the eternal Sonship of Christ, Heb. v. 7, 8, contending, that when the writer describes the *prayers* and *supplications*, the *strong crying* and *tears*, the *obedience* and *suffering*, the *fear* and the *deliverance* of the Son, "*he must refer distinctively and exclusively to the divine nature of Christ.*" "Was it (he asks) a subject to be introduced with so great an emphasis of holy wonder, that the Son, if his human nature alone were contemplated, should become obedient unto suffering?" Thus, then, we have an assertion from the highest Methodist authority, of the sufferings of the Supreme Deity. Again, Mr. Watson, with equal frankness, concedes that Isaiah's prophecy, *A virgin shall conceive*, &c. was, before the accomplishment, "obscure" and "equivocal," that the Jews did not expect the supernatural birth of the Messiah, and that the disciples of Christ might not know of his miraculous conception until the day of Pentecost. (Pp. 38—42.)

The second mark of heresy which Mr. Watson discovers in his brother Dr. Adam Clarke, is in his "canon of interpretation," laid down at the end of his Commentary, "that what is contrary to reason is contrary to Scripture." (P. 40.) This, he observes, leads to and authorizes Arian



and Socinian errors. (Pp. 51 and 82.) Nay, Dr. A. Clarke has in some places stated the doctrine of the use of reason in religion, more broadly than any Socinian writer, than "even Dr. Priestly\* or Mr. Belsham." (P. 64.)

In opposition to this *pernicious* and *fatal* notion, advanced by the learned Methodist, the more orthodox brother declares, (p. 83,) that with him "it is of small consideration, whether a doctrine be reasonable or not," for that "truth is not to be prejudiced by the reasonings of men;" that (p. 60) "the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity," stands upon "no rational evidence of the doctrine itself;" that (p. 68) "the doctrines of the Trinity in Unity; of the union of two natures in one personal Christ; of the resurrection of the same body; not only transcend, but contradict human reason;" nay, (p. 90,) that it is, to his mind at least, "a very strong argument, *à priori*, against any scheme, that it renders a doctrine of pure revelation less difficult to reason." With singular felicity, he quotes Miss M'Avoy, the Liverpool lass, who has, or *had*, the incomprehensible faculty of seeing with her fingers, as an illustration of the occasional reasonableness of an unreasonable faith. (P. 72.)

This opponent of Dr. A. Clarke endeavours to fasten odium upon his principle of the use of reason, by shewing that it is acted upon by "the modern Socinians," the universal scarecrows. He says, (p. 66,) in a sentence which has "a most lame and impotent conclusion," "when a passage in the New Testament stubbornly contradicts their reason, which they are sufficiently ready to assume is eternal reason, *they expel the chapter or verse from the sacred record; and often, on very insufficient evidence of its want of genuineness.*" This self-mocking passage needs no comment. But Mr. Watson means that "Socinians" strike out of the Scriptures the words and phrases and sentences which agree not with

their system, solely on account of that disagreement. He should have substantiated a charge, which he ought to know that Unitarians repel with indignation. At least, he should have forborne to blame a practice which he himself finds convenient. We will explain ourselves. Mr. W.'s hypothesis is, that the phrase, "Son of God," denotes the Divine nature of Christ, and not the human. But an unlucky text stands in the way, viz. Mark xiii. 32: *But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no not the angels which are in heaven, NEITHER THE SON, but the Father.* How is this difficulty obviated? Simply by remarking, that all the passages in the New Testament, where the term Son of God occurs as applied to Christ, have been examined, *except this solitary text*; and that Dr. Clarke confesses the difficulty of it, and appears disposed to give up the genuineness of the clause, "neither the Son." (P. 47.) So, then, truth is satisfied if Dr. Clarke be silenced, and the appearance of a disposition in that Commentator to abandon a clause, because it is in direct hostility to the doctrine of the deity of Christ, shall suffice for its being treated as spurious, though it is found in every existing manuscript, and every known version.\* The "Socinians," forsooth, are driving to the "Serbonian bog," (p. 82,) inasmuch as they "expel chapters and verses, —often, on very insufficient evidence:—" whither, then, are they bending, who connive at the excision of words and clauses which obstruct their system, not only without evidence, but against all evidence whatsoever? Their critical pilgrimage must terminate in some Dismal Swamp, or Slough of Despond.

ART IV.—*Liturgies for Unitarian Worship.* Second Edition. 12mo. Hunter and Eaton. 2s. 6d. 1817.

THIS is a republication, in a cheap form, of a work compiled by Mr. Rutt, in 1801. He has put out a *second edition*, at the request of a Christian society, who felt the want of such a help. We recommend the *Liturgies* to such small Unitarian congregations as have no minister to lead their devotions, and approve of a Form of Prayer.

\* Mr. Richard Watson quotes several times, and always misspells, the name of Priestley. His pamphlet is not badly printed, and we infer that he is a total stranger to Dr. Priestley's works, as we dare say he is to those of all other Socinians. His reference to them is not, we believe, even at second hand.

\* See Griesbach in loc.

## POETRY.

From "*Emblems and other Devises, gathered, Englished and moralized, and diverse, newly devised by Geoffrey Whitney,*"—a Friend of Sir Philip Sidney.

*Omnis Caro Fœnum.*

All flesh is grass, and withereth like the hay:

To-day, man laughs, to-morrow, lies in clay.

Then let him mark the frailty of his kind,  
For here his term is like a puff of wind;  
Like bubbles small, that on the waters rise,  
Or like the flow'rs whom *Flora* freshly dyes.

Yet in one day their glory all is gone:  
So wordly pomp, which here we gaze upon:  
Which warneth all that here their pageants play

How well to live, but not how long to stay.

*Superest quod suprâ est.*

E'en as a flow'r, or like unto the grass,  
Which now doth stand, and strait with scythe doth fall;

So is our state: now here, now hence we pass:

For Time attends with shredding scythe for all.

And Death, at length, both old and young doth strike,

And into dust doth turn us all alike.

Yet, if we mark how swift our race doth run,

And weigh the cause why we created be;  
Then shall we know when that this life is done,

We shall be sure our country right to see.  
For here we are but strangers that must flit:  
The nearer home, the nearer to the pit.

O happy they, that, pondering this aright,  
Before that here their pilgrimage be past,  
Resign this world, and march with all their might,

Within that path that leads where joys shall last;

And, whilst they may, there treasure up their store,

Where, without rust, it lasts for evermore.

This world must change, that world shall still endure.

Here pleasures fade; there shall they endless be:

Here man doth sin, and there he shall be pure:

Here death he tastes, and there shall never die:

Here hath he grief, and there shall joys possess,

As none hath seen, nor any heart can guess.

VOL. XIII.

2 E

## ALEXANDER AND DIOGENES.

*Animus, non Res.*

What man is rich? not he that doth abound.  
What man is poor? not he that hath no store.

But he is rich, that makes content his ground,

And he is poor, that covets more and more.  
Which proves the man was richer in the Tun  
Than was the king that many lands had won.

## SONNETS TO FAME.

I.

*Fame the shadowing forth of Immortality.*

The names that long oblivion have defied,  
And wild commotion's earth-appalling shocks,

Stand in lone grandeur, like eternal rocks  
Casting broad shadows o'er the silent tide  
Of Time's unebbing flood, whose waters glide

To unseen ocean, from its awful spring,  
And waft along each light and earth-born thing,

Yet leave these monuments in lonelier pride.

There stand they—fortresses uprear'd by man,

Whose earthly frame is mortal—symbols high

Of life unchanging, power that cannot die—

Proof that our nature is not of a span,  
But in its holiest principles allied

To life and love and joy unperishing.

T. N. T.

II.

*The Memory of the Poets.*

The fame of those sweet bards whose fancies lie

Like glorious clouds on summer's holiest even,

Fringing the west upon the skirts of heaven,

And sprinkled o'er with hues of rainbow dye,

Is not of trumpet sound—nor strives to ire  
With martial notes sublime—from ages gone

In most angelic strain it lengthens on  
Earth's greenest bowers with fresh delight to fill,

Heard breathing from the silence of the sky  
Or trembling in the joy of gushing rill,

Or whispering o'er the lakes unrippled breast—

Till its last earthly melodies are still

Hush'd 'mid the joys of immortality

In the calm bosom of eternal rest.

T. N. T.

## OBITUARY.

Feb. 2, 1818, at *Westerham, Kent*, Miss JANE SALE, in the 24th year of her age; whose character entitled her to the affectionate esteem of her relatives and friends, and whose death is deeply lamented by all who knew her. She was interred in the burial-ground belonging to the General Baptist Society, at Bessell's Green, near Sevenoaks, on Sunday, the 15th. An address was delivered on the solemn occasion, by Mr. S. Dobell, of Cranbrook, to a very numerous and affected audience. The text, Psal. xxiii. 4, was explained, as expressing the Psalmist's confidence in the *preserving* goodness of God, rather than his hope in the *termination* of his life; yet, in application to the event, was considered in a more popular sense, as pointing out a remedy and support against the fear of death.

In early life, the subject of this record made religion her highest regard, and from her childhood was always attached to reading, particularly the sacred Scriptures: she afforded her friends much gratification in contemplating the improvement she derived from that inexhaustible source of wisdom and instruction, and has left behind her an example worthy the imitation of the young. While useful studies of less importance were not neglected, or left unimproved, she frequently spoke of the pleasure she found in pursuits of a religious nature in preference to any other.

Although blessed with health and vivacity, (before the lingering disorder which terminated in her death,) she had not been allured from her duty to her God, by the follies and vanities of a giddy world; but conscientiously adhered to an upright, steady perseverance in the path of piety and virtue. Before she was led to suppose her illness of a dangerous nature, she observed, "Through all the changing scenes of life, I have ever found the purest source of pleasure and comfort was in the steadfast adherence to holiness." Her religion was the religion of *the heart*; she laid but little stress on matters of a speculative nature, though she was not careless and indifferent respecting truth: her sentiments were rational and devout,—the result of an impartial investigation pursued by an unbiassed mind. While she was candid towards those who differed from her in opinion, she was decided in favour of Unitarian Christianity. The example, sufferings and constancy of the Saviour of the world, as a spotless pattern for her imitation, were much impressed on her mind, and as far as in her lay, she copied this brightest model of excellence in seeking her God, who was present with her, by the power of a living

faith, "in a distressing hour," as but a short time before she expired, she said, with calmness and composure, to her surrounding friends, "*Behold with what resignation a Christian can die!*"

D. C.

— 13, at his house on *Dulwich Common*, in his 86th year, PERCIVAL NORTH, Esq. one of the oldest attendants at Essex Street Chapel.

When valuable members of society are removed from this transitory state of existence, their surviving friends are naturally anxious to retain such imperfect memorials as memory can retrace, and description supply. It also becomes a duty to record merits, from which there are few who may not profit. The late Mr. NORTH, of Bridge Street, was so dear to his relatives, so beloved by his friends, and so respected by a most extensive acquaintance, that few men will be so generally regretted, and none can deserve to be more so.

A sound understanding, a manly character, a most affectionate, benevolent and liberal heart, were in him adorned by the kindest, most frank, and winning manners; his open, placid, animated and benignant countenance, portrayed the heart that enlightened it, inspired confidence and invited to friendship, which his solid worth always confirmed. He spent a long life in active, useful and profitable industry; upright, honourable and liberal in all his dealings, he filled every situation that he was called to, with distinguished ability and unsullied integrity, and with manners so engaging, that had he aspired to the highest honours and dignities which the City of London could confer, few were so likely to attain them. He had early imbibed, and zealously cultivated and supported, the genuine principles of civil, religious and constitutional freedom. He was from early conviction, a firm believer in the unity of the Godhead; a regular attendant on, and supporter of, the Unitarian doctrine; and a truly pious and religious man. His deeds of charity and benevolence were not merely the result of occasional applications, or temporary feelings, but constant, regular and extensive, supplying the widow and the orphan, sustaining the helpless, and protecting the distressed. In domestic life and social intercourse, he was the delight of all who knew him; hospitable, animated, zealous in every good cause, the promoter of every good work, and the inspirer of every kind and generous feeling. After having spent a long life in the practice of every virtue, he resigned his mortal existence with perfect



composure and equanimity, in charity with all men, grateful to his Maker for the many blessings he had so long enjoyed, in the joyful hope of being again united with his family and friends in a blissful immortality.

Feb. 19, at *Sidmouth*, in the 36th year of his age, Mr. JOHN PESTER, Baker. He was a kind husband and father, an industrious, upright tradesman, and a valuable member of society. His illness, which arose from a neglected cold, was long and painful, but borne with much patience and resignation. He was an *Unitarian* upon inquiry and conviction, and, till his illness, which confined him from public worship fourteen months, a constant attendant at the *Old Dissenting Meeting-house* in *Sidmouth*.

He had a great desire of life, and was often much dejected with the increasing conviction which almost every day gave him, that this desire would not be gratified. This was accompanied, however, with no fear of death or its consequences. He had such a full persuasion of the Divine goodness, that he contemplated, though with humility and reverence, yet without dread, an entrance into the Divine presence. In religious matters, the example of this excellent young man was worthy of close imitation. He had an inquiring mind, and a firm, independent spirit. Considering his station in life, he thought and read much upon religious doctrines, and whatever appeared to him to be *truth*, he had the courage to avow and follow. This led him to change some of his early notions, and to adopt such opinions as his riper judgment convinced him were more agreeable to reason and Scripture. Particularly he renounced, in the fullest manner, the unintelligible and unscriptural notion of a *Trinity of Persons in the Godhead*. He believed in and worshiped only *one God, the Father*. Upon the same ground, namely, that there was no foundation for them in Scripture, he gave up the popular doctrines of original sin, the imputation of Christ's righteousness to believers, the election of a few to eternal life, and the condemnation of far the greater part of mankind. He could not suppose it possible that the Almighty should be disappointed as to the final lot of man, or that the fountain of *wisdom* and *love* should act in such a foolish and cruel manner, as to *destroy*, or render *for ever miserable*, most of the creatures which he had made. He fully agreed with the Apostle Peter, that God is no respecter of persons, but that in every nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness, according to the light which is afforded him, will be accepted by him. *Faith* in Christ, i. e. a belief that Jesus of Nazareth was the promised Messiah, and the greatest messenger of God to mankind, he had no doubt was necessary for a Christian, and

what, indeed, fixes upon any one the name of Christian; but he was also satisfied that this faith would be of no use, if it were not productive of *good works*. Religion, he would often say, was a *personal* thing, and that in order to be approved of God, and fit for heaven, it was necessary to be morally and truly good. While, however, he thus thought for himself, he had not the smallest dislike to those who *conscientiously* thought otherwise. His leading maxims were, "Prove all things." "Believe not every spirit, or every doctrine that is proposed to you, but try the spirits, whether they be of God." "Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind." These are surely honourable and Christian principles, and the more we act under their influence, the more we shall honour God, and benefit ourselves.

E. B.

— 24, at *Portsea*, after a week's confinement, ELIZABETH, second daughter of the late Mr. George SMITH, landscape painter, of *Chichester*; a lady in every view most truly amiable. She possessed a portion of her father's taste and genius: from her childhood she was of a delicate and infirm constitution, such as required much attention. Her general deportment was such as to gain more than respect, from a numerous circle of friends and acquaintances. A heart like hers, always alive to sympathy, and a disposition ever ready to assist and relieve, could hardly fail to meet a return of general esteem and love. A peculiar method in her, drew from children their love; in whose instruction she also took particular delight. From deliberate judgment and choice, she was by profession a *General Baptist*, considering adult baptism the true and only mode appointed by the Christian Head; which, together with the Lord's Supper, were, in her view, of perpetual command. She was, therefore, regular in her attendance on it, as also at public worship; at which, her aim was always to be there by the appointed time for service. In doctrinal views, a firm believer in the *unity* and *paternity* of God, her mind was free from perplexity or fear through life; and prepared to meet the end of it, with that composure such views and such deportment are calculated to impart. Her experience at that solemn period, was of the most desirable nature. When her disorder assumed that aspect which indicated a probable fatal termination, she took an affectionate leave of all her friends, with the same composure as if going a journey only in this world! She expressed grateful thanks for all the attentions paid to her; indeed, her life had been so correct, that she had no bad account to settle with herself, her friends, the world, or her God. All was happy as the dying can wish, or the living receive consolation from. She

often, at this time, said, that death had no terrors; she was far on her journey, and had no wish to return to this world; to her, there was *one great I am, and Jesus Christ*. All she said, and all she did, was solid and rational proof of the efficacy of the *Unitarian faith*, with a conformity to the commands of Jesus Christ, to give the most undisturbed peace in the hour of death, and the sure and certain hope of a resurrection to everlasting honour and happiness. With the kindest admonitions to the young, whom she saw, were added this stimulus to goodness: "Act well, and you need never be afraid to die." Thus has passed away a life, the most truly valuable, though not high in station; one who has not lived in vain, and who will be long and affectionately remembered. The body was interred on Monday, the 2nd of March, in the General Baptist Chapel, St. Thomas's Street, Portsmouth, by the Rev. Joseph Brent, by whom an appropriate funeral sermon was preached on Sunday evening, the 8th, from Revelation xiv. 13.

Feb. 24, at *Prescot*, Miss BISPAM. Having endured a protracted illness with exemplary patience and fortitude, Miss B. sank into the arms of death, cordially respected and deeply lamented by an extensive circle of friends. The affectionateness and amiableness of her disposition, and her sociability and vivacity endeared her to her numerous acquaintances. Her virtues, which were not few in number, were divinely appointed to shed their lustre principally in the domestic circle. By the awful and mysterious decree of heaven, she had long been the consoler of a bereaved brother; the sympathizing, tender and faithful nurse of his two amiable daughters, committed to her care in their infancy; and latterly, the protectress of a

doubly-orphaned nephew. So valuable a life, though not devoted to the more public and pompous offices of humanity, was not lightly estimated; nor can her setting sun, eclipsed amid meridian beams, be viewed with a tearless eye. Memory, faithful to her trust, will cherish the recollection of the excellencies and kind offices of one, endeared to survivors by the ties of nature and the cords of sympathy. Obedient to the dictates of love and gratitude, her nurtured nieces, her fostered nephew, and often solaced brother, will promptly rank her among their best earthly friends. Cheered by the well-grounded hope of a happy meeting in heaven, our dear departed friend fell sweetly asleep in Jesus.

W. T. P.

March 5, at *Prescot*, of apoplexy, Mr. SHELLY. By this mysterious dispensation, a disconsolate widow and four orphans of tender age, have their prospects awfully changed. Mr. S. was apparently recovering from the second attack of this alarming disorder: he was so far convalescent, as to be able to attend to his business without any sensible inconvenience; and on the morning of his dissolution, had breakfasted with his family with more than ordinary enjoyment. As a husband and a father, he was truly affectionate, and as a friend, he was affable, cheerful and sincere. On his settlement at *Prescot*, he joined the Unitarian Society in that town; and though he had previously been a member of the Established Church, his attachment to the new principles he had espoused, was daily strengthened; and he greatly rejoiced in the diffusion and prosperity of pure and unadulterated Christianity.

W. T. P.

## REGISTER OF ECCLESIASTICAL DOCUMENTS.

*Address and Rules of the Church Building Society, agreed to at a Meeting of the Nobility, Clergy and Gentry, at Freemasons' Hall, February 6, 1818, His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury in the Chair.*

The want of church room, especially for the lower classes, in all the populous parishes which surround the city of London, and in many other parts of this kingdom, has been long felt and deplored; and the fearful consequences, thence resulting to the best interests of religion and order, are universally admitted.

Urged by these considerations, a number of respectable individuals presented a me-

morial to the noble lord at the head of his Majesty's councils, soliciting the attention of government to the necessity of providing additional church room; and afterwards resolved to attempt the formation of a society for promoting this good work.

As it was their duty in the first place to obtain the sanction of the heads both of the civil and ecclesiastical establishments, and as this could only be done by framing some fundamental rules, and submitting them to the consideration of the persons whose approbation and patronage they solicited, much time unavoidably passed away, before their plan could be matured, and a society arranged, which might claim the attention of the nation at large.

Such a society is now formed; but it comes forward at a moment when its utility may appear to be superseded by the prospect of more adequate and effectual relief being afforded by the legislature of the country. So far, however, from such relief being likely to render the efforts of the society unnecessary, its promoters have the best reason to believe, that, in subserviency to any parliamentary enactments, its operation will prove highly beneficial in many cases, and in some, perhaps of the greatest urgency, essentially useful for the speedier attainment of the great object in view.

All, therefore, who feel that this great evil calls for redress, all who are justly alarmed at the dreadful consequences which must ensue, if the lower classes of the community continue to be deprived of the means of joining in the public worship of the Established Church, are earnestly entreated to give this society their liberal and zealous support.

#### *Rules and Regulations.*

1. That the society be named "*The Society for Promoting the Enlargement and Building of Churches and Chapels.*"

2. That the society be governed by a president, vice-presidents, a treasurer, and a committee of thirty-six members; of which thirty-six, two thirds shall be laymen, and one-third ecclesiastics.

3. That his Royal Highness the Duke of York be the patron of the society.

4. That the Archbishop of Canterbury be the president of the society.

5. That the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of the two Provinces, and twenty-five lay Peers and Commoners be the vice-presidents of the society; and that all vacancies in the vice-presidency be filled up by the committee.

6. That the president, vice-presidents and treasurer, be ex-officio members of the committee; and the treasurer and one-fourth of the thirty-six elected members in rotation, shall vacate their offices at the annual general meeting, but be capable of immediate re-election.

7. That all persons making a donation of one hundred guineas or upwards, shall be governors of this society—shall be eligible to be vice-presidents, and have a double vote at all general meetings.

8. That all persons who shall contribute twenty guineas in one donation, or two guineas annually, shall be members of this society, have a right to vote at all general meetings, and be eligible to the committee, provided such annual subscriptions shall not then be in arrear.

9. That all annual subscriptions shall become due on the first day of January in each year.

10. That a general meeting be holden

annually on the third Thursday in May, and oftener if the committee shall think it expedient.

11. That at the annual meeting a report of the society's proceedings be made by the committee, together with a statement of its receipts and payments; that three auditors be then appointed for the year ensuing, a treasurer be elected, and the vacancies in the committee be filled up from a double list prepared by the president and vice-presidents.

12. That every order to be made and act to be done by the committee, shall be made or done with the consent of the majority of the members present at a meeting of the committee; such a meeting to consist of not less than five.

13. That all monies received by the society in donations, subscriptions, bequests, or otherwise, shall be paid into the Bank of England, in the names of four trustees to be appointed by the committee; and that all sums not immediately wanted be invested in government securities in the names of such trustees.

14. That no money shall be advanced by the society towards the enlarging or building of any church or chapel in any parish or place, unless the consent of the ordinary, patron and incumbent of the church or chapel already existing therein, (if any such there be,) shall first have been obtained to such enlarging or building.

15. That no grant exceeding £500 shall be made, unless approved by at least two-thirds of the members present at a meeting of the committee, and confirmed by a majority of the members present at a subsequent meeting of the committee, to be called expressly for that purpose.

16. That assistance shall be given to those parishes and places only which shall advance, towards effecting the objects aforesaid, as much money as, in the opinion of the committee, shall bear a due proportion to their means; and all parishes and places applying for aid, shall state the extent of their population, their pecuniary means, and the efforts they have made, or are willing to make, towards accomplishing the object.

17. That the society shall not advance a greater proportion than one-fourth of the estimated expense of the works, unless for some special reason to be made out to the satisfaction of the committee.

18. That the society will not themselves engage in building or enlarging any church or chapel, but will confine the application of their funds to assisting such parishes or places as shall be desirous of erecting or enlarging churches or chapels within their respective limits.

19. That it shall be an object of the society to obtain and communicate infor-



mation that may facilitate the enlarging and building of churches, particularly with respect to economy in building.

20. That it be a condition in every grant, that no expense shall be incurred for ornamental architecture beyond what shall, by the committee, be deemed essential to give to the buildings to be erected and enlarged with the aid of this society, the

character of churches or chapels of the Church of England.

21. That in the aid to be granted by this society, preference shall be given to such parishes and places as shall propose to afford the greatest extent of free sittings in proportion to the aid granted; such extent to be in no case less than half the additional area and accommodation.

## INTELLIGENCE.

### *Causes affecting Dissenters at the last Assizes at Salisbury.*

**EXEMPTION FROM TOLL.**—*Lewis v. Hammond.*—The pleadings being opened by Mr. Gazelee, Mr. Sergeant Pell stated, that the sums sought to be recovered by this action amounted only to tenpence; but a verdict for that sum would carry costs. Although the amount was nominally small, yet the matter was really so important, that he was instructed by the Protestant Society for the Protection of the Religious Liberty of Dissenters, established in the metropolis, to seek to recover by their verdict that small amount. That real importance would appear, if it was considered that an improper demand of tolls might be justly regarded as an infraction of those rights of exemption, which Dissenters were entitled to claim with their countrymen, who were members of the Established Church, and that a very small amount weekly demanded from multitudes of persons, would constitute an aggregate of contribution which, if improperly imposed, it would be absurd to sustain. The plaintiff, in this case, was Henry Lewis, a yeoman, residing at Foxhanger, in the parish of Rowde, near Devizes, in this county. He is a member of a congregation of Dissenters of the Independent denomination at Devizes, where he regularly attends on Sundays. In travelling from his house to the meeting-house he passes through a turnpike gate, at which the defendant is the collector. Ever since the first introduction of turnpike acts, the legislature to promote religious worship on Sundays, has wisely exempted persons attending, from the payment of tolls on passing through turnpike gates on those days. With equal wisdom and liberality, the legislature has granted to Dissenters an exemption similar to that conferred on members of the Established Church; and, indeed, the exemption has been necessarily more extensive, because to Churchmen the exemption only operates when they are going to their own parish churches, where they ought to attend; whilst to Dissenters, the right is

reserved to attend such places of religious worship as they conscientiously approve. But the exemption in each turnpike act depending on each particular act, and the exempting words having been various in different acts, questions on their construction had occasionally arisen. Such was the origin of this action. In this act, the words exempted persons residing in a parish or township in which the roads should lie, from the payment of toll on Sundays, when "going to or returning from their parochial church, chapel or other place of religious worship on Sundays." The benefit of this exemption the plaintiff had claimed. By the collector it had been refused. He had insisted on the sum of tenpence as toll for the plaintiff, which he was compelled to pay, and this action was brought to recover back the amount. The reasons on which the defendant wished to exclude the plaintiff from the benefit of the exemption, would be stated to the court. He understood they were, first, because the word *parochial* restricted the exemption to the parish, in which the plaintiff dwelt; and secondly, because there was another Dissenting place of religious worship in that parish, and nearer to his residence, which would have been his proper place, and whereat he should therefore attend. Such reasoning appeared unsupported equally by the letter and by the spirit of the act; and the untenable nature of that reasoning had been already decided in a case at the Suffolk Assizes, before Mr. Justice Grose, in which he had directed a verdict for a plaintiff who brought a similar action, and had refused the defendant a case. A result precisely similar he also anticipated and thereat he should rejoice, because thereby the intention of the legislature would be effectuated, and that verdict would promote public worship, public morals and public peace.

William Cook being called, proved that he knew the plaintiff, who was a very respectable farmer at Foxhanger, in the parish of Rowde, where the turnpike road lies; belonging to the congregation of

Dissenters at Devizes, where he regularly attended for four years, since his residence in the country; that on Sunday, April 20th, 1817, he accompanied the plaintiff to Devizes; that the toll of ten pence was demanded by the defendant, that plaintiff claimed an exemption and explained where he was travelling; that exemption was disallowed by the defendant, who insisted on the toll, and which the plaintiff was obliged to pay. On his cross examination by Mr. Casberd, for defendant, he admitted that the meeting-house at Devizes was not in the parish wherein the plaintiff resided; that he passed through several parishes; that there is a Dissenting meeting-house in the parish of Rowde, wherein the plaintiff resides, but of the Baptist denomination.

Mr. Casberd, for defendant, then expressed himself satisfied as to the facts, but submitted that in point of law the plaintiff could not sustain the action for the reasons anticipated by Mr. Sergeant Pell, and requested a case; but Mr. Justice Holroyd said, that he remembered the case in Suffolk; that he thought the plaintiff was entitled to the exemption, and he would not grant a case, but should direct the jury to find a verdict for the plaintiff; but he would not preclude the defendant's counsel from applying to the court if they should be so advised to correct the judgment he had formed. The learned judge directed the jury accordingly, who found, verdict for plaintiff, damages ten-pence, and costs.

**RIOTS AT ANSTREY—INTERRUPTING PUBLIC WORSHIP.**—*The King v. The Rev. William Easton, clerk, James Gerrard and eight others.*—Mr. Gazelee opened the indictment, charging the defendants, first, with a conspiracy to interrupt, on December 31, 1816, a congregation of Protestants assembled for religious worship at Anstey, in a house duly certified and registered; and secondly, generally with a riot on the same day and at the same place; to which the defendants had pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Sergeant Pell addressed the court in a speech of considerable length and great eloquence. In that cause, as in the former, he was selected by a Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty in London, to vindicate those rights of the Protestant Dissenters which had been injuriously assailed. The case was important. It was as important to the members of the Established Church as it could be to Dissenters. Their character, the character of the country, the character of the times, were interwoven with the result. He was a member of the Established Church. He gloried in that connexion. His pleasure and pride originated in his knowledge that such church

was tolerant. Assailed in its infancy by persecution, persecution had been by it, even in darker ages, constantly renounced. It would not now assume weapons which, in periods of danger and of difficulty, it had disdained to grasp. To pronounce an apology for religious freedom, or to assert the paramount rights of conscience on that day, and in that court, would be to add lustre to the sun, and to demonstrate what no man would venture to dispute. Those rights, poets, lawyers, prelates and statesmen had united to assert; and he was distressed to find that those rights had been forgotten and disregarded by a clergyman of the Established Church, and by an officer in that county, to whom their sacred nature should have been known, and by whom, if assailed by others, they should have been upheld. To all sects of religionists, the church and the law had manifested a liberal and enlightened toleration; but the Protestant Dissenters appeared to claim their peculiar care. Their differences were not as to subjects important to salvation, but as to points of discipline and church government, as to which the most pious, intelligent and learned men might reason with equal integrity and with different results. To that body of men, always attached to constitutional liberty, and equally averse to anarchy and despotism; modest, humble, useful and persevering—the country owed great obligations in periods of the greatest difficulty; and it would be equally injurious and ungrateful to return kindness with injuries, and support with oppression. The absurdity of such conduct could only equal its intolerance and injustice. Persecution would give energies and create resistance, which indulgence might relax and prevent. They were the real enemies of the church who would adopt such measures for its maintenance. Conscientiously did he believe, even in these times when the dangers of the church formed a topic of conversation in every circle, that those dangers only could arise from the conduct of its own ministers, and a disregard to the principles on which it was established and endowed. He did not indeed expect its preservation from jolly parsons, from fox-hunting clergymen, from those who thought much of the spoils and little of the improvement of their parishioners; unsupported by the respect and love of those by whom they are observed, they might, indeed, have recourse to means to exclude Dissenters and intruders, which devout, laborious and affectionate ministers need not to adopt. It was when he witnessed such conduct, and then only, that he trembled for the church. He knew, and he gloried in the knowledge, that multitudes of clergymen, eminent for learning, for active benevolence, for zeal, constituted truly its honour and defence.



In proportion to his respect for such men, and his veneration for their virtue and usefulness, was his disgust at such persons as the defendants, on whom the court that day would decide. That day a clergyman of this county, the perpetual curate of the parish of Anstey, and holding another benefice, attended by James Gerrard, the tythingman of the parish, would be found to have been associating at night, in the depth of winter, with the eight other defendants, ignorant and misguided men, and endeavouring, by riots and noises and proceedings, violating order, liberty and public peace, to interrupt the religious and tolerated worship of a small congregation of Dissenters in a dwelling-house, assembled according to their consciences only to worship their God. The witnesses would detail the facts. Of the guilt of the defendants, he had not the smallest doubt. As to their verdict, he felt a confidence amounting to certainty; and although that verdict must pain his heart, as it must convict a clergyman of such an offence, and of an offence which would likely deprive him of his livings, and his means of repeating such misconduct; yet he should be consoled by the reflection, that thereby the church would be vindicated from reproach;—the spirit of persecution would be restrained;—the loyal attachment of the Dissenters would be perpetuated;—and persons worshiping God in the remote hamlet and straw-roofed cottage, would be taught to feel themselves equally secure with their fellow-worshippers in the city and the metropolis; in the most capacious meeting-house of their brethren, or in the noblest and most venerable cathedral of the Established Church. He then proceeded to call the witnesses for the prosecution.

Edward Davies, Esq. deputy registrar to the Bishop of Salisbury, produced a certificate that the dwelling-house of James Butt, in the parish of Anstey, was intended to be used as a place of religious worship by an assembly or congregation of Protestants.

Rev. Wm. Hopkins is a Dissenting minister residing at Tisbury; officiating there over a Dissenting congregation; Anstey is the adjoining parish; the perpetual curate of Anstey also resides at Tisbury; was requested to attend and preach at Anstey; the house of James Butt was certified for the purpose; went there for the first time in November, 1816; repeated his visits several times; was interrupted during the service by external noises; wrote a letter remonstrating to defendant, James Gerrard, the tythingman, and principal farmer, explaining his principles and motives; went again, and for the last time, on December 31, 1816, in a chaise cart: arrived about half-past five, commenced the service at six, the night was cloudy, showery and

cold, and the roads muddy; a considerable number of persons collected about the house, about seventy or eighty; when the service began, a tremendous noise was made with horns, bells, and discordant instruments; he attempted to proceed, but could not be heard; requested some friends to go out and remonstrate; they returned; the noises were increased; the females were alarmed; they feared the mob would break in; his efforts to continue were unsuccessful; and he was obliged to stop in the middle of the service, and to discontinue it; went away; ascended the carriage; a temporary silence as he got in, but then he was followed by the mob, amidst such noises and execrations, for half a mile, until he reached the boundary of Anstey parish; from fear he had never repeated his attendance at Anstey; he had received a letter from defendant Gerrard, maintaining the right of the people to make noises, and to enjoy their sports.

Samuel Alford is a farmer at Tisbury; acquainted with Butt's house at Anstey; attended there on December 31, 1816; Rev. Wm. Hopkins attended there as the officiating minister; Divine Service was in the evening, which was cloudy and showery; saw a number of persons assembled together before Butt's house, making a great noise with cow-horns, and large sheep bells, and various other noisy instruments, and that the noise was excessive and tremendous; Wm. Sheppard, high constable of the hundred, and other respectable persons, attended the place of religious worship and were present with him; went into the house, and the noise having for a short time ceased, religious worship began, when the noise became very great; he, with Sheppard and Coombes, went out to the door, where he saw a mob of seventy or eighty persons, shouting hideously, blowing cow-horns, and shaking sheep-bells, hallooing and whistling with whistles, about nine yards from the door; that a great noise, riot and disturbance was occasioned, and the noise might be heard at a considerable distance, and the continuance of religious worship was prevented, and the peace of the village was interrupted; saw amongst the mob, defendants, the perpetual curate of the parish of Anstey, who lived two miles off, at Tisbury, and James Gerrard, a farmer and tythingman; the clergyman encouraged the mob; saw him wave his hand, and distinctly heard him three times bawl out to them, "Play up, play up, play up;" James Gerrard used similar language, and was very active in the disturbance; Gerrard exclaimed to Wm. Sheppard, "Go along in, and hear your preacher;" returned to the place of worship; Mr. Hopkins was making great exertions that his sermon might be heard, but the noise was too great, and the people too much alarmed, and he could not proceed; when Mr. Hopkins left



the house the mob followed him and many of the congregation, blowing their horns and other noisy instruments, to the breach of the peace, to the very extremity of the parish; on December 5th, 1816, he had occasion to pass through Anstey, defendant James Gerrard came to him, and said, "I hope you won't think of coming here any more to encourage such a low-lived, scandalous set of fellows;" witness said, "we don't come here to offend you or any other person;" Gerrard answered, "I am very much offended, and do consider it a very great insult, and hope you won't think of coming here again;" witness said, "we certainly shall, and the more you oppose it, the more we shall consider it our duty to support it; we have a licence from the bishop, and no man dare to interrupt us." Gerrard replied, "I know we don't in the house; you may preach in the house as often as you please, and they shall make their noise in the street as often as they please, and you nor any other man shall prevent them, and as often as that fellow comes here to preach he shall have a band of music after his a—;" witness told him, "that every man who joined in the riot was subject to a fine of £40;" Gerrard replied, "I will see them out of it; I have encouraged them and will again." Cross-examined by Mr. Casberd; Mr. Hopkins, of the Independent persuasion; a regular meeting-house there, three miles from Butt's house; congregation at Anstey consisted of about sixty persons, in a small room much crowded; several Anstey people there, and ten or twelve from Tisbury; there was formerly a May pole on the space before Butt's house, which had been removed eight years, and replaced since the riot.

James Butt, the owner of the house, confirmed the statement as to the riots, and the presence of the clergyman and tythingman with the rioters, and identified all the other defendants as having bells, horns, fifes and different instruments, except Pike, whom he saw present, but could not state his instrument; saw the clergyman a week or a fortnight before December 31, who said to him, "Is the Methodist preacher coming to your house to preach to-night?" "No, Sir, not before next Tuesday or Wednesday." Clergyman—"I am surprised such a fellow as you should bring such a set of fellows or damned fellows, into the place; I hope we shall be able to make an example of you within this month." Saw clergyman in the mob, on December 31, and heard him say to the mob before the service began, loud and sneeringly, "make way, make way for the Methodists to hear their preacher."

John Butt corroborated the evidence of his brother. Clergyman's house two miles

and a half from that place. Cross-examined by Mr. Williams.—Clergyman has a Sunday school; he had been upon no duty that day. Re-examined. There were many youths and boys among the mob.

William Sheppard, high constable of the hundred. The account given by the former witnesses true; attended the religious worship at Anstey, on December 31; Mr. Hopkins, the officiating minister, was preaching; he was called upon as high constable to suppress a riot in the street opposite the place of worship; went out, saw the people collected about ten yards from the door, shouting, blowing horns, and making a tremendous noise with various noisy things; saw the clergyman and Gerrard; addressed Gerrard, as the tythingman, saying, "Sir, I am ashamed that such disgraceful proceedings as these should take place in a parish where you are the peace-officer, without your endeavouring to suppress them;" Gerrard answered him, "You had better bide at home and mind your own business;" clergyman then addressed him, saying, "the more shame for you, for being here." He again addressed Gerrard, saying, "If you do not immediately endeavour to put a stop to it, if I live till the next assizes, I will present your parish for rioting, and you for neglect of duty, in not suppressing it." Gerrard and the clergyman then, three distinct times, ordered the mob to "play up, play up, play up." The noise then became so great that he could scarcely hear himself speak; returned back into the meeting; found the congregation disturbed and alarmed, and the continuance of the service was completely prevented.

Joseph Stringfellow, a Catholic and a farmer, resident at Anstey; clergyman and Gerrard came to his house after the first or second time that Mr. Hopkins had been at Anstey; they came to him to come and see that he and the fellows did no harm; said he was a Catholic and tolerated, and declined to interfere. Cross-examined: there had been formerly a May-pole and a feast on May day; discontinued for ten years, at the request of Gerrard; but such noises and proceedings never known until Mr. Hopkins went there to preach.

The letter before referred to, written by Gerrard, having been read, Mr. Casberd addressed the court and jury for defendants. To the clergyman the result was most important; his character would be lost, his preferment prevented, and ruin might ensue to his family and himself. He submitted that a conspiracy was not proved; there might have been riots on December 31, but there was no evidence of any pre-concerted determination to put down the preaching as stated in the indictment.

Even as to riots, he submitted from the definition of a riot, in Hawkins, that the assembly of the people at a wake could not be deemed a riot, although the noise might be excessive. The opposite counsel had professed friendship for toleration and attachment to the Established Church. He also was friendly to liberal principles; but the Dissenters should not court persecution: why had not Mr. Hopkins remained at Tisbury, and why come to Antistey where it did not clearly appear that he was invited?

Mr. Justice Holroyd here interposed; he said that could be no excuse for such proceedings; Mr. Hopkins had a right to come and preach there if he thought proper, and he could have no doubt but that a great riot had taken place, which was highly criminal; and even as to the conspiracy there were very strong facts from which it might be inferred, and which he should submit to the jury.

Mr. Sergeant Pell then stated, that whilst his clients sought protection, and would bring up the defendants for judgment, they did not wish to crush or to ruin them. With a liberality worthy of their principles, they would not therefore press for a conviction on the count for a conspiracy, which would probably produce that effect: and as from clemency and not by way of compromise, they would be content that the defendants should be convicted of the riot, except Pike, against whom the judge thought the evidence as to overt acts, indistinct.

His Lordship expressed approbation at such conduct, and charged the jury accordingly, who returned a verdict—Guilty of a riot against William Easton, James Gerrard, and all the other defendants, except Stephen Pike who was acquitted.

The defendants, who are out on bail, will be of course brought up to London for the judgment of the Court of King's Bench next term. The trial lasted five hours, and the crowd in court was excessive.

### *Case of the Colchester Unitarian Church.*

SIR,

At the request of the Unitarian church in this town, I draw up their case for insertion in the Repository. I have delayed doing it for several weeks, that I might, after spending the whole of the last month among them, be the better able to judge of all the circumstances, and speak respecting them with the more decision, in recommending their case to the attention of the Unitarian public.

The circumstances which led to and attended the unroofing and dilapidation of the Presbyterian, now the Unitarian, chapel, in Helen's lane, Colchester, are at-

ready before the public, and are much too long to be here narrated: suffice it to say, that after the most careful examination of all the particulars, it appears to me, that there was no other mode of proceeding, but the one adopted, to prevent the expulsion of the Unitarian part of the then congregation, the rendering the power of the trustees completely null, and the establishment of religious tyranny in the said chapel. After the most rigid scrutiny, I am fully satisfied that the course taken was the only practicable one left to the friends of liberty and free inquiry after truth, who now form the Unitarian church in this place.

The chapel is now roofed, completely repaired, and greatly improved; it is a pretty large and commodious place of worship. After a pretty close examination, I cannot perceive that any unnecessary expense has been incurred by the repairs and improvements which have been made. A debt of about 50*l.* had been incurred, before the church and chapel were openly distinguished by the name of Unitarian, and brought into connexion with the Unitarians as a denomination; this debt the friends here take upon themselves, and will defray by their own exertions, which is as much as it is in their power to do in their present circumstances. Since they connected themselves with the Unitarians as a denomination, the debt incurred by new roofing the chapel, and the other repairs, is 250*l.* The following subscriptions towards removing the said debt have been received.

Rev. Mr. Toms, Framlingham	1	0	0
Friends at Palgrave	-	7	7
Unitarian Fund	-	20	0
Eastern Unitarian Association	5	0	0
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	33	7	0

Debt still remaining - 216 13 0

The Unitarian Church in this town being at present small, and the circumstances of its members not such as qualify them to make great pecuniary exertions, they are under the necessity of soliciting the aid of the friends of Unitarianism, in different parts of the kingdom, towards the discharge of the debt unavoidably incurred by repairing their chapel, as stated above. Any assistance they may be pleased to afford, will be thankfully received, and may be remitted to the Rev. R. Aspland.

In recommending the above case, it may be proper for me to mention my views of the importance of the Unitarian cause in this town, and to say something of the Unitarian congregation lately formed here. The Unitarian cause in Colchester must appear of considerable importance, when it is considered that it is the most populous



town in Essex, situated in the midst of an extensive and populous district, in which Unitarianism had no ostensible existence, until it gained footing here, and that there is a prospect that, before any great length of time, it may be extended from this to some of the neighbouring towns; to which some knowledge of it is already communicated, by the distribution of tracts. Could the friends of Unitarianism have had the choice of a town, in which they would commence the Unitarian cause in this part of Essex, surely this would have been the town on which, after due consideration, they would have fixed.

The congregation is at present small, nor is this any matter of surprise, as every possible means is used by the reputed orthodox to intimidate, alarm, and keep persons from attending. Those who constantly attend, are become pretty well acquainted with the Unitarian doctrine, are steady and zealous in the profession of it, are united and consistent in their conduct, and their number has increased during the last few weeks. They have established a Fellowship Fund, for the promotion of Unitarian objects, to which most of the members of the society are subscribers: they have also an Unitarian library, supported by subscription among them. On the whole, the prospect of success to the Unitarian cause in Colchester, and of its consequent extension to other places in the neighbourhood, is good; and if the debt on the chapel can be shortly removed, there is little doubt of its progress being the more rapid; as a considerable debt on a small society, while in its infant state, is not only felt as a depressing circumstance by the society, but often is the means of preventing others from joining them. With these views of the case, I take the liberty of submitting it to the consideration of our friends in different parts of the kingdom, and of soliciting their assistance for the Colchester Unitarians.

R. WRIGHT.

P. S. There is a burying-ground to the chapel.

*Colchester, March 7, 1818.*

*Unitarian Fund Society, of the High Street Chapel, Portsmouth.*

THE Reformation removed a few of the grosser corruptions of Christianity; a great number were, however, left unexamined. The Reformers having accomplished as much as the temper of the times and the circumstances in which they were placed by Divine Providence would permit them, confidently hoped and expected that the work on which they had entered with so much intrepidity, and which they had so ardently prosecuted, would be continued by their immediate successors. But the

fervent zeal and the noble spirit of reform, which they bequeathed to posterity, became an unclaimed legacy; and not being called into action, were very soon lost.

Nearly fifty years ago, some inquiring members of the Established Church, who had become dissatisfied with her doctrine, discipline and formulary of prayer, petitioned parliament to be relieved from their subscription to them. Notwithstanding their cause was advocated by men of high respectability and of the first talents in the House of Commons, their petition was rejected by a very large majority; which, of course, determined that the members of the national church must continue to believe in, subscribe to, and carefully preserve these remaining corruptions. Individuals were, nevertheless, found both in and out of the church, who seriously and earnestly endeavoured to winnow the chaff from the wheat, and to remove, at least, a part of that mass of error with which the religion of Jesus had been for so many ages debased. Though these pious and learned men succeeded, by deep research and indefatigable industry, in detecting many of these errors, they were extremely cautious, especially among the Dissenters, of communicating this knowledge freely and generally in their respective congregations; finding, perhaps, few of them inclined to hear, or prepared to receive it: for, pains, penalties and disabilities of the severest kind, had been enacted in the reign of William and Mary, to deter those who should dare to "impugn the sacred mystery of the blessed Trinity."

The love of truth was so strong in the mind of one\* of the highly respectable body of petitioning clergy for further reform, as to render it impossible for him, "with a safe conscience, to hold his preferment in the church." This great and good man having left all, taken up his cross instead of the crosier, which he might have obtained, and followed Christ, erected in Essex Street, London, an altar to the worship of one God, indivisible in his nature and essence, the God and Father of Jesus, the God to whom Jesus prayed, and to whom alone he taught his disciples to pray. From this period, Unitarianism began to attract the attention of thinking men, and to make some advances in the minds of those who could venture to inquire into the nature and character of a Triune Deity, whether such Deity were worshiped, under different symbols, in the cavern of Elephanta, or the Ca-

\* The late Rev. Theophilus Lindsey. Every lover of Unitarianism should read the very interesting Memoirs of this venerable apostle of evangelical truth, by his valuable friend, the Rev. Thomas Belsham.



thedral of St. Paul's. Still its advances were slow, until the pains and penalties of fine and imprisonment were, with so much liberality, repealed by the Legislature about four years and a half ago. Since that time, its progress has been considerably increasing; and the more it is promulgated, the more it must increase, from its simplicity, and from its perfect accordance with reason and the Scriptures.

This necessary increase of Unitarianism produces frequent calls on the benevolence of those few Unitarian congregations which have been for some time established in various parts of the kingdom. They are become so frequent, as to render applications on the part of the resident ministers, to the more opulent members of their societies, irksome and unpleasant. And yet they cannot send their brethren away empty; they feel that the needy ought to be relieved, and that the hungry should be fed. A remedy has been suggested, by which, at a small individual expense, to administer substantial relief in such cases, and to assist our Christian brethren in procuring the true bread of life.

The remedy proposed is a weekly contribution, so small as to render it universal; since each person will naturally be desirous of communicating to others that knowledge which he himself values. One penny per week is within the reach of every one, and even of the young persons, or the children of a family, who should be induced and encouraged to give this trifling sum to the maintenance of the public worship of their heavenly Father. Unitarians must look to the rising generation for the continuance of their exertions. The children of Unitarian parents should, therefore, be early instructed to love the cause of evangelical truth; they should be impressed with a desire to advance the cause they love, by their small weekly contributions; and they

should be led to cherish a lively interest in promoting, by every means in their power, those gospel doctrines which their parents have so fearlessly avowed, and so zealously defended.

*Regulations:—*

The society is designated, The Unitarian Fund Society of the High Street Chapel, Portsmouth; and commences with the year 1818.

Its object is to promote the cause of Unitarianism generally, according to its means; but more particularly, to assist poor Unitarian congregations in erecting, appropriating, or repairing places for public worship.

Annual subscribers to pay five shillings. A book of donations will be kept for those who may be desirous of subscribing more.

Weekly subscriptions are to be one penny; to be paid half-yearly, quarterly, or six-weekly.

The minister shall be the president.

A treasurer, secretary and a committee of twelve gentlemen shall be chosen at the commencement of every year; one third of the committee are to be ineligible for immediate re-election: for the first two years this one-third will be determined by lot; and afterwards, those who have been longest on the committee to retire by rotation.

The committee shall meet quarterly; and any five of its members, with the president and the secretary, to be considered sufficient to transact business.

The committee shall receive and determine on all applications made to the society for assistance; and the secretary is empowered to summon the committee, on such applications, as soon as possible.

Subscriptions and donations will be received by the Rev. Russell Scott, president, Mr. James Scott, treasurer, and by Mr. Merrick, the secretary.

---

## MONTHLY RETROSPECT of PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR,

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

---

OF all persons in the United Kingdom, the least interested in the determination of the proper time for the celebration of Easter are the writer and the readers of this Survey: yet, as the question is connected with many points of importance in literature, science and ecclesiastical history, the circumstance that has taken place in the sect established by law, as well as in the communion attached to the see of Rome, cannot be passed by unnoticed. These sectarians profess to be guided by a certain law, laid down by a congress of eminent characters, under the denomination

of bishops, called together by the reigning emperor, at the city of Nice, in the year three hundred and twenty-five. One object of this congress was to prevent disputes respecting Easter, and to introduce uniformity in what was called the Christian world in the celebration of it. They agreed that it should always be on a Sunday, depending on the phase of the moon after the vernal equinox. The reason for taking into consideration the phase of the moon must be looked for in the corresponding regulations of the Jews, respecting their passover; and, as it was an undoubted

fact, that our Saviour was crucified at the passover at the time of full moon, the great point particularly attended to by the congress was, that the Easter-day or festival of the resurrection should not take place till after the full moon; and in consequence a regulation was made, that if the first full moon after the vernal equinox happened on a Sunday, Easter-day should be the Sunday after.

Now it is remarkable, that in the discussions that have taken place this year on the Easter-day, there seems to have prevailed a total ignorance respecting the reason of the law in the rubrick of the Common Prayer Book, at least as far as the writer has had an opportunity of making any inquiries on this subject. He has asked the question of various persons in different ranks of life and religious persuasions, and yet not one of them could give an answer to this question: Why did the congress at Nice, and the framers of the Common Prayer Book make it particularly binding, that if the first full moon after the vernal equinox should be on a Sunday, Easter day should be on the Sunday following? All the answers were very wide of the mark, but in general they concurred in this, that it was a matter of no consequence when Easter-day was kept: and they supposed that the Almanack makers knew what they were about. One person, remarkably attached to the Prayer Book, and who would have been very indignant, if her clergyman had swerved from the rubrick in the lessons or collect for the day, being hampered by the positive declaration of the rubrick in this case, and the knowledge that full moon was on the 22nd of March, got over the whole difficulty by supposing, that there must have been some good reason for altering the rubrick, and she was perfectly satisfied with whatever might be done by the rulers of her church. It was scarcely worth while to observe to her, that the rulers of the church probably knew nothing of the matter, and took Easter day as was settled by the Almanack makers.

Be all this as it may, Easter-day has this year been celebrated on the day on which it was intended, and for very good reasons, that it should never take place; and consequently all the services of the Sundays in the Prayer Book for the remainder of the year are out of place. This is nothing to us. But it is something to find, that the attachment to times and seasons is so much worn out, that the rubrick may be construed into a dead letter, and that an Attorney-General, who was so indignant at a supposed jest only on the Athanasian creed, should pass unnoticed the violation of the rubrick. This is a

good omen, and we shall hope that it will lead in time to an examination of the Prayer Book itself. As the men of this day feel no longer the veneration that was paid by their ancestors to certain times and seasons, they will examine and compare with Scripture, what their ancestors drew up, upwards of two hundred years ago, for the regulation of their faith and religious worship.

It cannot be said, that there is a want of zeal for religious institutions at this time. For, notwithstanding the cry on the distressed state of our finances, a bill is in parliament for appropriating a million of money to the building of churches; and besides, there has been a meeting of the chief members of the sect established by law, to raise a subscription in aid of the same purpose. This building of new churches, at the time when the old ones present such vacuities at the time of divine service, may be considered as a singular phenomenon: for we may observe without fear of contradiction, that the present churches in England will hold on any day far more than have an inclination to go into them. It is true, that in some places, from a very increased population, there is a defect in this respect: but in general it might not be a bad thing to follow the plan adopted in some parts of Switzerland, where Catholics and Protestants, at different times of the day, make use of the same church, to let the Methodists, or other Dissenters, have the parish church at those hours when it is not wanted by the Establishment. They will then be filled, and become more serviceable to the community at large; and, when we consider that this million is to be raised upon the whole community, such an arrangement is what with propriety might be granted by the ruling party, to that, which, if not in wealth and power, yet in numbers, is equal or perhaps superior.

If we may judge of the churches in the country by those in London, this measure will be chiefly advantageous to the evangelical party; for, except in very few instances, it is by them only that the churches are filled. The new ones are to be built in populous districts, and in those districts the evangelicals will always have the preference. The reason for this is obvious. Without attending to the grounds of difference between the two parties, they take more pains, and endeavour to impress upon their hearers the material objects of their common faith. Yet, perhaps, it has not occurred to the legislature, nor to these parties, nor, it may be said, sufficiently to those of our own persuasion, who are also employed in building places of worship, why, after so great an expenditure upon such objects, so little has really been gained on the side of

religion. It is not known when the first building was erected by Christians for the sake of public worship. There is no trace of any such thing in the apostolical writings. We read there of the church at a person's house, but the word ought to have been rendered meeting or assembly, which was held in a room in that house used afterwards for other purposes. In those meetings every one took a part according to his peculiar gifts. There was no such thing as a service exclusively performed by one person with a peculiar character attached to him; and it would be well for Christians to consider whether the change from the apostolical mode of worship has not been exceedingly detrimental to the cause of the kingdom of God.

Soon after the great departure from the spirit of Christianity in the usurpation of bishops, or pretended fathers of the church, lording it over Christ's heritage, magnificent buildings were erected in imitation of the heathen temples. In these a degree of pomp was displayed little consistent with the humility of the first teachers of Christianity; and they frequently excited the jealousy of their heathen neighbours. Many of these structures were destroyed at the time of the Dioclesian persecution; but they raised their heads again when Constantine formed his establishment in church and state, and the temples of the Heathens were violently seized from them and converted to the purposes of the new superstition. The latter temples were easily convertible to the new faith, for they were adapted to solemn processions, and the imitation of Pagan sacrifices, which now began to be the general worship of those who called themselves Christians. The Roman empire was soon covered with similar buildings, many of them of beautiful or magnificent architecture. Yet, as their number and magnificence increased, the spirit of true religion declined, and at last thick darkness covered the earth, and the worship of the unhallowed name almost universally prevailed.

On the great revolt from Popery, a considerable and very advantageous change took place in the services of these churches, the principal of which were the reading of the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, and the interpretation of them at stated times by the officiating minister. This was a very great improvement, and if it falls short of the perfection to which every Christian is to aim, still we must not be senseless of the obligations we lie under to those by whom this improvement was effected. The plan adopted by the sect established by law, was in general pursued by the parties which dissented from it, and congregations listened to the voice of their teacher, seldom thinking of the duty of exhorting each other, but

leaving that task to the officer, whose peculiar business it was deemed to be. In this manner things were conducted for upwards of two centuries in this country, when it struck some eminent men, distinguished by their piety, that this could never have been the intention of the first founders of Christianity, that one should be appointed a teacher, and the rest were to remain in a state of pupilage all their lives. They began to diffuse the notion that all were interested in religion, and unless they all felt that interest, there must be a coldness in divine worship, and very little feeling of universal benevolence. In consequence of this, churches were formed by the society which now goes under the name of the Methodists, and is entitled to a high degree of our respect. They were not content, and in this we cannot too highly applaud them, with the formal instruction and devotion of one day of the week, but they divided their society into classes and bands, by which they might conveniently meet at other times in their private houses, and mutually edify each other. This is a very great improvement upon the former plan, for by this the talents of all are brought forth. They have discovered that others, besides those who are called men of learning, are capable of communicating the spiritual things of God; that many have gifts, which, under the former system, might have lain buried for ever.

This plan has been adopted, we believe, in very few cases by us; yet it may be submitted to general consideration, that wherever a place of worship is built for three or four hundred members, there seems to be a waste of expense in its appropriation to a service for only one day of the week. The congregation might be divided into classes, so that each party might conveniently meet in it, and there employ themselves in those objects which are interesting to all Christians. Among us, as among the Methodists, it would be found, that many possess gifts which are now lost, many capable to edify each other by reflections on our Scriptures. For it is a great error to suppose that scholastic learning is necessary to the furtherance of the gospel. Many who know nothing of Scripture but what they have learned from the translation in the vulgar tongue, and have never attended to any of the disputes about its meaning, know nothing of the pretended fathers, of councils, of articles of faith, may far excel in the knowledge of Christ, those whose lives have been passed in the dust of folios. Not that learning is to be despised, but the only learning to be valued by us, is that which does not seem to be held in great estimation; that which gives us the knowledge of the Scriptures in their original languages; and, if in our



meetings, any one will read to us a chapter from the Hebrew or the Greek, thereby rectifying any error into which we may have been led by the imperfect translations now in use, he will receive from us due estimation. This point is recommended to all who wish to be valued for their learning; and whether we possess among us any one who can do this, it is left to others, who have more experience than the writer to determine.

The legislature has been occupied for some time on the bill of Indemnity. There did not exist in any one's mind a doubt that such a bill would be passed, yet it gave occasion for animated debates in both houses, in which a variety of facts connected with the Suspension of the Habeas Corpus act were developed, and scenes laid open, which, in the page of history, will disgrace this country. There was one thing, however, which no Englishman could have anticipated, and that is, that the pains of a human being should be made the subject of merriment in an assembly of senators! Yet so it was. Among the petitions presented to the House from the *détenus*, was one from an infirm old man, who, in consequence of the violence used towards him, and the weight of his irons, was obliged to undergo a painful operation for a rupture. This was chosen as the theme for a display of wit by a member of administration, celebrated for his parodies and satirical verses on all with whom he is now associated in the bonds of friendship. The torture of a man under the agonizing pains of a dreadful operation, excited a general laugh on one side of the House, when dressed up in all the meretricious arts of specious eloquence. What would this speaker have said to his friends during the six weeks that he lay on his bed incapable of turning himself from the ball shot through his buttocks by this now valued friend whose place he had been secretly undermining? What would he have said, if his pains had been turned into a jest, and he had been made the object of their merriment? This feature, in the passing of the Indemnity bill, will not be easily forgotten. The neglect of petitions was to be expected; that the afflictions of the prisoner should be a matter of jest, betrays such a degree of depravity, and we might even add bad taste, as reflects equal disgrace on the speaker, and on those who could countenance such misplaced buffoonery.

In France, the debates of their houses continue to be uninteresting. Libels as they are called, are daily published, and the frequent seizure of papers does not prevent the writers from giving their effusions to the public. The press will gain the victory even in France. The Censorat affords matter for much speculation;

the difficulties in its way are the bishoprics, for which funds are not easily to be found. As to the superstition intended to be supported, public opinion is so much against it, that the Pope and his clergy are sunk too low ever to be again the authors of much mischief. The shot at the Duke of Wellington occupies still some attention.

The Polish Diet is about to assemble, and the rescript of the Emperor Alexander on this subject does him great credit. The Autocrat seems to have better ideas of civil and religious liberty than any other sovereign in Europe; and Poland stands a chance of enjoying more happiness under his mild dominion, than it could have done under its former proud, domineering and oppressive aristocracy.

From Spanish America, the accounts are afflicting to humanity. Spain has ever been cruel, and it was not to be expected that Mina, if taken, would be treated otherwise than as a rebel. But the partisans of the Spanish misrule, forgot that their opponents had the power of retaliation, and above a hundred Spaniards have been sacrificed to the manes of the unfortunate chieftain. When the passions are thus let loose, the consequences must be dreadful. The war must be now carried on to the annihilation of one or other of the parties. If Spain succeeds, gibbets, tortures, and all the horrors of the Inquisition, will be its avenging instruments. We could hope that the other party, if successful, will not disgrace its cause by such wretched and unjustifiable expedients.

Before this report is concluded, it may be thought by some incumbent on the writer to take notice of our friend Belsham's last tirade—but the contest is too trifling. On the subject of his indignation it will be sufficient to say, *Qui capit ille facit*: and once for all, he is recommended to Mr. Robinson's History of Baptism, in which he will find a full refutation of all that he has advanced on infant baptism and babe sprinkling. It is rather extraordinary that he should either not have seen, or have made so little use of that excellent work, in which there is more learning, and a better description of the manners and customs of the early Christians, than perhaps in any other ecclesiastical writer. As to the imputation of the writer of this paper belonging to a sect of late date, this is a mistake of our worthy friend: for, when the writer quitted the sect established by law, he followed the example of Paul, and, not conferring with flesh and blood, gave himself wholly to the sacred Scriptures, and to those only: and his sect, if it is to be called a sect, is that to which Paul belonged, and of which he spoke, when he said, "after the manner that they call heresy, worship I the God of my Fathers."

## NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

The Theological and Miscellaneous Works of Joseph Priestley, LL. D. F. R. S. &c. With Notes by the Editor. Vol. IV.

Letters to a Protestant Divine in Defence of Unitarianism. By Another Barrister. 8vo. 5s.

A Letter to Dr. Chalmers, occasioned by his Notice of Unitarians in the Appendix to his Sermon on the Death of the Princess Charlotte. To which is subjoined, a Statement of the Evidence of Sir Isaac Newton's Unitarianism. By Benjamin Mardon, Minister of the Unitarian Church, Glasgow. 8vo. 1s.

Posthumous Discourses of the very Venerable Joshua Toulmin, D. D. Selected, revised and edited by Theophilus Browne, M. A. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Christianity and Present Politics how far reconcilable: in a Letter to the Right Hon. W. Wilberforce. By Rev. H. Bathurst. 8vo. 3s.

Who are the Happy? A Poem on the Christian Beatitudes, with other Poems on Sacred Subjects. By William Hamilton Drummond, D. D. M. R. I. A. 8vo.

An Inquiry whether Crime and Misery

are produced or prevented by our present System of Prison Discipline. By Thomas Fowell Buxton. 8vo. 5s.

*Sermons on the Death of the Princess Charlotte.*

(Continued from p. 152.)

At St. Nicholas Street Chapel, Lancaster, Nov. 23, 1817. By W. Lamport. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

By H. G. Watkins, A. M. St. Swithin's Church. 1s. 6d.

By T. Bartlett, M. A. Kingston. 1s. 6d.

By W. Chaplin, Bishop Stortford. 1s.

By J. H. Cox, Hadleigh. 1s.

By Jos. Fletcher, M. A. Blackburn.

By G. C. Gorham, M. A. Cambridge University. 1s.

By C. S. Hawtree, M. A. Jews' Chapel. 1s.

By W. Harris, Wallingford. 1s.

By J. Kennedy, Teston Church. 1s.

By T. Lewis, Islington. 1s. 6d.

By W. Marsh, A. M. St. Peter's, Colchester. 1s. 6d.

By R. Newman, Feversham. 1s.

By James Pilkington, Rayleigh. 1s.

By C. F. Ramptler, Fulneck. 1s.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from A Steady Unitarian; T. C. H.; J. Chadwick; A. U. C.; H. G. (Maritus); J. H.; Peter Post Obit.; I. W.; John Kenrick; W. T. Procter; L. Holden; J. M.; A. Z.; An Occasional Reader; Eucharis; Hæresiarthus; Hopeful; M. H.

We have received a letter from Mrs. Margarot, relict of the late Mr. M. Margarot, animadverting upon a passage in Mr. Muir's letter, inserted XII. 577, in which the writer says, "From our society" (meaning that of the political exiles at Sydney, New South Wales) "Margarot is expelled." Mrs. Margarot says, that their society would have done Mr. M. no honour, and that they afterwards courted his acquaintance. She then brings some most serious accusations against the persons before referred to, which we cannot consent to record on our pages; especially as no charge has been brought in this work against Mr. Margarot, which such counter-charges are necessary to refute. Mr. Muir states Mr. Margarot's expulsion from amongst his companions; Mrs. Margarot asserts that they afterwards sought to regain his acquaintance; and here the affair may rest. We ought to add, that Mrs. Margarot says that "Mr. Margarot visited Mr. Muir's and Mr. Skirving's friends after his return to England;" and that she announces, that "if there are any of Mr. Palmer's friends alive, who may wish to know any thing more of him, she will be at home any day they may please to appoint by a note, to answer their inquiries." Her address is No. 4, Dear's Place, Somers's Town. Her letter is left to her address at the Publishers.

The letter from Liverpool was inserted before the letter from Macclesfield, requesting its withdrawal, was received.

Another Liverpool Correspondent complains of the *duplicity* of the ministers connected with the Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Tract Society calling themselves *Presbyterian*. We leave them to their own defence.

The illness of the Editor during nearly the whole of the month, will, it is hoped, serve as an excuse for any irregularities, omissions and errors in the present Number.