

# THE Monthly Repository.

No. CXLVIII.]

APRIL, 1818.

[Vol. XII.]

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

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

(Continued from p. 164.)

No. 10.

*John Locke to Philip à Limborch.*

*Rotterdam, Nov. 30, 1687.*

MOST EXCELLENT FRIEND,

AS nothing tends so much to preserve or restore the health of the body as tranquillity of mind, you may be assured that your agreeable letters, those testimonies of your affection and benevolence, have proved my chief consolation during that weak and uncertain state of health which I have long experienced. When often weary of other remedies, your prescription, always pleasant and most palatable, has refreshed me. And while I nauseated and rejected others, your salutary medicine, prepared with your Attic salt, I always the more eagerly desired. Beware, then, how you fancy that your letters could have given me any trouble, unless you believe the convalescent, whom you have cherished by the kindest and most anxious care, to have become quite an ingrate. Your expressions of so much friendship have sometimes served to recover me, even when rapidly declining. If I have been tardy in acknowledging these favours, you know the man too well to expect that indisposition has made me expeditious. However, if you will admit this as a reasonable excuse, I have delayed a little that I might assure you of my confirmed health, and join with you in congratulating a recovery which was so much the object of your care and solicitude.

I lament that Oratio was so soon taken from us,\* not because you have thus lost the glory of a triumph, for I know that if truth prevail, you are

See p. 102, Note.

VOL. XIII.

indifferent to the reputation of a victory. Yet had he lived, it would have been gratifying to have drawn from him some acknowledgment of the force of your reasonings. But I designed, when I next wrote, to ask you for the particulars of his sufferings in the Inquisition. I am led to this just now from having met with an account by a Frenchman, of what he, though a Catholic, endured from the Portuguese Inquisitors, at Goa,\* in India. His narrative inclines me fully to believe all that the Jew represented. Since, therefore, he has departed to the land of silence, I request that you would commit to paper, what you recollect of the affair, that we may not lose the evidence we now possess respecting that *evangelical* method of conversion.

I am sorry to have missed being of your party at the entertainment of your friends, not because I care for oysters, for on such occasions I am least of all pleased with the silent moments, and the speech of such companions gives a relish far more gratifying than even an Oyster of Gaurus.†

Pray give my respects to your excellent wife, and all of the Veen and Guenelon families. Two or three weeks ago I wrote to Mr. Le Clerc,

\* *The Relation de l'Inquisition de Goa*, 12mo. Paris, 1687, appears in Limborch's "Catalogue of Authors," prefixed to his *History of the Inquisition*. The author of the *Relation*, he frequently quotes, and particularly describes his various attempts "to destroy himself," from "the despair he fell into, through the cruelty and length of his imprisonment." See Chandler's *Translation of Limborch's Hist.* i. 241.

† Probably referring to Javenal, *requiescat dignus morte perit, comes licet ostrea centum Gaurana*. *Motus & motus*, viii. 1:85.

and at the same time sent him some papers.\* I wish to know if he received them safe, for I begin now again to attend to these things. Give my respects to him.

Adieu, and continue to make me, by your regards and your correspondence,

Yours, most affectionately,  
J. LOCKE.

No. 11.

John Locke to Philip à Limborch.

Rotterdam, June 22, 1688.

MOST EXCELLENT FRIEND,

ALTHOUGH my threats have not appalled your resolution, you may perceive, when you choose to try, what it is to vex a wasp, to which a friend provoked and angry may be not unfitly compared. I have not yet seen those Acts of Leipsic† in which you make your appearance. I may now give you joy. Your affair is well settled. I was beginning to doubt a little the merit and importance of the work, while none of the system-mongers discovered in the whole treatise any thing to disapprove, for it would not have contained enough of sound and uncommon reasoning to satisfy the intelligent, had it pleased every one. But now I quarrel not with the lashes, nor fear what marks they leave. The power, if not the inclination of these pedagogues, is so harmless that their rods leave neither wounds nor scars.

I have several times sent to England your *Proposals* for a subscription, but have yet received no answers. I used every occasion to inform various persons, but I know not with what success. Such objects are too generally neglected, unless some one is at hand to urge the indecisive and remind the forgetful.

I am much pleased with your account of the Jew, and hope you will soon have prepared a volume, in which the Holy Office, painted to the life, may attract universal admiration. It

\* Perhaps the abridgment of the Essay. See p. 86, note \*. Mr. Locke is also supposed to have been a frequent contributor to La Cense's *Bibliothèque Universelle*.

† *Acta Lipsiensia*, a review of learned works, was then published at Leipsic.

is truly to be regretted, that such examples of sapidity, and so numerous, should remain secret. Let them be brought to light, that, at length, the grounds of the faith may be understood, and the mode in which it is promoted.

I say nothing of the MS. copy; for our friend Furley,\* two days ago wrote to you on the subject. As I thought you sometimes met Wetstein,† I took that opportunity to enclose some papers to be delivered to him. More than fifteen days ago I wrote to him, with some books, and requested to have others sent to me as soon as possible, but I can procure no answer from him. I regret his silence the more, because I wrote at the same time to Dr. Veen, and returned two volumes of *Garcilaso de la Vega*,‡ which he lent me some time ago. Pray, give my respects to him and the rest of your friends.

Farewell, my kind friend, and continue your regards to

Yours, most respectfully,  
J. LOCKE.

No. 12.

John Locke to Phillip à Limborch.

Rotterdam, July 30, 1688.

MOST EXCELLENT FRIEND,

WHETHER you are disposed to consider me as angry or pleased, I am conscious of too long silence. The wasp should have answered, as a friend, the friend he had provoked, the sooner to have blunted the sting. But I know not by what mental torpor it happens, that I act properly the part neither of friend nor foe. Whether my way will please you I know not, but if I served our friend Slade thus, he would be not a little displeased, for I well know he could not endure such versatilities.

It is much to be regretted, that the publication of the manuscript, which you were arranging with Wetstein, is not to proceed. I fear, if it is not

\* See p. 88.

† A Dutch bookseller, of eminence; the celebrated Biblical critic Wetstein, was of the same family.

‡ Either the poet, or one of the same name, a native of Cusco, who wrote, in Spanish, the history of Florida, and that of Peru and the Incas." See Biog. Dict. 1784. V. 543.



committed to the press, that there will not soon appear an historical work so luminous. Indeed, I consider it as far preferable to most of the works which are now generally read.

With much pleasure I have read our friend Le Clerc's *Tentamen*,\* as he calls it, on the ancient poetry of the Hebrews, and am persuaded that no small light may thus be thrown on the rest of the Psalms in the Holy Scriptures. I wish to see an edition of the whole book of Psalms thus arranged by him. Pray urge him to dispatch such a work as quickly as his other engagements will permit. When I mentioned the opinion [of Le Clerc] to a friend of mine, versed in the Hebrew learning, he rejected it; but he now admits the evidence.

I had many other things to say, but am interrupted by the arrival of a friend from England, so they must be postponed to my next. Adieu, and regard me as

Yours respectfully,  
J. LOCKE.

No. 13.

John Locke to Philip à Limborch.

Rotterdam, Nov. 24, 1688.

MOST EXCELLENT FRIEND,

MY servant, who had some business at Amsterdam, set off immediately on asking my permission, so that I had no time to write to you. I sincerely regret that the health of your family is so interrupted. Concerning the disease and its cure, I venture not to give an opinion while absent, nor, indeed, is it necessary while you are among so many experienced and attentive medical friends. Only one thing permit me to recommend. If, as you expect, the small pox, at length, appear, avoid all heating medicines or bed-coverings, which excite a ferment in the blood;

\* This appears to have been a Preface to some pieces, by his father, Stephen, and his uncle, David Le Clerc; according to the following article in J. C. Opera, under 1687:

"Davidis Clerici Orationes, Computus Ecclesiasticus et Poemata. Ascendunt Stephanus Clerici Dissertationes Philologice. Quibus Rerumfessionem praeferit Jacob Clericus. Amst. apud Hens., Metastemum. 8vo.

producing grievous sickness, with no small danger. My regard for you, and the interest I take in your concerns, extort from me this advice, and indeed I speak from experience.

I trust the health of your family is, however, in such a state, that I may speak on other subjects, especially if they are agreeable. Our friend Furley had an audience of the Prince before his departure,\* and solicited his interference to put a stop to the persecution attempted in this province, and at a time peculiarly unseasonable. He urged the business so warmly, that the prince was pleased to write a letter to the bailiff of Kennemerland, who, by the authority of the synod, had adjudged Foecke Floris, minister of a church of Mennonites,† to depart the country within eight days, on pain of imprisonment. The history of this Foecke Floris you can learn more correctly from others than from me, for to our friend Furley, till this circumstance occurred, he was not even personally known. But, believing the common interest of Christians to be implicated in the case of this man, he took it up, and pursued the business with an ardent zeal. Had he not, indeed, been importunate, nothing would have been done. We may now hope that letter (from the Prince) will restrain the fury of the persecutors. If you hear any thing further of this affair, among your Mennonites, pray inform me.

\* For England, where the Prince of Orange landed, November 4, 1688.

† So called from "Menno Simons, a native of Friesland," who, "in 1536, resigned his office of priest in the Romish Church," and joined the Anabaptists. According to Mosheim, they maintained "the human nature of Christ." He says that "a severe persecution was set on foot against them in the Palatinate, in the year 1694, which was suspended by the intercession of William III. King of Great Britain." See Mosheim. Eccles. Hist. 2d edition. IV. 142, and V. 45 and 47.

W. Penn mentions a "meeting" which he had in 1677, at Amsterdam, "with Golenus Abrahams, the great father of the Socinian Mennonists, in these parts, accompanied with several preachers, and others of his congregation." See \* An Account of W. Penn's Travels in Holland and Germany, anno 1677." P. 243.

Farewell, most excellent friend,  
with your whole family, so wishes,  
very affectionately,

Your most devoted,  
J. LOCKE.

No. 14.

*John Locke to Philip à Limborch.*

*Rotterdam, Feb. 16, 1689.*

IT was my earnest wish, most excellent friend, before I left this country, to have had an opportunity of visiting my friends at Amsterdam, and especially yourself. Yet every thing has proved adverse, as if on purpose to oppose my wishes. First, the frost, and then my hurry; since which the rain has prevented my journey. For, last Saturday, going to the Hague that I might there prevail on a noble lady to accompany me to Amsterdam, where she had designed to go, a very violent shower overtook me on the road to Delft, and incommoded me all the way to the Hague. Thus I arrived wet through, and instead of going on to you the same evening, the lady not only dissuaded me, on account of the great danger to my health, but even forbade the journey. Thus the rain, which before had scarcely fallen for two months, disappointed me even of that short interview which I joyfully expected when I set off. At the court I found every thing prepared for departure, with so much impatience of delay, that it was generally believed that the Princess's fleet would sail the first favourable wind.\* I, indeed, began my intended journey to you, trusting not so much to the wind, as to the religion of the Princess, which I scarcely thought would suffer her to begin the voyage on a Lord's day, even though an east wind should invite her. But now they wait only for such a wind as may suit the navigation, that they may at once go on board the ships. I returned hither yesterday evening, and how long I shall be delayed here I know not. This, however, I know well enough, that nothing is more irksome than to be even fatigued with

\* The Princess of Orange had remained in Holland, awaiting the success of her husband's enterprize, and was now about to join him.

leisure, and yet not to command time for a favourite purpose. How I long to pass an hour or two among you, the countenance, the speech, the embrace of friends have an indescribable value, of which I long to partake. Your attachment to me, and mine to you cannot be doubted, nor could our mutual friendship be increased by the ceremony of a farewell. Yet I wish to see you, to shake your hand, and to repeat the declaration that I am entirely yours. Should this be now denied me, let me hope for it at a future time, for I would not augur so ill to myself, as to suppose that the day will not arrive for us to meet again. Many things have inclined me to seize the present opportunity of sailing homewards; the expectation of my friends, my private concerns, now so long neglected, the frequent piracies, and especially such a safe conveyance, afforded me by the friendship and attention of the noble lady, whom I am accompanying. Yet, I trust, you will be assured, that *here* I have found for myself another country, and I may almost say other relations; for whatever most endears the name—good-will, affection, charity, all those things, whose ties are stronger than those of blood, to connect and bind men together; these I have largely experienced among you. I have here friends ever to be revered by me, and such as I would fain revisit, should leisure and opportunity be allowed me. This I surely know, that I depart with a desire of returning again, to share with them those sincere and solid enjoyments, the kind influence of which I have experienced, so that, while far from my own connexions, and, suffering in every other respect, I never felt any sickness of the mind.

As for you, (best of men, most friendly and beloved,) when I think of your learning, your talents, manners, candour and gentleness, I appear to have found in your friendship alone, (not to speak of the rest,) what must always make me feel grateful for the years I have passed among you, so pleasant and improving. Nor do I know how such a portion of my life could have been elsewhere so agreeably passed; certainly no where with more improvement.



May the almighty and most merciful God render your felicity abundant, preserving your country and family in safety, that you may long remain a blessing to the church and to all good men. As to my disposition towards you, such as it is, such it will remain. I can add nothing to it. And, I trust, my regard to you is not more known to me than to yourself, whose friendship for me has been proved by so many services, that I can believe all you say of it in your charming letters.

To your excellent wife and your children, to the Veens and the Guenelons, to all, give my kindest regards. I leave you as my advocate and patron to them, lest they should bear hard upon a man engaged to them by so many benefits, if not for running away, yet for taking leave in a manner not quite becoming. Such, however, generally is the course of human affairs, that nothing but the will is in our power: with that I am wholly

borne to them, with that I entirely embrace them, nor can I ever lose the memory of their benefits, or restrain the confession of a grateful mind.

Farewell, most respected friend, and continue to regard me

As yours,  
Ever most affectionately,  
J. LOCKE.

Soon after the date of this letter, the writer quitted Holland, which country he does not appear ever to have revisited. He sailed in the fleet which conveyed the Princess of Orange, who arrived in London, (according to Burnet, O. T.) Feb. 12, 1689, the day before the offer of the crown.

During this same year, 1689, Mr. Locke, before he quitted Holland, had printed, in Latin, his first *Letter concerning Toleration*. It was immediately translated into Dutch and French, and printed in English.

## MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

Manchester College, York,

SIR, March 10, 1818.

THE lovers of Dissenting history, of which that of academical institutions is so important a part, are indebted to Mr. Manning for the lists inserted in your last Number [p. 89] of the students educated at the different academies in the West of England, since the beginning of the last century. To make the account complete, I subjoin a list of those who were educated wholly or in part at Exeter, under my father and Mr. Bretland, between 1799 and 1804. Those who know the difficulties with which this institution had to contend, and the very small support which it ever obtained, and who consider how soon it was dissolved by the premature death of its principal tutor, will not wonder that the list is a short one.

Coffin, Walter, Bridgend, Glamorganshire.

Castle, Michael Hinton, Bristol.

Shute, Henry, (Divinity,) Exeter; settled at Shepton Mallet.

Bransby, Jas. Mews, (Divinity,) Ipswich; Moreton Hampstead, Dudley.

Kenneway, Richard, Exeter; died in India.

Hunt, Thomas Yate, Birmingham.

Perry, James, (Divinity,) S. Wales; Wrexham, Chester, Liverpool.

James, John, (Divinity,) S. Wales; Lloyd-Jack, Cardiganshire.

Crawford, William, Cork.

Hobson, Shepherd, London, since dead.

Astley, Wilkinson, Chesterfield.

Simpson, John, Bath.

Davies, Henry, (Divinity,) South Wales; Filby, Taunton.

Madge, Thomas, (Divinity,) Crediton; Bury St. Edmunds, Norwich.

Kenrick, John, (Divinity,) Exeter.

Mr. Simpson, Mr. Davies and Mr. Madge, finished their course of study at York.

The friendly reviewer of my Sermon before the West of England Unitarian Society (XII. 738), has quoted a passage from it, in which allusion is made to the circumstances under which that society originated, and the difficulties through which it has struggled to its present flourishing and efficient state. As most of those who were instrumental in its formation have been removed by death, the majority of its present members are probably ignorant of these circumstances.

and may be interested by a brief detail of them, which I am enabled to give from some letters put into my hands by Mr. Isaac, the respectable minister of the Unitarian Baptist congregation, Moreton-Hampstead, and addressed to him by my father. He had formed a plan for the delivery of a series of lectures upon those doctrines of Christianity, of which erroneous notions commonly prevail, and had engaged eight or nine ministers in Exeter and its vicinity to bear a part in it. The chief peculiarity in the plan was, that the whole course was to be delivered in one place, by the associated preachers, each taking his turn, at the interval of a fortnight, and then to be repeated to their respective congregations, till the whole series had been preached in every place comprehended in the union. A week day evening was chosen both for the convenience of the ministers, and to avoid giving offence to those who disliked the introduction of controversy into the pulpit on the Sabbath. The sermon was to contain "a brief but comprehensive view of the arguments from reason and scripture, in support of the doctrine maintained, accompanied with inferences and observations calculated to shew that it will have no unfavourable influence upon the religious conduct of those by whom it is embraced, but on the contrary affords as good or a better foundation for peace and comfort, and for the duties of piety and morality than the opposite opinion. The whole to be conducted with as little of the appearance of controversy as can be admitted." The first meeting at Exeter, which had been built for Mr. James Peirce, as a refuge to heresy and liberty of conscience, from the fury of the western inquirers, was the place fixed upon for the first delivery of the lectures, but on application being made to the trustees, the use of it for such a purpose was refused. In alluding as matter of history to this refusal, it is not my wish to revive any of the feelings which may have been excited at the time, nor to give pain to those who may have been instrumental in procuring it, and who may still survive. I am inclined to believe that both this and a subsequent refusal of another place of worship in Exeter for a similar purpose, (a meeting of

the Unitarian Society,) arose not from any hostility to Unitarianism, but from a fear that the jealousy of government, then beginning to be awakened by the introduction of revolutionary principles from France, might be excited by this open attack upon established opinions, or even the buildings be endangered by the outrages of a church-and-king mob. They misjudged the temper even of those troublesome times, I believe, in apprehending any such danger, and they certainly very much misconceived the motives of the projectors of the plan in question, if they suspected them of any concealed political schemes; but it is not for us, *natis melioribus annis*, harshly to pronounce that the refusal may not have proceeded from conscientious fears of the consequences: when the love of innovation is inflamed into frenzy, it is not wonderful that prudence is chilled into timidity. In consequence of this difficulty at the outset, the scheme was never carried into execution, although in a letter written by my father to Mr. Isaac immediately after, he announces his design of persevering in it. It happened that soon after, a meeting of ministers took place at Bridwell, near Collumpton, for the purpose of opening a chapel for Unitarian worship, and in consequence of the failure of the other plan, that of an annual association was proposed, and the Western Unitarian Society was formed. It is, I believe, the second of the kind in this kingdom, and only younger by a few months than the London Unitarian Book Society. The drawing up of the rules, and the preamble, in which the principles and objects of the society are stated, devolved upon my father, and he continued to transact all its business till his death; but the idea did not originate with him. In a letter which is before me, he himself attributes it to a layman, and, I believe, the person alluded to was Mr. William Davey, of Fordon, a gentleman who, after many years' residence in the United States, has lately returned to this country.

One motive with me for bringing forward the plan, to the obstruction of which the formation of the Western Unitarian Society was owing, has been to suggest the utility of forming associations for the purpose of deliver-



ing lectures on the principles of Unitarianism, at different places, in succession. Among the various plans of co-operation in diffusing religious truth, I have not observed any which exactly corresponds with this. In districts where congregations of our denomination are more thickly scattered than in that from which I write, I know that frequent meetings of ministers, accompanied with religious services, are in use; but the discourses delivered are not in any sense systematic, and cannot be doctrinal without destroying the harmonious character of the association, while varieties of opinion prevail among the members. They, therefore, very properly confine themselves to our common Christianity, or our common principles of Protestantism and Dissent. But in the populous neighbourhoods of Manchester, Sheffield or Birmingham, I should think that a plan similar to that which I have detailed, might be carried into effect with ease and with very beneficial consequences. It would unite the stimulus of novelty with the advantage of a digested scheme; and at a smaller expense of labour to each individual minister than any other method, would secure to the members of their congregations the benefit of a connected view of the evidences and practical influence of their own faith, enforced by all the ability which the association comprised. With best wishes for the increased success of your labours, which I regard as peculiarly valuable by affording a channel for the communication of such suggestions as these, I remain, &c.

JOHN KENRICK.

Clapton,

Str., Feb. 27, 1812.

HAVING had occasion, in preparing the volume of Dr. Priestley's Works, now in the press, to consider the alleged Deism of Hobbes and Collins, I naturally referred to Dr. Leland's *View of the Deistical Writers*. I had perused that work, several years since, with all the confidence in the author's correctness, which has, I apprehend, been general among his Christian readers. I was, however, not a little surprised to find that such implicit confidence had been misplaced. Two instances occur in

my notes to the volume above mentioned; but it is due, not more to the character of the writers misrepresented, than to the credit of that religion they have been supposed to reject, to censure, as publicly as possible, any ungenerous reflections on their motives, or any heedless or more culpable misrepresentations of their language, when either can be justly charged to the account of *Christian* advocates; especially of those on whose authority their fellow-christians have been accustomed to rely. In this view I propose, with your permission, to consider the authorities and arguments on which Dr. Leland has placed *Hobbes* and *Collins* among *Deistical Writers*; beginning with the former, whose case will occupy more than the remainder of this letter.

It is, I think, impossible to open the third Letter in the *View*, which comprises the "Observations on Mr. Hobbes's Writings," without perceiving that Dr. Leland was unprepared to allow the author he was about to examine, the advantage of an unprejudiced and impartial tribunal. The common vague imputations are thus repeated without the reference to a single authority: "There have been few persons, whose writings have had a more pernicious influence in spreading irreligion and infidelity than his," though it is admitted that "none of his treatises are directly levelled against revealed religion." We have then an approved sentiment concerning "the Holy Scripture" quoted from the author's book, *De Cive*, introduced however by the remark, that "he sometimes affects to speak with veneration of the sacred writings," thus prejudicing the writer's cause on the threshold of the inquiry, by imputing to him an insidious pretence, even when his language is irreprehensible.

Immediately occurs a charge of a very serious nature: "He sometimes seems to acknowledge inspiration to be a supernatural gift, and the immediate hand of God; at other times he treats the pretence to it as a sign of madness; and by a jingle upon the words, represents God's speaking to the ancient prophets in a dream or vision, to be no more than their dreaming, that he spoke to them, or dreaming between sleeping and waking." 12. 57. Ed. 2d. To justify this charge,

Dr. Leland refers to *Leviathan*, p. 196, where I find a paragraph, of which, as most satisfactory, I quote the whole:

"When God speaketh to man, it must be either immediately, or by mediation of another man, to whom he had formerly spoken by himself immediately. How God speaketh to a man immediately, may be understood by those well enough, to whom he hath so spoken; but how the same should be understood by another, is hard, if not impossible, to know. For if a man pretend to me, that God hath spoken to him supernaturally and immediately, and I make doubt of it, I cannot easily perceive what argument he can produce, to oblige me to believe it. It is true, that if he be my sovereign, he may oblige me to obedience, so as not, by act or word, to declare I believe him not; but not to think any otherwise than my reason persuades me. But if one that hath not such authority over me, shall pretend the same, there is nothing that exacteth either belief or obedience. For to say that God hath spoken to him in the Holy Scripture, is not to say God hath spoken to him immediately, but by mediation of the prophets, or of the apostles, or of the church, in such manner as he speaks to all other Christian men. To say he hath spoken to him in a dream, is no more than to say he dreamed that God spake to him; which is not of force to win belief from any man, that knows dreams are for the most part natural, and may proceed from former thoughts; and such dreams as that, from self-conceit and foolish arrogance, and false opinion of a man's own godliness, or other virtue, by which he thinks he hath merited the favour of extraordinary revelation. To say he hath seen a vision or heard a voice, is to say, that he dreamed between sleeping and waking; for in such manner a man doth many times naturally take his dream for a vision, as not having well observed his own slumbering. To say he speaks by supernatural inspiration, is to say, he finds an ardent desire to speak, or some strong opinion of himself, for which he can allege no natural and sufficient reason. So that, though God Almighty can speak to a man by dream, visions, voice and inspiration, yet he obliges no man to be-

lieve he hath so done to him that pretends it, who (being a man) may err, and (which is more) may lie."

In this passage there does not appear any thing to warrant Dr. Leland's accusation of the author, and, indeed, it is difficult to understand how the letter-writer could suppose that Hobbes there "represents God's speaking to the ancient prophets." He is evidently describing a modern pretender to immediate divine communications, a character not uncommon in his age, one who was not satisfied to believe "that God hath spoken to him in the Holy Scripture, by mediation of the prophets." This view of Hobbes's design is confirmed by the succeeding paragraphs, which shew "by what marks prophets are known," and that "the marks of a prophet, under the old law," were "miracles and doctrine conformable to the law." The following passage of the paragraph, which concludes the chapter, is pointedly to the same purpose: "Seeing, therefore, miracles now cease, we have no sign left whereby to acknowledge the pretended revelations or inspirations of any private man, nor obligation to give ear to any doctrine, farther than it is conformable to the Holy Scriptures, which, since the time of our Saviour, supply the place, and sufficiently recompense the want of all other prophecy; and from which, by wise and learned interpretation and careful ratiocination, all rules and precepts necessary to the knowledge of our duty both to God and man, without enthusiasm or supernatural inspiration, may easily be deduced."

The next evidence of *Hobbes's Deism*, is the following: "To weaken the authority of the sacred canon, he endeavours to shew, that the books of *Moses*, and the historical writings of the Old Testament, were not written by those whose names they bear; and that they are derived to us from no other authority, but that of *Esdras*, who restored them when they were lost." P. 57.

To support this charge, which is not very charitably introduced, Dr. Leland refers to *Leviathan*, pp. 201, 202, 203. The author there employs the same arguments which have been used by some acknowledged Christians, especially respecting the *Penta-*



teach. He however, subjoins, that "though Moses did not compile those books entirely, and in the form we have them, yet he wrote all that which he is there said to have written." As to the supposed restoration of the books of the Old Testament, Hobbes says, "If the books of *Apocrypha* may in this point be credited, the Scripture was set forth in the form we have it in by *Esdras*, and may appear by that which he himself saith." He then cites at length the passages in 2 *Esdras* xiv. 21, 22, and 45, 46, adding, "and thus much concerning the time of the writing of the books of the Old Testament."

Dr. Leland describes this opinion, which Hobbes proposed, entirely on the authority of *Esdras*, as "a supposition, in which he hath been since followed by others on the same side, and very lately by a noble Lord," referring to his own "Reflections on Lord Bolingbroke's Letters." Thus he leaves his readers to understand that this reliance on the authority of *Esdras* had originated with Hobbes, from whom Bolingbroke adopted it. Yet the Letter-writer, from his acquaintance with christian antiquity, must have known, that the same deference to that apocryphal authority had been paid by "many of the ancient fathers, *Irenæus, Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, Basil, Jerome, Augustine and Chrysostom.*" To the writings of all these fathers, in this view, Dr. Prideaux has referred; adding, however, his opinion, that "the fourteenth chapter of the second Apocryphal Book of *Esdras*," is "a book too absurd for the *Romanists* themselves to receive into their canon." His own *Theory* is the following:

On the return of the Jews from the captivity, *Ezra* "collected together all the books of which the Holy Scripture did then consist, and disposed them in their proper order, and settled the canon of scripture for his time. He added, in several places throughout the books of this edition, what appeared necessary for the illustrating, connecting or completing of them; wherein he was assisted by the same spirit, by which they were at first wrote." Thus this learned author accounts for "the several interpolations, which occur in many places of the Holy Scriptures. For,"

VOL. XIII.

he adds, "that there are such interpolations is undeniable, there being many passages through the whole sacred writ, which create difficulties that can never be solved without the allowing of them." *Prid. Connect. Pt. i. B. v. Ed. xi. II. 476, 491, 492.*

From this statement it appears, that the only question between Hobbes, who followed *Esdras* and the fathers, and Dean Prideaux, who disputed their authority, was, respecting the extent to which *Ezra* had been supernaturally assisted, either to amend or to restore the Old Testament Scriptures. It is obvious, that neither of these opinions could afford a just ground for the charge of *Deism*. Dr. Leland must surely have forgotten how he had attempted to sustain that charge, in the instances I have already adduced, when, in his preface, (p. xi.) he said, of the writings he had examined, "great care has been taken to make a fair representation of them, according to the best judgment I could form of their design."

This communication has extended farther than I expected, from the large quotations by which I have thought it necessary to sustain a charge of incorrect, if not of unfair conduct, against such a writer as Dr. Leland. I must reserve what I purposed to allege, further, till another opportunity.

J. T. RUTT.

Oundle,

Sir,

March 19, 1818.

BEING a lineal descendant of one of those excellent men, "of whom the world was not worthy," I was, in course, highly gratified by the able vindication of their character and views, as to civil and religious liberty, given in the two last Numbers of the *Monthly Repository*, [pp. 15—18 and 80—91].

As you solicit "biographical notices" from any of your readers respecting the *Students of Dissenting Academies, &c.*, I wish it were in my power to communicate something of that kind, which might be deemed worthy of the attention of your readers. I have, however, scarcely any thing to impart but what is merely genealogical.

My great-grandfather, Mr. Joseph Chadwick, M. A. of Eman. Coll.

2 H

Camb. is very respectfully noticed in the Nonconformists' Memorial, as ejected from Winsford, a college living, in Somersetshire, though he had a numerous family of children, and had only £30 per annum of his own property for their support; and in such strait circumstances, it is pleasing to find it recorded of him, that he was "a very cheerful man, as well as strictly conscientious and pious." My father being a younger branch of the family, no remains of my excellent ancestor ever came to my hand, except only "A few short Counsels and Directions," almost entirely practical, drawn up for two of his sons on their leaving home, in order to be apprenticed and trained up for their future comfortable subsistence and usefulness.

Of my ancestor's family I could never learn any particulars but the following: One of the daughters, named Esther Stephens, was married and settled at Culmstock, Devon; another daughter was married to Mr. Cooke, of Wiveliscombe, Somerset, whose grandson went to Jamaica, sixty or seventy years ago, whose descendants, I believe, now rank among the principal inhabitants of that island. Of the sons, James and John, to whom the "Counsels" were given, I never heard any thing farther. Another son, *Thomas*, was my grandfather, a Dissenting minister, resident in Taunton many years, who kept a large grammar-school there, under whom many respectable men among the Dissenters were educated, preparatory to their academical studies, and amongst others, the late venerable Mr. Towgood, of Exeter, who expressed himself to me, concerning him, in terms of high respect and esteem, seventy years after he had left the house of his early instructor, (in 1715). My grandfather died about the beginning of the year 1727, leaving two sons: 1. *Thomas*, a respectable tradesman in Taunton, in the woollen manufactory, who had an only son, *Joseph*, who died a bachelor at Tiverton, about twenty years since, and four daughters, all unmarried, and all, I believe, now deceased. 2. *Joseph*, my father, educated for the ministry under *Mr. Grove*, as mentioned in your list; but he was never settled with any congregation, having been

necessitated, on account of ill health, in early life, to decline the pastoral office, though he lived to his 81st year a very retired life, and died at Taunton, his native place, Feb. 25, 1785. The only remaining male descendant is, it is highly probable, the present writer, born at Trull, a small village, about a mile from Taunton, Sept. 19, O. S. 1751, so that, in a very short time, as far as appears, our *line* will become quite extinct, though, it is hoped, that a name will remain, in celestial estimation, "better than of sons and daughters."

Of the collateral branches of our family I could never gain any information. All that is certainly known is, that my great-grandfather, the ejected minister, came out of Lancashire; and Sir Andrew Chadwick, of London, who died in 1768, came out of the same county (or his ancestors). Sir Andrew would have purchased a commission in the Middlesex Militia for my cousin *Joseph*, about 1760, but his mother, fearing it would be injurious to his morals, prevailed on her son to decline it. After that, Sir Andrew took no more notice of the family, though he had no children of his own, and died possessed of very great wealth, all which went to the government, no legal heir being found. It is very remarkable, that the family coat of arms were the same; and a gentleman of Taunton, who had seen Sir Andrew, declared there could be no doubt of the consanguinity, the family resemblance was so striking. Sir Andrew said, not long before his death, "that he did not know he had any relations in the world, but if he had any, they were in the West of England." Now, our family were the only persons remaining of the name in the West. What a pity, it seems, that rich men who have no families do not themselves make the proper inquiries, seeing their means are so ample, as to enable them, if within the sphere of possibility, to obtain satisfactory and beneficial results.

The MS. of "Counsels" would occupy but three or four of your pages, if you might think it proper for insertion in the Repository. I am willing to believe it will not be excluded; for though my worthy ancestor recommends, in the first place, the attention of his children to the Bible



and the *Assembly's Catechism*, nothing more is said about the latter in his *Directions*, which are *all*, as I have said, of a *practical and moral* kind.

Mr. Palmer has published, in his second edition, *Noncon. Mem.* some extracts, but I should prefer, though it may seem childish, the publication of the whole, as an agreeable relic of ancient piety and morals. If you grant this request, by mentioning it in your next *Repository*, \* I would send you a copy soon after, and, I remain, in the mean time, with sentiments of high respect, and fervent wishes that the Divine blessing may signally attend your indefatigable endeavours to promote the sacred rights of conscience, and the most enlarged views of civil and religious freedom,

JOSEPH CHADWICK.

SIR, March 10, 1818.

MAY I request a place in your *Miscellany* for a few suggestions on a very important, though much contested subject? I am, Sir, one of those who feel unconvinced of the scriptural evidence of the proper deity and pre-existence of the Lord Jesus, and who disapprove of much that passes current concerning the nature of his mediation. Yet, when I compare the views of Unitarians in general, on this point, with the word of God, I cannot but suspect that, according to the custom of men, those who are avoiding one extreme are running into the other. Very scripturally indeed, as appears to me, do they protest against a deal that we hear about inflexible justice, satisfaction, substitution, imputation, sacrifice and the like; doctrines that seem ready to subvert the plainest principles of scripture and common sense.

But leaving these grosser ideas, is it scriptural to deny, plainly and blankly, that in the mediation of Jesus there was any thing properly of a propitiatory or atoning nature? Surely an atonement for sin does not necessarily imply a rendering God merciful; or the accompanying of the extension of

\* We respect the piety and good sense apparent in the *Counsels*, as abstracted in the *Noncon. Mem.*; but we must submit to our worthy Correspondent, that they are principally confined to objects of juvenile instruction. These, though highly important, are not exactly suited to the design of our publication. Ed.

grace to one sinner, with so stupendous a sacrifice as to lead all others to despair; neither does it imply a purchased pardon, nor any of the ideas just recounted: a sense may be assigned to the word, and to others of like import, entirely free from every such implication. That in the mediation of Jesus there was an atonement for sin, properly signifies, that that mediation was expressly calculated to manifest the righteousness of God in connexion with the extension of gospel grace; and, therefore, that it was in consideration of this, as a *necessary provision*, that such grace was extended. By the righteousness of God, I mean that character in which he is the rewarder of the virtuous and the punisher of the wicked, according to his grand scripture attribute, the rewarder of every one according to his works. The forgiveness of sin is indeed always a lovely and gracious waving of the stricter part of this character, while in the other, his grace overfloweth all our deservings. But it is only to the humble and penitent that his justice relents; and it is my object to maintain, that in connexion with this mercy, as exercised in the mediation of Jesus, the display of that more awful character is expressly provided for as an important and necessary object. Having distinguished my doctrine from unscriptural opinions on one side, I must turn for a moment to the other, to guard against a misconception, to which the subject is equally liable: I mean that of supposing, that by propitiation or atonement, we are only to understand the means by which reconciliation is brought to pass. This, indeed, is refining the doctrine till it is entirely lost and evaporated. If that which is merely the mean of enlightening the mind and changing the heart is to be called a propitiation, because it leads to reconciliation with God, then, indeed, the Bible is a great propitiation; and so is also the Holy Spirit, without which no religious impression can be finally effectual. In this view also, eloquent preaching and convincing writing are propitiatory, for they are also fruitful means of reconciliation with God. But, in truth, there is a proper difference between the means of reconciliation and an atonement. Atonement is the ground or occasion of reconciliation, not the means: the

consideration on which grace is extended, not the means of extending it. In the present instance, the one illustrates the government of God, the other, that is the mean, affects the heart of the individual; the value of the one lies in its maintaining general laws, that of the other in its particular effects; the force of the one is that of a thing done and accomplished, that of the other is in the efficacy of its present action. Surely these are sufficiently distinct in their immediate provinces, though altogether agreeing in their ultimate ends, the universal interests of piety and virtue. Let me distinguish once again; repentance has its proper and immediate causes, but the force of the atonement is in its preparing for the observation of the penitents and of others, a display of the divine laws and providence. Now let me call to remembrance a few passages of the New Testament, and ask, whether in all of them the most natural and significant meaning, and in some the only intelligible meaning, is not that of propitiation? "This is my blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Matt. xxvi. 28. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins." Eph. i. 7. Is there not here too *close and pointed* a connexion between the blood of Jesus and the forgiveness of sins, to be explained on any other principle? "When he had by himself made a cleansing of sins." Heb. i. 3. What cleansing but this had Jesus *then* made? "If we walk in the light as he is in the light, we have communion together, and the blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin." 1 John i. 7. What other *significant* meaning can be assigned? And stronger still are the following verses: "We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation or atonement (*ἱλασμός*) for the sins of the whole world." 1 John ii. 1, 2. This, indeed, refers immediately to the intercession: but is obedience unto death less prevailing and acceptable? Or can we separate the intercession from the preceding sufferings and obedience which gave it efficacy?

I will add a few passages containing sacrificial allusions. These are often too hastily dismissed as figurative, without duly attending to the force of

the figures. Our Lord, indeed, was not truly and literally a sacrifice, because there was not at his death priest or altar, nor any of the essential conditions of that religious rite. The death of the Son of God was in the order of providential events. I do not then contend that it *was* a sacrifice, but that it had the atoning virtue of a sacrifice. We may observe, that it is in this especial regard that the allusions and comparisons often consist; that they are made not as condescensions to the prejudices of the Jews, that is in the spirit of saying, "If any atonement was needed, Christianity has a better one than any of the Jewish," but as constituting a real excellence and important truth of the gospel; and finally, that the sacrifices are considered as expressly ordained by God to supply the absence, and prepare the way, for the great and virtual sacrifice that was to come. Now the sacrifices were not means of holiness, but considerations of forgiveness. If then the apostles seriously represent the death of Christ as a sacrifice made for the sins of the whole world, in express reference to the atoning virtue of the sacrifices, how can we escape the conclusion that they did attribute to it atoning virtue?

A few out of many passages thus representing it are the following: "Whom God foreordained as a propitiation, through belief in his blood, to manifest his righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of the believer in Jesus." Rom. iii. 25. Here is an allusion to the mercy-seat, signifying that in Jesus, God dispenses mercy, but adding, through his blood, alluding to the sacrifices with whose blood the mercy-seat was sprinkled; while the concluding words declare that the end of all this was just what I maintain, namely, that God might be just, and the justifier of the believer in Jesus. Nothing could be more directly to the purpose than this passage. Again, an allusion to the sacrifices, very evidently, is the saying of John the Baptist, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." Here the Lord is compared to a lamb, sacrificed as a sin-offering. Peter speaks of Christians as those who are chosen unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus. "In the Epistle to the Hebrews, a book, though somewhat



questionable as to its author, yet of the highest authority, this view is largely enforced, so largely that I think it needless to quote single passages, because, if the argument is evaded, it must be by some general principle of interpretation, which I have intended to combat in some preceding remarks. Having said thus much on the scriptural evidence of the general view, I will suggest a few particulars, in which the efficacy of the mediation of Jesus, as an atonement for sin, may partly consist; keeping close to scripture light, which will, I think, confirm and illustrate the following points, to those who will consider them in it. I shall mention five particulars: 1. In saving men, through exalting Jesus, God hath notably rewarded obedience and virtue. 2. That grace is conferred upon us through one of our brethren, so highly exalted over us by his obedience; and that we depend so much upon him, and that he stands between us and God, is calculated to humble us as sinners before God. 3. The death of Jesus exhibited, in the most striking manner, the abominable malignity of sin, and its awful and lamentable consequences. Thus, perhaps, it superseded the necessity of the law, and also, by filling the measure of Jewish guilt, prepared the way in which the wisdom of God would save the world, according to the argument of Paul in the eleventh chapter of Romans. 4. Such a mediation tended to make us feel the risk of utter ruin into which sin had brought us, inasmuch as so great an exertion of the Divine love and power must be displayed to redeem us. 5. The full performance of the law by our great deliverer tended to honour it in our eyes, and to shew how God honours it, and will have it honoured. To judge of the reality of these particulars, they must be brought to the test of Scripture: if they are not more or less unfolded there, they may probably be fanciful and unimportant. I will offer two further reflections, and then conclude. 1. The death of the Anointed was not arbitrarily required as an atonement, but came about in a providential way, and to answer direct purposes in the gospel dispensation, independent of atonement, on which I cannot here enlarge. 2. There

are other things of the nature of atonements, both in the constitution of the world, and God's religious dealings. Origen remarks, "since we are all redeemed by the blood of Christ, how know we but some may be redeemed by the blood of martyrs?" This is not unreasonable; but three considerations will sufficiently distinguish the atonement of Jesus from the works of any other man: the greatness of the person, his perfect innocence, and the universal relation of his person and work to all mankind. And this doctrine I maintain to be one of the most highly interesting and important lessons of the New Testament; while it is so natural an inference from the facts of the gospel history, that we might have drawn it of ourselves, though perhaps we *should* not. May not a Unitarian hold such an atonement? May he not hold it with more advantage, and less danger of abuse, than any other believer?

HOPEFUL.

SIR,

March 5, 1818.

I PERFECTLY agree with Mr. Friend [p. 107] that the participation of the bread and wine communion should not be so interwoven with the general service as to cease to be optional. Scruples in persons who may have to reproach themselves with some recent immoral lapse, or from any other cause, should be respected. The reluctance to participate, generated by the gloomy superstitions to which this rite has given occasion, is a feeling which deters many; and I question how far the entrapping them, or compelling them into the practice, would answer the purpose of tranquilizing or reconciling the minds of such persons, who, perhaps, retain the impressions of a religion in which they might have been educated.

But as this ordinance is peculiarly calculated to refresh our memory of the exemplary self-devotion of him "who loved us, and gave himself for us," and thus influentially to stimulate moral inactivity, and keep alive salutary purposes in the heart, I am loath to see any writer, for the sake of a little display of Judaical learning, attempt to reason away this interesting and affecting bond of union among Christians, as a mistaken rite of no imperative obligation; a capricious

ordinance of no authority, and of no real or intelligible utility.

The arguments for this purpose appear to me among the weakest which it has ever been my fortune to encounter; and they involve what cannot be called by any other name than that of a blunder.

We are told, that by *this* bread and *this* cup, our Saviour referred to a particular time of blessing the cup; a custom familiar to the Jews, and which they still retain; that the very term of the Lord's Supper shews how widely Christians have departed from the institution of Jesus; for that the bread and wine are actually taken in the middle of the day, or near it; and the drift of the argument is, that since we have not this custom of blessing a particular cup at meals, and since we do not commemorate our Lord's body at supper time, we do not in fact possess his institution at all! It would be about as much in point to say, that the Jews wore beards, and that as they were bearded who first assisted at this commemoration, Christians who have smooth chins, are mere pretenders to the character of communicants in the original institution.

There is, it seems, no longer any common meal to give occasion for these blessings; and it is, therefore, become no longer a family rite, but a congregational service. Why, Sir, it had so become in the days of Paul, who, in his first epistle to the Corinthians, xi. 22, reprehending the excess which took place at the Lord's Supper, not in a *family*, but in a *society*, asks, "What! have ye not *houses* to eat and to drink in?" And he proceeds to explain that this is not a meal, but a solemn and significant conversion of a social custom into a religious rite: "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come." It was not the form, or manner, or the time of doing this, I presume, that gave its character or its value to the institution; but it was the *object* of this simple ordinance, and the allusion couched under the act. The family meal suggested this mode of commemoration by the natural emblems which it offered, of the life-sustaining doctrines of Christ, and of the blood of the resurrection, by which they were made influential on the believer; but the custom of the meal

ceased to be such merely, when it was ordained as a significant rite; and why this rite, therefore, should be still connected with a meal at all, or why it should not take place equally well at sun-rise, or at noon, as at the supper hour, and still retain the character and spirit of its first institution, "shewing forth the Lord's death till he come," I profess myself totally at a loss to comprehend. It might as well be insisted that we should use the same wine, the same quality of bread, the same sized cup; or that the institution is no longer the same.

But the writer has another notable reason, in addition to the monstrous innovation on the time of supper, to prove that the celebration of the rite appointed by Jesus to his disciples, and renewed to Paul by special revelation, (but from which the objector seems to think the liberty with which Christ has made him free completely absolves him,) is no longer practicable. The churches are, it appears, in a state of confusion respecting it: some partake of the memorial sitting, others kneeling or adoring. But as this state of confusion is not seen to arise in any *single* church, as some do not sit in one part of the building, while others are kneeling in another, I am at a loss to see what the state of confusion has to do with the introduction of the rite into the service; or why every congregation may not commemorate the Lord's body in its own manner, and yet each, with broad daylight to boot, have a fair right to be regarded as celebrating the Lord's Supper. Of course I except the mass-idolaters, and the political Sacramentarians. What the state of confusion, or the diversity of persons, offers in support of doing away with the rite altogether, or what is equivalent, regarding it as a matter of indifference, I do not perceive. The same inference might be drawn of the uselessness of Christianity itself, which, yet, independent of traditionary errors and corruptions, continues to exert its vital spirit and practical power. If the writer sees nothing but confusion in the various modes of celebrating the rite of the communion, the confusion is, perhaps in his own perception. If some be wrong, it does not follow that all are wrong; and as to the appeal to the traditions of men, which he speaks



of so contemptuously, though the same appeal is resorted to in favour of the change of the sabbath, and infant baptism, and *against* the doctrines of *three Gods in God*, or a *second God out of him*, we may content ourselves with a reference to the historic testimony of *the Epistles*; whence it appears obvious, that the ancient practice was to partake of the bread and wine in the posture, whatever it was, which they used at meals: for as the apostle reproves the Corinthians for converting the Lord's Supper into a common meal, (which the writer would persuade us that it was,) they must have *placed themselves* as at meals; and if this were wrong, we should have had some injunction to that effect, and a clear direction for a more reverential posture. This is the mode adopted by Unitarians, as well as other Dissenters, and by the Presbyterian Kirk of Scotland; though the writer, who is so scrupulous about the *hour*, might, perhaps, equally scruple at the posture of *sitting*, and contend, that if we do not lie on couches, we cannot commemorate the death of Christ.

## EUCCHARIS.

SIR,

March 9, 1818.

**B**Y most Christians who dissent from the Established Church, the Lord's Supper, as it is called, has been considered as a family meal, and a most important institution in Christianity; the being admitted to be a partaker of the feast, or being rejected from the table, being generally considered as the test of Christian fellowship. Having formerly had the same views, and considering that I have sufficient grounds for altering my opinion on this subject, with your permission, I would take the liberty, in your liberal publication, to lay those reasons which have convinced me, before my fellow-Christians, for their investigation.

My first suspicions of the authority for this ordinance arose from a considering of the nature of Christianity, in opposition to Judaism: the first is allowed to be the religion of the mind; the other is a schoolmaster to bring us into Christianity; a religion of ordinances, to lead us to the religion of the heart. But if Christianity has ordinances in it, whether they are ordinances retained from Judaism, or new

ones created and adapted to an improved state, Christianity is no longer that perfect religion we have been taught to consider it: it is only a higher state of Judaism; a religion that retains its external observations, and is not that pure intercourse of worshiping God in sincerity and truth, which Jesus taught it to be.

These considerations naturally led me to ask, when this said-to-be ordinance was to be observed, the time, the plan, the persons, the manner. Is it an institution to be taken in the morning, noon, or night? Is it to be taken in a room, or in the body of the assembly, in private or in public? Are all the members of the church to be alone partakers, or all that call themselves Christians, that choose to partake in this said-to-be eucharistical sacrifice? Are the children of those who are members to partake of it with their parents; or are none to be admitted to it, but such only who are in Christian fellowship? And how is it to be taken, a morsel of bread half cut, and half broken, delivered by the hand of an officiating priest, with a sip of wine, or wine and water; or is it with a draught of generous wine, to wash down a stale and husky bun; or are assembled Christians to shew their equality, by pulling to pieces with washed and unwashed hands, the same loaf? Is it to be taken kneeling, sitting, or standing? Are the communicants to come in turns around the table of the Lord, or are they, scattered over the place of assembly, to have the plate and cup brought to them? When the preciseness of all the known appointments of the law was considered by me, and how strictly Israel was enjoined an exactness in their observation, "*thou shalt not add to, neither shalt thou diminish therefrom*," I could but conclude, that if this was an ordinance, Christians knew not how to observe it, nor when it should be partaken of; seeing some, in addition to all the former queries, partook of it daily, others weekly, others monthly, and others yearly; and that whilst some consider it a *panacea* to remove all their past sins, others looked at it with fear and trembling, daring not to approach the sacrifice, lest they should eat and drink to their own damnation.

Thus bewildered, I determined to look at the authority by which this ordinance is recommended for the Christian's observation. On turning to Matt. xxvi. I found it recorded, that on the first day of the feast of unleavened bread, they made ready the passover: ver. 26: "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake, and gave to his disciples, and said, Take eat, this is my body." 27: "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all of it." 28: "For this is my blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." 29: "But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom."

The language of the xivth of Mark is not quite so full, but is to the same purport with that of Matthew, and from either of them it would be difficult, without doing violence to the historian's language, to find an institution of an ordinance. Matthew and Mark, as well as Luke, all of them record, that on the night the passover *must be killed* Jesus and his twelve apostles, when the passover was ready, partook of it; and the whole of the facts they record, are facts connected with the Jewish passover institution; nor does it appear to me possible, from any thing recorded by Matthew or Mark, for a moment to suppose that Jesus had any intention of instituting any ordinance for the perpetual observation of the church of God.

Luke's history confirms this fact, that Jesus was partaking with his disciples of the passover meal. For he says, xxii. 7, "Then came the day of unleavened bread, when the passover must be killed." 13: "And they made ready the passover." 14: "And when the hour was come, he sat down, and his twelve apostles with him." 15: "And he said unto them, with desire I have desired to eat this passover with you, before I suffer." 16: "For I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." 17: "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves." 18: "For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come." Evidently, so far at

least belongs to the observation of the Jewish passover, and to nothing else, and agrees in substance with Matthew and Mark. Luke goes on to say, xxii. 19: "And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake, and gave to them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. 20: "Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood, which is shed for you."

The only difference between Luke and the two other historians, in the import of their words, is, *this do in remembrance of me*: but these words can have no farther force than on those to whom the direction is given, and that was to the apostles alone. Supposing then these words to convey a precept, it was a precept from Jesus to his apostles, that whensoever they eat the passover, or if we must extend the words to their utmost limits, whensoever ye, my apostles, assemble at a feast or meal, observe my manner, and act *in remembrance of me* at such meal, as I, the master of the feast, have now acted with you at this passover meal.

Taking the words in this sense, they agree with the whole of the preceding, as well as the following context. Freely translating the passage, it might be thus rendered: *Thus is my body delivered up in your behalf; in like manner each of you act in remembrance, or commemoration, of me.* This language agrees with the language John declares Jesus to have used at this time. John xiii. 34: "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another." xv. 12: "This is my commandment, that ye love one another, as I have loved you." 13: "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." 14: "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you." Luke, in the remainder of the conversation that he records as passing at this time, unites his testimony to that of John, that Jesus on this occasion, not only by precept, but by example, inculcated on his disciples the most earnest desire of each of them to vie with each other in doing the most humbling acts of kindness towards each other, from the recollection that Jesus had, from love to them, voluntarily submitted to shame, indignity and death.



When my mind had arrived at this state of the examination, it felt delighted with its views of Christianity, having before given up Baptism, the only external ordinance left to reformed Christianity was removed, and the doctrines of Jesus appeared to be what the first teacher of them declares them to be—the religion of the heart, the worship of God in the mind and in sincerity; and the passages heretofore adduced to support the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, appeared to be there recorded for the establishment among the apostles of that noble principle, which Mr. Owen, of Lanark, is now contending ought to be considered as the foundation on which the superstructure of human society ought to be erected, *that, instead of self-love being the foundation of our social love, our social is the only solid foundation for our self-love.* To establish this all-subduing principle of action amongst his disciples, Jesus, at the passover feast, consecrated the last acts of his life, at supper and after supper, acting as the menial in waiting upon them, washing their feet, and such other servile offices as might be an example to each of them to strive to be the most useful and most kind towards each other, making love, as Paul expresses it, *the perfect bond* to Christian society.

The passage in the xith of 1 Cor. I have not before noticed, because evidence must be found for or against this ordinance of the Lord's Supper, in the histories, the epistles being only deductions from them; for Paul says, ver. 23, "I have received concerning the Lord." By comparing what he has received with Luke's Gospel it will be found, that it was from the history of the ministry of Jesus, written by Luke, his fellow-traveller, he had received it. The most material part where they differ is, that Luke only says, *this do in remembrance of me*, after breaking the bread; but Paul adds, that after Jesus had given them the cup, he adds, *this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me*; and these words, thus repeated, strengthen my argument, and shew, that though the historian records that Jesus used them but once, he meant that they should apply not to their food alone, but to their drinking, and to their whole conduct, that whether they ate

or whether they drank, or whatsoever they did, in all they should, by recollecting the example of Jesus in all their social actions, glorify God. If any one will but read over this chapter from 18—34, I think it will be impossible for him not to be convinced, that the whole of it refers to a feast, or meal, of the Corinthian Church, and in no way whatsoever can apply to an ordinance; and that the ordinance of the Lord's Supper is not a plant which God hath planted, but is, on the contrary, a relict of the Romish Church, a weed of human will-worship.

N. N.

SIR, *Essex House, April 8, 1818.*

AS your Christian Surveyor of the Political World has fairly taken his flight, peace be to him; I shall pursue him no further. "The contest," he says, "is too trifling." I trust, however, that it has not been without its use, and that my opponent himself may have taken a lesson of prudence and caution.

But though he can do nothing himself, he has, it seems, an ally in reserve that is invincible; and he kindly recommends his opponent 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." He adds, "It is rather extraordinary that he should either have not 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." I give my worthy opponent full credit, that he writes to the best of his judgment and belief. But though he may have read Mr. Robinson's book, as he did mine, with much greater attention and care than "any one else ever did, or ever will," I regret to say, that I am constrained to differ widely from him in his conclusion. In fact, the true reason why I omitted the mention of Mr. Robinson's work, in the Plea for Infant Baptism, was, that I was much concerned that such a book should have been written by such a man.

When Mr. Robinson's work was first published, I procured it immediately, and began to read it with great avidity, fully expecting to derive

great information from it, and that it would throw much new light upon the historical argument. My disappointment was proportionate. In Mr. Robinson's work, I found much curious information about fonts and baptisteries, and I read much harsh censure of the celebrated Bishop of Hippo, who, previous to his conversion, appears to have been a profligate young man, and who, after he became a Christian, wrote many injudicious and intemperate works; but who, greatly to his honour, in the decline of life, published a book of Retractations, which might, one would think, have abated the severity of censure in one whose candour, if life had been spared, would probably have induced him in this respect to have imitated the example of the great St. Augustin. But in vain did I search the pages of Mr. Robinson for a single fact or argument to elucidate the much controverted question concerning Infant Baptism. In vain did I seek for any proof that either Christ or his apostles had ordained the application of Baptism to the descendants of baptized persons, but had limited the rite to those only who were of adult age:—in vain did I look for any opposition in the earliest ages of the church to the early and prevailing practice of Infant Baptism:—in vain did I inquire for a single denomination of Christians, for a single country, a single district, a single church or congregation, in which adult baptism was the prevailing practice:—in vain did I ask even for a single individual, Tertullian excepted, who expressed disapprobation of Infant Baptism, or for a single individual, who, being the child of baptized parents, had his baptism deferred to adult age:—and finally, in vain I sought after the solution of the extraordinary problem, how it could possibly happen that when adult baptism was the institution of the apostles, so great an alteration as Infant Baptism should have been so early introduced, and so universally received in perfect silence, without the slightest opposition, without a single church adhering to the apostolic institution, without a single individual lifting up his voice in its favour; and that at a time when the church was rent into a thousand parties, by controversies upon subjects of much less importance; for all persons are not of

the opinion of the Christian Surveyor, that the question concerning the true origin of a christian institution is too trifling to be discussed. Upon all these subjects did I seek with eagerness and with fond expectation for information in Mr. Robinson's truly learned work; but I sought in vain: and I closed the book with disappointment and regret. Yet this is the book to which I am sent "to find a full refutation of all that I have advanced upon Infant Baptism." \*

As this is probably the last letter, or as my polite opponent calls it, *tirade*, that I shall address to you upon this subject, I will take the liberty of subjoining a few cursory observations.

In the first place, I am myself chargeable with a great oversight in having omitted to state at length the important testimony of Justin Martyr, though I have appealed to him, in p. 46 of the Plea for Infant Baptism. The passage is found in Justin's Apol. p. 22, Edit. Thirlby, viz. "Many men and many women, who are now sixty or seventy years of age, and who, from their childhood, were discipled to Christ (*οἱ ἐκ παιδων ἐμαθητευθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ*, the very word used in Matthew), continue uncorrupted." The children who were thus *discipled*, were, no doubt, baptized; but whether they were the children of baptized persons or of proselytes, does not appear. If of the former, it would carry the practice of Infant Baptism very far back indeed into the apostolic age, viz. to A. D. 70 or 80; but at any rate, it is conclusive against the necessity of deferring baptism to adult age; and to those who deny proselyte baptism, it must be decisive in favour of baptizing the *children* of baptized Christians.

Some have conceived that the practice of Infant Baptism was only beginning to be introduced in the time of Tertullian; but will any one who

\* The misstatement and gross mistranslation of what Tertullian wrote upon the subject of baptism, can only be accounted for by the hurry in which Mr. Robinson wrote, and must have been corrected, had he lived to revise his work. Thus he translates *Norint petere salutem*, &c. "They just know how to ask for salvation," &c. whereas the advice of Tertullian is, "Let them know how," that is, let them wait till they do know how to ask for salvation, &c.



is at all acquainted with the writings and spirit of this violent ecclesiastic, believe that he would have treated the practice with so much lenity, if he had known it to have been an innovation? No, no. That was not Tertullian's way. The holy father, who is indignant enough where he finds an opportunity to vent his feelings, expresses himself upon this subject in a meek and subdued tone, under a consciousness that the practice of the universal church was in opposition to his advice. "Delay," says he, "is very useful. Why should their sponsors be brought into danger? Let them come when they are grown up. Let them be made Christians when they can know Christ. Why should that innocent age be in a hurry to obtain remission of sins?" Is this the language of one who knew that he was opposing a great and dangerous innovation? Is this the spirit with which Tertullian would plead in such a case?

But if it could for a moment be admitted that Infant Baptism was an innovation in the time of Tertullian, it cannot be denied by any who are conversant with the subject, that it prevailed universally in the time of Augustin, Pelagius and Jerome; who all consent in declaring that they never knew nor read of any one who denied it, not even among heretics themselves. The difficulty in this case of accounting for the unanimity of the Christian body in the observation of a rite directly opposite to the precept and practice of the apostles and the primitive church, and introduced so late as the age of Tertullian, would be unspeakably enhanced; especially considering the multitude of sects into which the Christian world was then divided, the malignity with which they regarded and persecuted each other, and the extreme improbability that one would be induced to borrow an unscriptural rite from another. The improbability, indeed, is so extreme, that it amounts to a moral impossibility, as incredible as a contradiction in terms.

Some have said that other rites, acknowledged to be unscriptural and superstitious, stand upon the same ground of evidence as Infant Baptism, and ought, upon the same principles, to be received. This I deny: I readily admit, indeed, that public worship,

the religious observation of the Lord's day, the annual commemoration of our Lord's death and resurrection, and the Eucharist, stand upon grounds precisely similar to that of Infant Baptism; and are observed, and no doubt will be observed, in the Christian church to the end of time. But I know of no other custom which can plead the same antiquity and universality. We learn from the Scripture, that the application of water was all that was essential to the rite of baptism. The sign of the cross, therefore, and the use of milk and honey, of salt and spittle, and the like, are totally groundless and unauthorized additions to it. However, if any one can prove that any other rite whatever can be traced to the same authority as Infant Baptism, I shall readily concede that it is of equal obligation.

I shall conclude with a few observations upon the letter of your respectable Correspondent, T. G. p. 31.

T. G. need not be apprehensive that the celebration of the Lord's Supper will fall into disuse, from any thing which may occur in this or any other controversy upon the question. It is so firmly established by universal custom, founded upon known apostolic practice, that the private opinions of a few dissentient individuals will never produce any sensible effect; and I regret with your worthy Correspondent, that an institution, the authority of which is so obvious, and the uses of which are so important, should be so much neglected. I cannot, however, agree in his suggestion, that the order of a religious service should be so arranged, as not to afford "an opportunity to depart" to those who are unwilling to remain. The proper remedy for the evil is, by reverting to the practice of the primitive church, and bringing children to the Lord's table as soon as they are capable of behaving with propriety.

When God was pleased to deliver a law to the Hebrew nation, he explicitly and publicly enjoined certain rites and ceremonies, such as the passover, the sabbath and the law of circumcision, in language too peremptory and too plain to be evaded, or misunderstood. It is obvious that he has not acted in this manner under the Christian dispensation, but has left us

to discover the few ritual observations which are annexed to the Christian religion, from the practice of the apostolical and universal church. It would have been as easy for Jesus Christ to have said, Remember the Lord's day: Baptize your infant offspring: Celebrate the Lord's Supper: and Worship God, as it was for Moses to have laid down the law of the sabbath and of circumcision: but he has not chosen to do it; he has left us to infer the expedience and the obligation of these institutions from early, universal and apostolical practice. T. G. will easily see, that though the evidence for one institution, the Eucharist for example, is more obvious than that of another, it is, nevertheless, wholly indirect and incidental, and very different from the peremptory mandate for the observation of the sabbath and the passover: nevertheless, this indirect mode of enjoining positive institutions may, perhaps, be a safer guide to the mind and will of Christ, than an explicit precept unattended with collateral evidence. For the genuineness of a single solitary rule is liable to be called in question; as for example, that text in Matthew so often referred to, "Go and teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," the authenticity of which may reasonably be doubted, since it is evident that the apostles and primitive teachers of the church baptized into the name of Jesus only, which surely they would not have done, had they known that a formula so different had been prescribed by Christ himself. And Mark, who commonly follows Matthew, only relates the order to baptize, without specifying the particular formula. But the consent of the universal church is a public act, notorious, which cannot be called in question without absurdity, and cannot possibly be accounted for, but upon the supposition of apostolical example and authority; and this authority, it is presumed, would be considered as obligatory by the great body of professed Christians, who regard the apostles as the messengers of Christ, and the authorized expounders of his doctrine. If, indeed, there are any who set up their own judgment above that of the apostles, who think that they were mistaken in the laws and ordinances which

they delivered to the church, and that instead of obedience, they deserve rebuke; to such, I confess that my argument does not apply: but as this sect is of very late origin, and of very limited extent, it may fairly be overlooked as an evanescent quantity, which forms no objection to the universality of the conclusion.

T. BELSHAM.

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

LETTER IV.

SIR,

April 10, 1818.

THE next passage\* cited by Mr. Wardlaw in support of the personality of the Spirit, is 1 Cor. xii. 11: "But all these worketh that one and self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as *he will*." "The Holy Spirit," he says, "is represented as possessing *will*, and as distributing the various miraculous gifts, *as that sovereign will directed*. The possession of *will* necessarily implies personality; and that *sovereign manner* in which that will operates in the distribution of supernatural powers, clearly shews it to be nothing less than a divine will." But how can the possession of will necessarily imply personality, when he himself admits,† that the same thing is applied to the *wind*? John iii. 8. But waving this, we observe, that if the pronoun *he* be of the masculine gender, it does not agree with the noun spirit, and cannot have that noun for its antecedent; and therefore another noun, with which it agrees as being of the same gender, must be sought for in the connexion as its antecedent. Now this we have in the 6th verse, where it is said, "There are diversities of operations," which the apostle goes on to enumerate; "But," says he, "it is the same God which worketh all in all;" and after describing a variety of spiritual gifts, he adds, "But all these worked that one and self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as *he will*," that is, as God will, who is said to have given those spiritual gifts, according to *whose will* they were divided and exercised, and

\* P. 284.

† P. 290.



who it is that *worketh all in all*. This construction is supported, I believe, by some of our best commentators on this passage.

Mr. Wardlaw next cites Matt. xii. 31, 32: \* “Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, but the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come.”

“In these words,” says Mr. Wardlaw, “the Holy Spirit is the object of a particular sin,—the sin of blasphemy. By Beelzebub, the prince of devils, the Pharisees, it is very obvious, meant a person, and they expressed themselves accordingly. To this wicked, malignant agent, Jesus in his answer opposes *the Spirit of God*; and without at all entering into any discussion respecting the precise nature of the sin against the Holy Spirit, which would be foreign to my present design, it is sufficient to observe, that *he* is evidently distinguished here from *the Son of Man*, just as we are accustomed to distinguish one person from another. They are both spoken of, with respect unto the same things, in the same manner, and the things mentioned are spoken concerning them universally in the same sense. If the Holy Spirit were only the virtue and power of God, then present with Jesus Christ in all that he did, Christ and that power could not be distinctly spoken against, for they were but one and the same.”

Let us examine a little the strength of these arguments.

First: the Holy Spirit must be a person, because it is the object of the sin of blasphemy. If being the object of the sin of blasphemy is a proof of personality, then the *holy place* and the *law* are persons; † then the worthy *name* by which Christians are called must be a person; ‡ then must the *name* of God and his *doctrine*, § his *word* and his *tabernacle*, || be also per-

sons; for all these are said to be blasphemed, or to be capable of being the objects of that sin.

Secondly: the Holy Spirit must be a person, because by Beelzebub, the prince of devils, the Pharisees meant a person. And to this wicked, malignant agent, Jesus opposes the Spirit of God.

1. I observe that Mark states, that the Scribes said, “He hath Beelzebub; and by the prince of devils casteth he out devils.” Our Lord, in this account by Mark, in his reasoning with them, says nothing about his casting them out by the *Spirit of God*; but in the close of the argument he says, “He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation; because they said he hath an *unclean spirit*.” By Beelzebub then, they meant an *unclean spirit*, and not a person. \*

2. Our Lord, Mr. Wardlaw says, opposes the *Spirit of God* to Beelzebub, and thence infers his personality. But is Mr. Wardlaw ignorant of the account Luke gives of this transaction? If not, did it never occur to him to compare it with that of Matthew? Had he done so, he would have instantly seen the fallacy of his own reasoning. Luke makes Jesus oppose to Beelzebub not the *spirit*, but the *finger* of God: † the *finger*, therefore, and the *spirit* of God are synonymous. If then the one is not a person, neither is the other: hence we have here a decisive proof of the impersonality of the Holy Spirit.

Thirdly: the Holy Spirit must be a person, because “he is evidently distinguished here from the Son of Man.” “*They are both spoken of, with respect unto the same things, in the same manner, and the things mentioned are spoken concerning them universally in the same sense.*” The conclusion from these premises is, “If the Holy Spirit were only the virtue and power of God, then present with Jesus Christ in all that he did, Christ and that power could not be *distinctly spoken against*; for they were but one and the same.” Upon this paragraph, which Mr. Wardlaw has cited from

\* Page 285.

† Acts vi. 13.

‡ James ii. 7.

§ 1 Tim. vi. 1.

|| Titus ii. 5. Rev. xiii. 6.

\* Mark iii. 22, 29, 30.

† Luke xi. 20.

Dr. Owen, we may observe, that there is not one single position in it which derives any support from any thing to be found in this account as related by Matthew. It is not true that the *same things* are here spoken concerning the Holy Spirit and the Son of Man, nor is it true that they are here *both distinctly spoken against*. The Pharisees speak against Christ as not “casting out devils, but by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils.” But they are so far from speaking against the Holy Spirit, that they do not say a single word about it: nor are they at all charged with having blasphemed it. Our Lord, we are told, proceeded to reason on the absurdity of supposing that Satan would cast out Satan, and asks them, if he by Beelzebub cast out devils by whom did their sons cast them out; “they therefore,” says he, “shall be your judges;” and then draws the conclusion, that if, on the contrary, he did this miracle by the spirit or finger of God, (not that they had blasphemed the *finger* of God, but) that, “no doubt the *kingdom of God* was come upon them,” and then Matthew goes on to represent him as warning them against being guilty of the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit; probably referring to the future dispensation of the Spirit which had not yet taken place; for John tells us that the Holy Spirit *was not yet given*, because the Son of Man was not yet glorified, and Jesus himself says, that unless he went away the comforter would not come unto them. “Whosoever,” says he, “*speaketh a word against the Son of Man*, (which they had done,) it shall be forgiven him, but whosoever speaketh against the *Holy Spirit*,” i. e. whosoever should reject and blaspheme that last, and clearest evidence of his Messiahship, “should not be forgiven.” The Holy Spirit and the Son of Man are not *distinctly spoken against*, then, in this connexion, nor are the *same things in the same sense said of them*, nor does the passage afford one iota in support of the point which Mr. Wardlaw adduces it to prove.

We proceed to consider Mr. Wardlaw's proof of the personality of the Holy Spirit from Acts v. 3, 4: “But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan

filled thine heart, to *lie* to the *Holy Spirit*, and to keep back part of the price of the land? Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? Thou hast not *lied unto men*, but *unto God*.” And verse 9: “Then Peter said unto her, How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord?”

“*He*,” (meaning the Spirit, says Mr. Wardlaw, what charming auxiliaries are these personal pronouns to his hypothesis on every occasion!! *He*,) “is in these verses, represented as *lied unto*, and as *tempted or tried*.” But how can any *one* be *lied unto*, “but *one who* is capable of hearing and receiving a testimony, and of discerning its truth or falsehood? Or how can *any one* be *tempted or tried*, but *one who* is possessed of understanding and will?”\*

Will it be denied that Ananias *lied* to Peter? Undoubtedly to him personally was the *lie* uttered, and uttered in his hearing; and he acting at the time under divine inspiration says, that it was *lying to*, and *tempting the Spirit of God*; but to *lie to* and to tempt the *Spirit of God*, is to lie to that person whose spirit it is. So our Lord tells his disciples that to receive them was to receive God,† because they were his messengers, and spake as they were moved by *his* spirit. So to *lie to* an inspired apostle is to lie to the Spirit of God. Mr. Wardlaw himself explains these words,‡ “Lying to the Spirit of God,” says he, “in these verses, is the same as lying unto God. To say that it is lying to an inspired man, does not affect the conclusion, for by *whom* were these men inspired? They were holy men of *God*, who spake as they were moved by the *Holy Spirit*. Ananias and Sapphira lied not to the supernatural influence which Peter possessed, but to the Divine *Author of that influence*, not to the inspiration of Peter, but to Him by whose influence Peter was inspired.” Who was the *Author* of that influence? By whom was Peter inspired? The only answer that can be given to these questions is, God.§ What then is this *influence*, this inspiration? The

\* Page 286.

† John xiii. 20.

‡ Page 293.

§ 1 Thess. iv. 8.



answer most obviously is, the spirit which God had given them. "But," says Mr. Wardlaw, "to lie to the Holy Spirit is to lie to God, therefore the Spirit is God." How does he come at this conclusion? Is the Spirit any where in the Scriptures called God, or ever said to be God? Never, any where; unfortunately for him, there is no such expression in the Bible as *God the Spirit*. Is it possible that God can be the *Spirit of God*? It is impossible, unless a person can be the *spirit of himself*: God therefore in this passage cannot be the Holy Spirit. Lying then to the Spirit, (notwithstanding his assertion to the contrary,) was lying to that spirit of inspiration, which God had given them, and consequently, to God by whom it was given. If God cannot be the *Spirit of God*, which is a self-evident proposition, then the converse of the proposition must also be true, that is, the *Holy Spirit* cannot be God: what then becomes of the argument for the personality and deity of the Holy Spirit founded on this passage?

The next passage produced by Mr. Wardlaw in support of his hypothesis is Eph. iv. 30: \* "And grieve not the *Holy Spirit of God*, whereby ye are sealed to the day of redemption." "Can any thing," says he, "be the subject of the *passion of grief*, or can any thing, unless in the *boldest flights of poetry* be so represented, that is not a *person*, possessed of understanding and consciousness?"

It would appear almost ridiculous to attempt to refute such an argument as this upon this subject, when we consider that such modes of expression are of such frequent occurrence, and so well understood by every body, without connecting with *spirit* the idea of personality, "of understanding and consciousness." Grief of spirit is a common expression. "They hearkened not unto Moses for *anguish of spirit*." Exod. vi. 9. "A woman of *sorrowful spirit*." 1 Sam. i. 15. "A woman *grieved in spirit*." Isa. liv. 6. "Why is thy spirit so *sad*?" 1 Kings xxi. 5. "They rebelled and *vexed his Holy Spirit*." Isa. lxiii. 10. This, together with the words under con-

sideration, is spoken after the manner of men, and, if it be so, it must be understood in the sense in which it is used by them, that is of *inward* and great grief. Will Mr. Wardlaw say, that all the above expressions, if they are not a proof of the personality of spirit, are "the boldest flights of poetry"?

If Mr. Wardlaw contends, that the ascription of what he calls personal affections and actions to spirit is a proof of personality, it would be easy to prove that every man's spirit is another person distinct from himself. "My *spirit* made diligent *search*." "My *spirit* hath *rejoiced* in God my Saviour." "My *spirit* *prayeth*." "They have *refreshed* my *spirit*." "O my soul, thou hast said unto the Lord thou art *my* Lord." "The *spirit* is *willing*, but the *flesh* is *weak*." But enough has been said to expose the fallacy of this argument.

We proceed to notice the only remaining passage on this subject. Acts vii. 31: \* "Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always *resist* the Holy Spirit; as your fathers did, so do ye." "The Holy Spirit is here represented," says Mr. Wardlaw, "as the object of *resistance*; one whose testimony, and whose will and authority were scorned and violently striven against."

Can then nothing be *resisted* but a *person*; and is resistance of an object the proof of its personality? Paul says, †, "So do these also *resist the truth*." And the writer to the Hebrews says, ‡ "Ye have not yet *resisted* unto blood, *striving* against *sin*." And in the preceding chapter, § it is said, "They were not able to *resist* the *wisdom* and the *spirit* by which he spake," which at once shews the way in which they and their fathers resisted the Holy Spirit. The objects of resistance in these passages are, *the truth*, *sin* and the *wisdom*, as well as the *spirit* with which Stephen spake: are each of these proper *persons*? If they are not, then *resistance* is no proof of personality.

But, says he, it was the resistance of "one whose testimony and whose will and authority were scorned

and violently *striven against*." Who was this *one*, whose testimony was resisted? Not the Spirit of God, but God himself. "I came to you," says Paul, "declaring unto you the testimony of God." So the gospel is styled, but it is never styled the testimony of the Spirit, as such. The word *one*, as meaning the *Spirit*, and *whose*, which does not agree with the word *spirit*, as supplying its place, are artfully introduced, (as the other personal pronouns continually are in the same construction,) to give the impression of personality, the impropriety of which must be obvious to every one.

Mr. Wardlaw concludes the whole of his argument on this subject, with the following observation: "Surely, then, that must be a person, possessing intelligence and will, and the other properties which constitute personality, which is thus represented as *blasphemed and spoken against, as lied unto, tempted, grieved and resisted*."

This by no means follows, because as we have shewn, the Holy Spirit, which he represents as the object *blasphemed and spoken against*, Luke explains, as being not a person in God, but as being the *finger of God*. We have also shewn, that when the spirit is said to be *lied unto and tempted*, it is said to be so, as the *Spirit of the Lord*, and, therefore, that the *lie* properly and personally was unto God, whose Spirit it is: so the text expressly says, "Thou hast not *lied* unto men, but *unto God*." And we have shewn, that being *grieved and resisted*, as applied to the Spirit, are no proofs of personality.

Thus we have endeavoured to establish what we proposed, that is to shew, that the Holy Spirit of God, neither is nor can be a distinct person from God, a divine person in the Godhead; and we have examined and endeavoured to refute all the arguments of Mr. Wardlaw in support of the opposite hypothesis: whether we have succeeded or no, must be left to the judgment of the reader. If we have succeeded and proved the impersonality of the Spirit, there can be no necessity of entering on the other branch of the subject—the *Divinity of the Spirit*, as a distinct person in the Godhead: for if its personality has

not been proved, and if it be incapable of proof, no arguments whatever can prove it to be a divine person.

JOHN MARSOM.

York,

SIR, March 25th, 1818.

A WRITER in the Christian Observer for February last, in his remarks on Mr. Wright, accuses him of doing the very thing in his attempted refutation of the doctrine of eternal torments, of which Unitarians accuse the orthodox, namely, "introducing as essentials of Christianity, doctrines built upon inferences and arbitrary expositions of ambiguous words and figurative passages of Scripture."

It is not my intention, Mr. Editor, to examine how far these accusations are well-founded, or to engage in any species of controversy. I merely wish to suggest to the candid inquirer after christian truth, that there is one view of that unspeakably important dispensation, and as I firmly believe but one, which steers perfectly clear of this objection, whether as it relates to the terrific doctrine to which we have already adverted, or to that of "salvation by faith," so zealously insisted upon; and of this, the defenders of Unitarianism have not availed themselves.

Looking lately into Archdeacon Paley's Evidences of Christianity, I find, in his chapter on the Morality of the Gospel, the following statement: "First, that the teaching of morality was not the primary design of the mission of Christ; secondly, that morality, neither in the gospel nor in any other book, can be a subject, properly speaking, of discovery." He goes on to say, "If I were to describe, in a very few words, the scope of Christianity as a *revelation*, I should say, that it was to influence the conduct of human life, by establishing the proof of a future state of reward and punishment, to bring life and immortality to light. The direct object of the design, therefore, is to supply motives and not rules, sanctions and not precepts."

Now, in my mind, this is precisely what Mr. Cappe had previously written upon the subject many years before, in what he has entitled,



"Christian Principles," but which the Archdeacon never could have seen, as they were not published till the year 1802. Mr. Cappe says, "Whatever is essential to Christianity, all the sects of Christians, without one excepted instance, own. It is essential to Christianity (the Gentile Christianity, which consists in receiving Jesus as the Life), to believe that he died and rose again, and was empowered to send from heaven the gifts of the Holy Spirit, and nothing else is essential." Now what is this but to assert what Mr. Paley has stated as "the scope of Christianity as a revelation," to influence the conduct of human life, by establishing the proof of a future state of reward and punishment, to supply motives and not rules, sanctions and not precepts: or, as Mr. Cappe expresses himself respecting the great object of the Christian revelation, or as he calls it, "the gospel of life," "to reveal the good news, the tidings, the discovery from fact, of a future life."

The Archdeacon goes on to say, that "morality neither in the gospel nor in any other book can be a subject of discovery, properly so called." A proposition which surely harmonizes perfectly with what Mr. Cappe has said in his *Christian Principles*, already referred to, (420, 421,) and which he thus sums up, "All the *doctrines* properly so called, the truth of which is supposed or admitted, or incidentally taught in Christianity, are doctrines of natural religion, and should stand entirely upon that ground. They are all supposed to be known or knowable before the promulgation of Christianity. All that it *reveals* is *fact*."

So far then, as it seems, the ideas of the Archdeacon and of my late honoured husband appear to coincide. But there is another important object of the divine mission of our Lord, as it respected the people of the Jews, namely, that of his declaring himself to be their Messiah, and of solemnly forewarning them of the fatal consequences of their rejecting him in that character, to which the doctrine of "salvation by faith," properly belonged; for we know assuredly that those, and those only, were actually preserved in the dreadful destruction which ere the end of that generation, overwhelmed their country, who, by

becoming Christians, enlisted themselves under his banner. To this the Archdeacon has not adverted, otherwise I think he must have admitted something like the view given in the *Critical Dissertations*, of which the *Christian Principles* form a part, of the twofold character of Christ; as the promised Messiah, to the descendants of Abraham, and of "the life," in respect of all mankind at large.

But be that as it may, for I am not solicitous, Mr. Editor, to shelter the *Dissertations* under the protection of any name, however highly and deservedly revered, being fully persuaded that eventually the general views they exhibit of the Christian dispensation, will stand upon the only immovable foundation, that of reality and truth.

That this publication should hitherto in general have been so coolly received, and that many of the striking solutions it contains of some of the difficulties under which Unitarians confessedly labour in attempting a consistent support of their principles, should seldom or never have been even adverted to by them, would, indeed, surprise me, were I not fully aware of the great disadvantages under which an unpatronized posthumous publication must always labour, and more especially, where, as in this instance, the person destined to be the Editor, must necessarily be incompetent to its defence, or to the procuring for it a favourable reception. Perhaps the question is not yet wholly out of date, even among the most liberal and enlightened, "Have any of the rulers and Pharisees believed on him?" But how much soever I may have regretted that my Unitarian friends, when engaged in an important controversy with their vehement opposers, should not have availed themselves of the far more decisive weapons of argument in their favour to be derived from the view of the Christian dispensation in these *Dissertations*, than any they have actually used; arguments which, however clear or striking, it is probable they may never have seen or considered, I console myself, Sir, under the firm belief, that the progress of knowledge, along with every other good, is under the best possible direction, and that although it is our bounden duty to aid its advancement by every means in our power, yet

that it is also our duty to be perfectly resigned under the disappointment whenever these efforts shall, for a time, prove unsuccessful.

By an early insertion of this letter in your valuable Repository, you will greatly oblige an ardent well-wisher to the important cause of gospel truth, and your friend and constant reader,  
CATHARINE CAPPE.

Tenterden,

December 5, 1817.

SIR, I HAVE observed with much concern what has taken place in your Repository, [XII. 448] since Mr. Belsham published his pamphlet on Baptism.

Asperity of temper and manner cannot benefit any cause, and must have an injurious tendency, as affecting the interests of a body, not by any means yet too numerous. The term used by the Christian in his Survey was certainly unjustifiable; as he has no just reason to consider those who practise Infant Baptism as less sincere and conscientious than those who reject it. Mr. Belsham could not well pass it by unnoticed: but it was not equally necessary to retaliate. Yet having done this, it would have been commendable in the Christian who writes the Survey, but who, in your Number for November, [XII. 655—657,] signs himself Ignotus, to have replied in the spirit of meekness; and not to have dealt in the reproachful and *thrice repeated epithet of babe-sprinkling*: as also that of domineering Rabbi, which certainly have no argument in them, and can be designed only to hold up those who practise Infant Baptism to derision and contempt.

It is by no means my intention to enter into a controversy on the subject of Baptism; but Ignotus should recollect that those who support the practice are not without their arguments. That children appear to have had applied to them an initiatory rite, from the calling of Abraham to the appearance of Christ; that it was the invariable practice of the Jews; and that the command to baptize being given in general terms, the disciples, as Jews, would thus understand it.

This, indeed, was the way in which the Jews treated their Gentile prose-

lytes: for which they had an express law, Exod. xii. 48. Thus proselyting a Gentile to the Jewish religion, all the male children were immediately circumcised. Proselyting, therefore, a Jew or a Gentile to the Christian religion, the disciples would immediately baptize all the children. There appears to me to be hardly any other possible conclusion. Had they not also done it, would that ever-cavilling people have failed to inquire of them the reason of their exclusion? Yet in the whole New Testament history, we meet not with a vestige of an objection thus applying.

Much has been said respecting the continuance of baptism, in countries already Christian; grounded principally on Emlyn's Previous Question. But here it may be asked, whether the initiatory rite ceased among the Jews, when brought under the Mosaic law, and settled as a nation? Or whether, when they had proselyted a Gentile, and he became as one born among them, and all his male children were circumcised, the obligation ceased as applying to their posterity? Whether, also, baptism is not of perpetual obligation, as a standing memorial of Christ's exaltation to the right hand of Divine Power? "All power is given me in heaven and on earth: go ye, therefore, and baptize," &c.

These are only thrown out as hints, that neither Ignotus nor any others may amuse themselves or attempt to prejudice those around them, by the evidently invidious terms of *babe-sprinkling*, &c. Ignotus must also see the propriety of correcting that expression in the beginning of his letter, "I will not *profane* the term of baptism," &c. I am certain, that upon reflection he must wish to retract. He was then, as he describes Mr. Belsham, seated at his desk.

If we see not this positive institution in the same light, let us continue to admit as sacred the right of private judgment; and go on with full cordiality of affection, in supporting those sentiments in which we are agreed: particularly the *Divine Unity*, and the worship of the one only living and true God.

L. HOLDEN.



SIR, Jan. 24, 1818.  
THE following extract from Whiston's *Memoirs of himself*, will serve to excite a suspicion that those whose judgments have demurred to the alleged authorities for *pædo-baptism*, in the modern sense of the term, have probably been far more numerous than those who have ventured publicly to impugn that established custom. Whiston, about 1712, having baptized two of his friends who were adults, was asked by one of them, whether he "should not think it were better, if baptism were deferred till after instruction, than used before it." The effect of this question is thus described by that serious and diligent inquirer after primitive Christianity:

"I immediately set myself to examine what the New Testament and the most early fathers meant by the words which they used, when they speak of baptism of *infants* or *little children*, I mean *νῆπια* and *παιδιά*, and which they esteemed not incapable of that holy ordinance. And I soon discovered, that they were only those that were capable of catechetical instruction, but not fit for understanding harder matters; and that none but such *infants* and *little children* were ever, in the first and second century, made partakers of baptism. This most important discovery I soon communicated to the world in this paper, *Primitive Infant Baptism revived*, which Bishop Hoadley and Dr. Clarke greatly approved; but still went on in the ordinary practice notwithstanding. I sent this paper also, by an intimate friend, Mr. Haines, to Sir Isaac Newton, and desired to know his opinion. The answer returned was this, that they both had discovered the same before." (Mem. Ed. 2, 1758, pp. 177, 178.)

Whiston's friend was, doubtless, Mr. Hopton Haynes. As to Bishop Hoadley and Dr. Clarke, if they were not misunderstood, the story affords a lamentable instance of consistency sacrificed to the authority or the emoluments of an Established Church, or to both, in their too commonly united influence.

On another subject Whiston gives the following account of a judge, who was in form a persecutor, but really disposed to let religion alone: "Mr.

Baron Price went the circuit in 1714. At Stafford, in giving his charge to the grand jury, he exhorted them to present all such as blasphemed or condemned the Church's doctrine of the *Trinity*: which charge I heard myself to my great dissatisfaction. Upon this, the High Sheriff afterwards told the Baron that I was in court, and should naturally suppose this part of his charge levelled against me in particular. The Baron replied, that he meant no such thing; that it was only his usual form; nay, that I was the honestest man in the world, and that he was then reading my works. Which declaration agrees with what I heard him say, publicly, in the Court of Delegates, when the Bishop of Winchester, *Trelhoney*, was pressing the judges to hasten their determinations what was *legal heresy*. My Lord, I will not take heresy upon my shoulders, nor upon my conscience, at which answer the Bishop expressed his great dissatisfaction." (Ibid. pp. 193, 194.)

This story will teach us how to appreciate, in other times, the seeming virulence of a charge against such as may be accused of having blasphemed "the Church's doctrine of the *Trinity*," especially as taught in that *form of sound words*, the Athanasian Creed. It may be found, on examination, that a judge really "meant no such thing—it was his usual form," and merely according to *law*.

R. L. C.

Brighton,

March 10, 1818.

SIR,

THE late Bishop Watson's *Antecdotes of his own Life* will continue to be a valuable moral lesson long after they have ceased to interest, by allusion to living characters, and the events of the day. There is a warning voice in them that will be heard in succeeding ages. Cardinal Wolsey's death did not say more emphatically than Bishop Watson's Life, "I charge thee, throw away ambition." It was a persevering attempt to reconcile practical contradictions, and its success would have been a refutation of the maxim of the great teacher, "Ye cannot serve two masters." One passage in his Life, which has, I believe, been quoted in your Review department, [pp. 53, 54,] has been

commented upon so differently in different periodical publications, that it may be worth while if you can spare room for its insertion a second time, to compare the different notices. The passage is this:—

“ I reduced the study of divinity into as narrow a compass as I could, for I determined to study nothing but my Bible, being much unconcerned about the opinion of councils, fathers, bishops, and other men as little inspired as myself. This mode of proceeding being opposite to the general one, and especially to that of the master of Peterhouse, who was a great reader, he used to call me *αυτοδιδακτος*, the self-taught divine. The Professor of Divinity had been nick-named, *Malleus Hæreticorum*; it was thought to be his duty to demolish every opinion which militated against what is called the orthodoxy of the Church of England. Now my mind was wholly unbiassed; I had no prejudices against, I had no predilection for the Church of England, but a sincere regard for the Church of Christ, and an insuperable objection to every degree of dogmatical intolerance. I never troubled myself with answering any arguments which the opponents in the divinity schools brought against the Articles of the Church, nor ever admitted their authority as decisive of a difficulty; but I used on such occasions to say to them, holding the New Testament in my hand, *En Sacrum Codicem*.”

“ On this simple narrative,” says a writer in the *Edinburgh Magazine*, “ it is quite unnecessary for us to make a single observation; it carries us along with it by the dignified force of truth. Few as the facts are, and told thus in their naked simplicity, without the most remote intention of winning our sympathy or creating an effect, the excellent narrator inspires us with respect and affection, and we feel towards him a portion of the enthusiasm which was so strong a feature in his character, and raised him above the sacrifice of one iota of integrity to the object of his most honourable ambition.” This commendation appears to be too unqualified to be in perfect harmony with the following remark of the same writer, “ There might have been something more venerable, more august in his image

after death,—something to which the meek and humble Christian would have turned with a purer pleasure, and from which he might have drawn a stronger support. Might not the politician have been sunk in the bishop, and the bishop changed into the apostle; but peace to the ashes of a good and a great man.”

In the judgment of the *Quarterly Reviewer*, however, there is no peace to the man, whether living or dead, in whom the Churchman is sunk in the Christian, and the anglican prelate in the fellow-disciple with all who acknowledge one *great* teacher and master. It is much to be lamented, that the want of consistency, of *unity* in the character of Bishop Watson, has deprived his friends of the power of denying, that the Reviewer's strictures upon his memory, which are written in the most envenomed spirit of ecclesiastical malignity, have generally any foundation in reason and in fact. But his defence would be an easy task if he were always as defensible as when he resolved to be what the master of Peterhouse called a self-taught, but should have called a biblical divine. On this manner of studying and teaching divinity, the Reviewer thus comments:—

“ Such was our Professor's conception of the nature of his office, and such the entire limits within which his discretion had led him to confine his theological inquiries. For contemning *the fathers*, Bentley was well scourged by Thirlby in a passage, which is equally adapted to the late Professor. ‘*Quid enim magis ridiculum aut fieri aut fingi potest quam homo Christianus, sacerdos, Theologiæ professor, omnibus philosophiæ studiis initiatus, in suis peregrinus aut hospes; Chrysostomum, Augustinum, Gregorios, Basilios, Originem, Athenagoram, Irenæum, Justinum, Ignatium ne nomine quidem novit,*’ &c.

If, indeed, it is the duty of the Professor of Divinity in an English university to defend by all possible means the doctrines of the Church of England, there is good reason for the animadversions both on Bentley and Watson, because the authority of councils and fathers may be obtained, where that of Jesus and his apostles is either silent or opposed. But that the Bishop was right as a Christian,



however wrong he might be as a priest and a theological professor, every Protestant would do well to confess. The following extract from Gilpin's Lives of the Reformers is a good comment on the opinion of Thirlby and the Quarterly Reviewer; and will probably appear to all Protestants, who do not consider themselves as obliged by law to support a sect, an abundant justification of Bishop Watson's method of studying divinity. It may also be used with some advantage by those well-wishers to Unitarianism, who are not quite satisfied with what has yet been done in the controversy respecting early opinions.

"I will not delay the reader with the particulars of this day, nor of that on which Bishop Ridley disputed (at St. Mary's Church, Oxford). I shall only say in general for the sake of truth, that the Papists do not seem to have had justice done them by their Protestant adversaries. Let these put what gloss upon the affair they please, the Papists certainly had the better of the argument on both those days. The case was this: they drew their chief proofs in favour of transubstantiation from the *fathers*, many of whom, and some of the more *esteemed writers* among them, speak on this subject in a language by no means evangelical. The two Bishops accordingly (Cranmer and Ridley) being thus pressed by an authority which they durst not reject, were not a little embarrassed. And, indeed, how could a Protestant divine defend such a passage as this from St. Chrysostom: 'What a miracle is this! He who sits above with the Father, at the very same instant of time is handled with the hands of men!' Or such a passage as this from the same writer: 'That which is in the cup is the same which flowed from the side of Christ.' Or this from Theophylact: 'Because we would abhor the eating of raw flesh, and especially human flesh, therefore, it appeareth as bread, though it is indeed flesh.' Or this from St. Austin: 'Christ was carried in his own hands, when he said, this is my body.' Or this from Justin Martyr: 'We are taught that when this nourishing food is consecrated, it becomes the flesh and blood of Christ.' Or this from St. Ambrose: 'It is bread before it

is consecrated, but when that ceremony has passed upon it, of bread it becomes the flesh of Christ.' Of all these passages, and many others of the same kind, the Papists, with not a little dexterity, made their avail. The two Bishops, in the mean time, instead of disavowing an insufficient authority, weakly defended a good cause, evading and distinguishing after the manner of the schoolmen.

"The prolocutor had told the venerable Latimer, that he must dispute on a certain day. The old Bishop, with as much cheerfulness as he would have shewn upon the most ordinary occasion, shaking his palsied head, answered smiling, 'Indeed, gentlemen, I am just as well qualified to be made Governor of Calais.' He then complained that he was very old and very infirm; and said that he had the use of no book but of that under his arm, which he had read seven times over deliberately, without finding the least mention made of the mass. In this speech he gave great offence, by saying in his humorous way, alluding to transubstantiation, that he could find neither the marrow-bones nor the sinews of the mass in the New Testament. Upon which the prolocutor cried out with some warmth, that he would make him find both; and when Mr. Latimer, recollecting himself, was going to explain his meaning in that expression, he was not suffered to speak."

J. M.

SIR,

April 3, 1818.

THE late Bishop of Landaff, in the Anecdotes of his Life, seems to think that eternal punishments of the wicked, may be necessary to preserve the holy in goodness, in a future state. This is a very extraordinary opinion, if the Bishop had been a man of much reflection; for it is founded upon a supposition, that the good, even in heaven, only continue to be such through *fear*; and what can be the *happiness* of that society, which requires the fear of eternal misery to keep it from revolt!

Temptations, which are very pressing, are very *painful*, and the *blessed* in heaven must be inconceivably *miserable*, if nothing but the dread of a greater eternal misery can keep them voluntarily in their present state.

There is then no heaven, but hell twice told, compared with the best of which, extinction of being is indeed blessedness. A virtuous state here is not described as a state of felicity; it is supposed to be exchanged for one hereafter; but according to this doctrine, the struggle is eternal, and the virtuous in heaven are eternally miserable. Virtue in this life clearly consists in the painful resistance of injurious propensities, and Socrates founded his claim to merit, on overcoming a corrupt constitution. It is upon this supposition, that Abraham Tucker thought that Jesus Christ was probably a being, by constitution, of even evil propensity;\* and that his pre-eminent merit consisted in always victoriously resisting it. There can be no other true theory of morals in this life; therefore, an eminently virtuous life cannot here be a happy one. Of the kingdom of heaven we have thought otherwise; but only upon the supposition, that our propensities there will all be in harmony with duty, and that painful resistance will be no longer necessary. Bishop Watson's heaven is a poor reward; and if for this future prospect he was indebted to Christianity, I think his obligations were not very great!

It appears that the intellectual character of the Bishop was not of a very high order. His mind was neither acute nor extensive: there is not a striking or original remark in any of his writings, least of all in these Anecdotes of his Life. He was in intellect greatly inferior to many of his contemporaries, to Abraham Tucker, to Middleton, to Paley, Price, Priestley and twenty others. We can well spare his *Treatise on Original Sin*, and that of any man who thought the subject worth writing upon. Original Sin is nothing but original misery. Man sins because he is placed in painful and suffering circumstances. Sin is not a willing rebellion of man against his own happiness, though this stupid notion seems to have been the theological sense of the term.

His anecdotes of the King, Queen,

~~now~~ In attributing this sentiment to the author of *The Light of Nature pursued*, there should, we think, have been a reference to the place where it may be found.

Mr. Pitt and others, are so trifling and worthless, that one wonders at the popularity of his book. What are more contemptible than English political parties? And did not this confident man find out, that neither the King, Queen, nor Mr. Pitt, governed the kingdom? Did he not know, what every child may know, that the Aristocratic party, who command the majority in the House of Commons, governed both the King, Queen and Mr. Pitt; and will continue to govern all the kings, queens, ministers and clerks in England?

Really I should have thought that this knowledge was not too deep for Dr. Watson, although it is obvious that he had not much depth.

I think, however, the Bishop was not without virtuous aspirations, and that his character is entitled to respect, and I earnestly hope that he has gone to such a state of enjoyment, that it will not be necessary to bolt him in heaven, by the horrors of eternal torments, should he attempt to escape.

HOMO.

SIR,

Feb. 8, 1818.

I HAVE not observed in any life of Sandius, the biographer of the Anti-Trinitarians, that he was ever in England. Yet he appears from the following passage in Wood's *Fasti*, 1664, to have studied at Oxford: "Among several foreigners that became sojourners and students in the University this year, to improve themselves in literature by the use of the public library," my author names "Christopher Sandius, who sojourned in a house near Queen's College, and gave his mind up, for the most part, to the perusal of Socinian books, not only in the public library, but in others belonging to colleges, and in booksellers' shops. He was born at Königsberg, in Prussia, 12th of October, 1644, and afterwards, being instructed by his father, of both his names, (the most noted Socinian in the country where he lived, and therefore deprived of those places of trust which he enjoyed, about 1668,) in the Socinian tenets, was sent by him to ~~Oxon~~ to improve them by reading and studying. Afterwards, retiring to his country, he wrote and published several books, and after his death (which happened at Amsterdam, on the last of Novem-



ber, 1680,) was published, of his composition, *Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitariorum*, &c. Freistad, 1684, 8vo. in which, pp. 169, 170, &c. you may see a catalogue of his works, some of which are Socinian." *Athen. Oxon.* 1692, II. 834.

This is the whole of Wood's article, and he must be allowed to have treated not untravvily this *Socinian*, of whom he, probably, had personal knowledge, for Wood resided almost constantly at Oxford. A French biographer has been less courteous to this scholar's memory, acknowledging his learning, but charging him with having applied it to an unworthy purpose:

"*Sandius* avoit beaucoup de littérature sacrée et profane, et étoit très-versé dans l'Histoire Ecclesiastique. Il abusa de ses connoissances pour composer divers ouvrages, qui eurent beaucoup de cours dans sa secte." \* *Nouv. Dict.* Paris, 1772. Art. *Sandius*.

The *Bibliotheca*, in an English dress, would be a valuable addition to our Unitarian tracts, of which so few are biographical. Separated from the pieces now annexed to it, the whole, even allowing for a few notes, would be brought into a small volume. I wish the Unitarian Book Societies would encourage such a design. They would, I am persuaded, ensure its speedy accomplishment.

LIGNARIUS.

*Ditchfield,*

February 10, 1818.

SIR,  
H<sup>AVING</sup> long wished to find some pages in your Repository devoted to an inquiry into the perpetuity of the Lord's Supper, I was led eagerly to the perusal of what occurs on that subject at pp. 31, 32. It would have been more satisfactory, had your Correspondent T. G. entered into an examination of the historical evidence of this institution, instead of resting the weight of his decision on the testimony of a writer, who, by his own account, was grossly misapprehended in what he had taught to the new converts of the Corinthian church.

\* Sandius was accomplished in sacred and profane learning, and eminently versed in Ecclesiastical History. These talents he perverted to the composition of several works, which his sect have greatly esteemed.

If we refer to the institution of the passover, Exod. xii. 3, we shall find the rite itself, and the whole of its observance, purely domestic. It is of some importance to notice this; for in our Lord's time, the same privacy and the same want of connexion with the ceremonial of public worship still continued. The occurrence took place only once a year. The last time our Lord partook of the passover, was in an "upper room," along with his twelve disciples. The narrative of the transaction is short, and told with no material variation by the different historians. We understand it as a Jewish feast, celebrated altogether by men of that nation; but rendered peculiarly interesting, as the last social repast which our Lord partook of previous to his death.

The first question that presents itself, is this: Did any one of the assembled disciples recognize in this last participation of the passover, with their affectionate Master, a new institution? Did any alteration in the time of this annual festival take place? Was any variation of the materials of which the feast consisted, then authorized? As we cannot answer any of these interrogatories in the affirmative, we must seek for additional evidence, before we bind the burden of a Jewish obligation upon the regard of all succeeding Christian generations. I have omitted quoting the separate narratives of this transaction, for the sake of brevity. They are of such easy access to all readers, that all may be enabled to judge of the propriety of what here is alleged, after a careful perusal.

The "additional evidence" is supposed to be supplied by the Apostle Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 23. This your Correspondent T. G. thinks conclusive of the argument. Let us, with minds abstracted from all pre-conception, and with reference solely to the customs of the converts at Corinth, examine the account. As the new version has already been quoted, I will do the same, only commencing at the 25th instead of the 23rd verse: "When, therefore, ye come together into one place, it is not to eat the Lord's Supper. For when ye eat, every one takes before others his own supper: and one is hungry, and another is drunken. What! Have ye not houses to eat and

drink in? Or despise ye the church of God, and shame those that have not? What shall I say unto you? Shall I praise you in this? I praise you not." Does not the apostle, by his censuring their coming "*together into one place*," condemn the public celebration of this rite? He inquires with warmth, "What! Have ye not houses to eat and drink in?" From this warm remonstrance against the disorderly and public exhibition of this feast, so perfectly in consonance with the private eating of the passover, and the affecting remembrance of it as the last social repast of his great Master, we find the apostle instantly refers to his Lord's account of the transaction, as sufficient to remove all the disorder of which he here complains. "For I have received from the Lord that which I delivered also unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the night on which he was delivered up, took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and said, 'This is my body which is broken for you, do this in remembrance of me.' In like manner he took the cup also when he had supped, saying, 'This cup is the *new covenant* through my blood, do this *as often as ye shall drink it*, in remembrance of me.'"

The peculiar propriety of the whole of this account, is plainly indicated by the characters to whom it was originally addressed. They had been members of a church possessing an "old covenant;" here is a *new one*, intended to supersede the other altogether. The injunction, "Do this as often as ye shall drink it," i. e. as often as ye celebrate the passover, *with a new designation*, "in remembrance of me," implies persons who have frequently observed this rite, under the sanction of a prior authority. It is evident that our Lord was anxious to give to the celebration of the passover a new interest amongst those of his disciples who were familiar with Jewish ceremonies, and were likely, at least during their own lives, to continue the practice of them. Indeed, allowing the supposed perpetuity of this rite, we find nothing to alter its private celebration, or to change its annual occurrence. The apostle severely censures the Corinthians for the impropriety of its publicity; "What! Have ye not houses," &c.

Under all the circumstances of the

case, we are fully at liberty to presume, that without an express direction to the contrary, (and which is nowhere to be found,) the apostles, as *Jews*, were not likely to alter the legal time of celebrating the passover, nor in such celebration omit any of the prescribed requisites of the feast. With a violation of the one, or a deviation from the other, the present investigation is not encumbered.

It ought, likewise, to be kept in remembrance, that the apostle in this part of his epistle, is confining himself altogether to his Jewish proselytes. This is made evident by turning to the commencement of the previous chapter: "Moreover, brethren," &c. and it ends with the close of the chapter, from which these extracts have been taken. I am aware, that much remains to be investigated in the course of our present inquiry. Perhaps a future opportunity, should not the subject be taken up by an abler pen, may allow me that room for continuation, which the limit of my present paper refuses to admit.

W. H.

SIR, Clapton, March 3, 1818.

THE following biographical notices occur to me, on looking at the *Lists* communicated by Mr. Manning, pp. 89, 90.

*Huxham*. He became a very eminent physician. See some account of him in the *Repository*, II. 1, note.

*Mudge* became "Vicar of St. Andrews, Plymouth." He published "A Volume of Sermons," and "An Essay for a New Version of the Psalms." He had two sons; *John*, a physician at Plymouth, who wrote a medical treatise, and was the author of an "Improvement in the Construction of Reflecting Telescopes." He died in 1793. *Thomas* was a watchmaker, and "made great improvements in time-keepers, on which he wrote a treatise."

*Foster*. Of Dr. F. there is an account in the *Repository*, II. 1—7, and 57—61, which may, without hesitation, be attributed to Dr. Toulmin, and is one of the many valuable assistances his pen has afforded to inquirers after the story of former days.

*King* ("afterwards Lord Chancellor"). Here must be a mistake, as Lord King was forty years of age, and



high in his profession before 1710. This *King* may have been one of the four sons of the Chancellor, who was a native of Exeter.

*Prior.* Probably Dr. P. who, at his death, was minister of a congregation meeting in Goodman's Fields, which, several years ago, was dissolved. The following short letters to Dr. Birch, which I transcribed from the originals among his manuscripts in the *Museum*, will serve to shew Dr. Prior's connexions.

"Dear Sir,

"I was guilty of a mistake with respect to the books. 'Tis the Parliamentary History, and not the Journals, Mr. Harris [the historian] wants to consult. The words of his letter are: 'Have any of your friends the Parliamentary History of England, just published? I had need see those volumes, which relate to Charles's reign, though I am loath to buy them, as they are very expensive; and I have a promise of the Journals of the House of Commons, from Sir George Yonge. I would be very glad to borrow the volumes above-mentioned, or pay for the reading of them, if they are to be borrowed of any bookseller for two months.'

"If you can procure the books for my friend, you will greatly oblige him and

"Your humble Servant,

"WILLIAM PRIOR.

"Well-Close Square,

August 16, 1756.

"To the Rev. Dr. Birch, in North-folk Street, Strand."

"Dear Sir,

"Mr. Amory, Flexman and self, intend to breakfast with you to-morrow morn at 9 o'clock. From

"Your humble Servant,

"WILLIAM PRIOR.

["11 June, 1757.]

"Tuesday afternoon,  
4 o'clock.

"To the Rev. Dr. Birch, in Norfolk Street."

*May.* In 1730, he became minister at *Gravel Lane, Houndsditch*. In 1738 he preached a funeral sermon for his friend *Mr. Grove*. See Prot. Diss. Mag. VI. 179. III. 84.

*Stogdon.* He must have been the author of the following pamphlet,  
VOL. XIII. 2 L

which I have in a volume of tracts: "A Defence of the Caveat against the New Sect of Anabaptists, in Answer to Mr. Reed's Reply." *Exon.* 1714. It appears among Mr. Nicholls's *Anecdotes*, that in 1711, "Mr. Laurence, a learned layman, baptized and bred among the Dissenters, was not satisfied concerning the validity of his own baptism, and was baptized by a Clergyman of the Church of England, and wrote in defence of what he had done, 'Lay Baptism invalid,' 1711; a defence of it the same year; and in 1712, 'Dissenters' Baptism null and void.' Against this notion appeared, in 1713, 'The State and Importance of the present Controversy, &c. in a Letter to the Author of Lay Baptism invalid. By a Country Clergyman;'" who, according to Mr. Nicholls, was "Dr. Turner, Vicar of Christ Church, London, and of Greenwich." *Lit. Anec.* IV. 227, 228. I have this pamphlet in the volume before-mentioned, also, "A Caveat against the New Sect of Anabaptists lately sprung up at Exon." 1714. Attributed, in MS. on the title-page, to *Mr. Withers*. This *Caveat* was occasioned by the following circumstances: "One Mr. Benjamin Read, of the City of Exeter, was designed for a Dissenting minister: his parents gave him a suitable education, and he was for several years at a private academy. All this time, he seemed to be a resolute Nonconformist, but about two or three months since he left the Dissenters, and on a sudden declared himself a zealous Churchman. A little after he conformed, he was persuaded to renounce his former baptism, as absolutely null and invalid, because it was administered by one who was not episcopally ordained. He submitted to be rebaptized, and the sacrament was solemnly repeated in the parish church of *Heavytree*, within a mile of Exeter. The person that officiated was one *Mr. Jenkinson*. The godfathers were two clergymen, *Mr. King* and *Mr. J. Walker*." *Caveat*, pp. 3, 4. Mr. Read appears to have replied in "A Letter to a Friend." This produced the "Defence," in which, and the "Caveat," the arguments also of Mr. Laurence are considered. See more of *Mr. Stogdon* in the *Repository*, IV. 57—62, and 121—125.

*Jeffrey, Thomas.* He was, no doubt,

the author of the following pieces: "A Review of the Controversy between the Author of a Discourse of the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion, and his Adversaries," 1726; and "Christianity the Perfection of all Religion, natural and revealed, wherein some of the principal Prophecies relating to the Messiah in the Old Testament, are shewn to belong to him in the literal sense, in opposition to the Attempts of the Literal Scheme. By Thomas Jeffrey." 1728.

Mr. Thomas Jeffrey was minister at Little Baddow, Essex, where Lord Barrington was one of his congregation. He had, probably, a personal acquaintance with Mr. Collins, whom he treats with much civility, acknowledging his "true worth, learning and integrity." Mr. C. often visited Lord B. at his seat called *Tofts*, in Baddow. There he also met Dr. Hunt, and "it is said to have been their custom, after dinner, to have a Greek Testament laid on the table, as they were all men of letters, and had a taste for Scripture criticism." Dr. Kippis says that Mr. Jeffrey, "if he had not died young, would, probably, have ranked among the most able advocates of revolution." He adds, "The writings he lived to publish, are much esteemed by those judicious readers who are acquainted with them; and they were highly approved of by Dr. Kennicott." See *Biog. Brit. Ed. 2, l. 626. Note (G). IV. 27. Leland's View of Deistical Writers, Ed. 2, l. 139, 144.*

Such are all the notices or conjectures which I can offer respecting Mr. *Hallett's* students. I must reserve to another letter the observations on a few names connected with the other academies.

J. T. R.

Brighton,

SIR,

March 10, 1818.

IT is with pleasure that I read of the great and numerous exertions that have been made in the establishing of *Auxiliary Unitarian and Fellowship Funds*; and it is earnestly to be wished that, in a little time, there may not be a congregation throughout the Unitarian connexion, which has not a similar institution; since, by these means, so well adapted to effect a closer union, and of consequence to gain an addition of strength, there is

scarcely a desirable work which the Unitarian body may not esteem within its power to accomplish.

Supposing it might be grateful and encouraging to your readers to be made acquainted with any, even the smallest circumstance, which would tend to the promotion of the spread of Unitarianism, I have the satisfaction to state, that at a meeting, held in October, 1817, at the *Unitarian Chapel, Cumberland Street, Brighton*, John Chatfeild, Esq., in the Chair, a Society was formed, which consisted, in a few days, of upwards of forty members, denominating itself the *Brighton Fellowship Fund*, established for the promotion of religious truth.

A treasurer and secretary were chosen, and a committee appointed, which meets every six weeks. An annual meeting is to be held, at which the committee's report will be read.

Wishing every possible success to institutions so beneficial, and that similar measures may be generally adopted by Unitarian congregations, I remain, &c. W. STEVENS.

SIR,

March 4, 1818.

I OBSERVE, in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for July, 1814, p. 3, an account of a curious paper of the time of Queen Elizabeth, lately discovered at Stationers' Hall. It is a *Memorial* of "Hugh Morgan, her Majesty's Apothecarie," who "asketh allowance from 24th June to 29th September, 1588, to be paid by the Treasurer of her Highness's chamber." Among a few specimens of the items in this apothecary's bill, I was attracted to the following:

"Confectio, in formâ manûs Christi, cum lapide bezohardi et cornu monocerotis, ex mandatâ Reginae, pro Domina Skipwith, xi. s." \*

Sir Thomas Browne, in his *Vulgar Errors*, (B. iii. Ch. xxiii.) mentions such compositions. Speaking of the pretended Unicorn's horn he says, "Nor is it great wonder we may be deceived in this, being daily gulled in the brother Antidote, Bezoar." But what could have been the supersti-

\* A confection, in the shape of the hand of Christ, composed of bezour stone and unicorn's horn, by the Queen's command, for Lady Skipwith, eleven shillings.



tion respecting the hand of Christ, thus seemingly encouraged by a Protestant Queen?

Give me leave to add a discovery which I lately made of the reason why courtiers are complaisant to Athanasius, and for his sake to the Creed which bears his name, in violation of all historical evidence. This reason I found in Milton's *Defensio pro Populo Anglicano* (Cap. iii. ad fin). Salmasius, in his *Defensio Regia*, had brought a host of Christian fathers to maintain, *The right divine of kings to govern wrong*, and among the rest Athanasius. Milton thus admits the fact: "Athanasius Reges terræ ad humana tribunalia vocare nefarium esse dicit." \* This is good: courtly doctrine, such as Burke opposed to Price, and which has been expanded over many a sermon for the *Royal Martyr*. But my uncourtly author goes on to say, "Quis hoc dixit Athanasio? Verbum enim Dei nullum hinc audio. Credam itaque ego imperatoribus potius et regibus de se falsum hoc esse fatentibus, quàm Athanasio." †

However Milton may here explode the authority of this orthodox father, whom Bishop Clayton degraded into a *pert deacon*, we see why the legal servant of a court should turn *school-divine* and defend Athanasius.

#### OTIOSUS.

SIR, York, April 7th, 1818.

I AM sorry that my anonymous Correspondent, according to the assertion of Dr. Stock, in the last month's Repository, [p. 182,] should have mistaken, and consequently have misrepresented the conversation of the late amiable Mr. Vernon, which produced so entire a change in the religious system of that gentleman; a mistake, however, with which I have no further concern than as it might affect the correctness of the quotations I have given from that letter in the reply, which I considered it as incumbent upon me to make to it. The

\* Athanasius declared it impious to bring Kings before human tribunals.

† Where had Athanasius this information, on which the word of God is silent? I will rather believe emperors and kings who have declared the falsehood of that opinion, than Athanasius.

Doctor is, indeed, so candid as to acquit me of any sinister design in the communication to which he refers: but in order to remove every shadow of doubt in his mind, that as far at least as I am implicated, he has not been misrepresented, I will send the letter itself to my friend Dr. Carpenter, requesting that he will show it to Dr. Stock. I would have sent an exact copy of this letter for insertion in the Repository, had I not been unwilling to take up so much room in your valuable Miscellany, on a subject which cannot interest the general reader, and which is, therefore, of comparatively little importance. The spirit in which it is written is truly christian; and in common with that evinced by the Doctor himself, and by his late amiable friend Mr. Vernon, affords so many additional proofs, that the piety and benevolence which shone through every discourse and every action of our honoured Master, as recorded by the Evangelists, and which form the very essence of his gospel, may be met with in the supporters of speculative opinions diametrically opposed to each other.

When, Mr. Editor, will Christians cease to anathematize those, who, having departed from the generally received systems of contradictory articles and creeds of mere human composition, fabricated in an age of bigotry, ignorance and superstition, presume to give a different, and, as they conceive, a far more rational and consistent interpretation of the highly figurative language of Eastern phraseology?

CATHARINE CAPPE.

AN epitaph intended to be inscribed on a monument about to be erected in the Unitarian chapel at Taunton, to the memory of the late Dr. Cox, of that place, composed by his friend William Evans, of Tavistock:

Dignam laude virum.  
Commemorat hoc marmor.  
Liberorum pietate consecratum  
Patris nomine  
Johannis Cox, M. D. atque V. D. M.  
prius.  
Qui honesti verique tenax,  
Amicum, patriæ, totius humanæ  
gentis amans

Et beneficia in egentissimos quosque  
præcipuè conferens,  
Arte divina medendi  
Sibi ipse, cura Dei

“Eregit monumentum ære perennius.”

Quinetiam

Maria, præcedentis conjux, religione  
et domestica fortitudine ditata, filii  
et filiæ cordi carissima, eheu! mortua  
est.

Ille ob. A. D. 1796, æt. 42; Illa ob.  
1810, æt. 49.

Mors ultima linea rerum est:  
Gratia autem Dei, æterna vita.

*The Nonconformist.*

No. IV.

*On the general Prevalence of Superstition.*

**M**AN in an uncivilized state of society is always addicted to idolatry or superstition. In the infancy of a people, idolatry has generally been the prevailing religion; and whenever a nation has been induced to relinquish its idolatrous practices, an anxiety has usually been evinced for the introduction of something that should be cognizable by the senses, and not dependent on reason alone for its reception. Hence the origin of ritual observances, and the prevailing attachment to a religion of splendid ceremony, in preference to one which inculcates moral duty, and the silent worship of the heart. From the beneficent character of the Deity, it is reasonable to suppose that our first parents were either ushered into the world with an intuitive knowledge of their duty and interests; or that they were immediately instructed therein by a special messenger from heaven. Thus informed, it was not likely that they or their descendants would soon degenerate into idolatry.\* Accordingly, we have no account in

\* The great age to which the Antediluvians attained, very much tended to preserve the knowledge of the true God among them. Adam lived 930 years, and Methuselah, who spent 243 years of his long life contemporary with Adam, lived also 600 years with Noah, the last of the old world. It is impossible, therefore, that Noah and his three sons and their wives, who went with him into the ark, should not have been informed of the proper Unity of God, and of the duty and destination of man.

the sacred history of any such falling off from the worship of the true God, before, or for a long period after the deluge.

It appears, however, that idolatry had obtained a considerable establishment in the world in the time of Terah, who was the father of Abraham, and was born within about 280 years after the flood. For we are expressly told in Scripture that Terah served *other gods*; and from the language of Joshua, who called upon the people of Israel saying, “Choose you this day whom ye will serve; whether the God which your fathers served, or the gods of the Amorites, in whose land ye dwell,”\* it is evident that idolatry had long been the established religion of the Amorites.

These people resided in a mountainous district, lying west of the Dead Sea, and it is remarkable that this was the very country in which Terah and Abraham originally resided. Some commentators have, indeed, asserted that Abraham was expelled from his own country for his aversion to that gross idolatry which prevailed in it; and Josephus tells us\* that this patriarch was the *first* person who openly taught the doctrine of the Unity of God, and that, on this account, the inhabitants of Chaldea rose up against him, and that he fled to the land of Canaan to avoid their outrage.

It seems to me very extraordinary, that the Sacred Writers should have given no historical account of the establishment of idolatry any where, for many ages after the flood, because, from the solemn denunciations of the servants of God, against this folly and impiety, and from other circumstances, we have reason to believe that, in the time of Moses, idolatry had overspread the greatest part of the known world, and that the species of idolatry which mankind first fell into, was the adoration of the sun, of the moon, and of some other of the heavenly bodies. “If,” says Moses, “there be found among you man or woman that hath served other gods, and worshiped them, either the sun or moon or any of the host of heaven, then shalt thou bring forth that man or that woman unto thy gates, and shalt stone them

\* Joshua xxiv. 15.

† Antiq. Book i. Chap. vii.



with stones till they die." \* We have further evidence that the first idolatry was that of the heavenly bodies, from what Job, the most ancient writer on record, and who is supposed to have been contemporary with Jacob, † says of himself, "If I behold, (says he, in the sublime language of oriental poetry,) if I behold the sun when it shineth, or the moon walking in brightness, and my heart hath been secretly enticed, or my mouth hath kissed my hand, (that is, made obeisance to them after the Eastern manner,) I should have denied the God that is above." ‡

Moreover, in the time of Josiah, King of Judah, we are told that the people "burnt incense to the sun, and to the moon, and to the planets, and to all the host of heaven." §

There was, therefore, great propriety in the narrative of Moses, in the first chapter of Genesis, wherein he takes no notice whatever of the creation of any beings superior to man, but dwells with great minuteness on the formation of the sun, the moon and the stars; as though he was determined to deprive his people of every pretence for adopting the idolatrous practices of their neighbours, by shewing them, that the God of the Hebrews, not only created man and every living thing upon the face of the earth, but that the splendid orbs of heaven were also his workmanship, and therefore, Jehovah, the maker of heaven and earth was, and ever would be, the sole object of religious worship.

It would occupy too much time to recapitulate the various denunciations of the Almighty against idolatry, and especially if I were to attempt to inquire into the methods by which the prophets of the Most High successfully opposed the false worship of the surrounding nations. This, however, might be formed into a very interesting narrative; and I am inclined to think it might be shewn, that wherever the Jewish or the Christian religion was professed by a considerable

number of the people of any country, it always succeeded in extirpating idolatry.

But notwithstanding this triumph of true religion over the false worship of the Heathen, there is an evil still in the world which neither Moses nor Jesus, nor the united efforts of their most zealous followers, through a long series of ages, have ever yet been able to subdue. I refer to *superstition*: that baneful, that noxious ingredient, which poisons the sweetest pleasures of many unfortunate individuals; that gigantic phantom which overshadows their fairest prospects; that predominating temper which gives a peculiar bias to every propensity of the heart, and is calculated to distort the most engaging and amiable features of the human character.

If I were asked to define superstition, I would say, that it consisted in false and unworthy notions of the Deity; in devotion improperly directed; in unmeaning and absurd rites; and in a ridiculous fear of imaginary and invisible beings. True religion is founded on the exercise of the understanding, and in right notions of God; whereas, superstition rests upon the belief of the possibility of appeasing an offended Deity by the sufferings of an innocent victim; by outward and laborious services; by severe mortifications; by extreme scrupulosity in all ceremonial observances; or, by embracing and promulgating certain opinions which are in reality derogatory to the honour of God, and subversive of the best interests and happiness of man.

I shall adduce a few instances to justify me in these assertions.

The manners and customs of the Egyptians were all tinged with superstition. They washed their drinking vessels more from superstition than cleanliness, and dreaded the eating of meat that had been cut by any other knife than that of an Egyptian. \* They not only worshiped the vulture and crocodile, but established regular hunting parties to procure for those deified birds, such food as was most agreeable to them. † And, from the book of Genesis, we learn that a very numerous and useful body

\* Deuteronomy xvii. 2—5.

† See Goguet's Origin of Laws, among the most Ancient Nations. I. 241 and 385.

‡ Job xxxi. 26—28.

§ 2 Kings xxiii. 5.

\* Goguet's Origin of Laws. I. 350.

† Ibid, 356.

of men were rendered objects of public aversion in consequence of another of their superstitions, and that this fact made it necessary for Joseph to take several precautions before he durst introduce his father and brethren into the presence of Pharaoh.\*

In the history of the Jews we read that the children of Israel used various divinations and enchantments, and caused their sons and daughters to pass through the fire in an idolatrous sacrifice to Moloch, the chief deity of the Amorites.† We learn also, that on a certain occasion, when a party at sea was overtaken by a storm of unusual violence, the mariners cast lots for the purpose of ascertaining which of the crew was obnoxious to the displeasure of the gods, and had occasioned that evil to come upon them.‡ And in an earlier period of their history (about 1100 years before Christ), we read that Saul, although he had issued an edict of banishment against all wizards and those that had familiar spirits; § yet, when he was in difficulty himself, he resorted to a woman who was reputed to have a familiar spirit, to entreat her to call up the spirit of the deceased Samuel, || that he might inquire of him what it would be advisable for him to do, in order to defeat a powerful army that was coming against him. ¶

The practice of consulting such persons, prevailed in Judea through every period of the Jewish history. Zechariah, who lived only about 500 years before Christ, tells the people of Jerusalem, that "Their idols had spoken vanity, and the diviners had told false dreams." \*\*

\* Genesis xli. 34.

† 2 Kings xvii. 17.

‡ Jonah i. 7.

§ 1 Samuel xxviii. 3.

|| The raising the ghost of Samuel was perfectly consistent with the notions of the people of those times. Plutarch speaks of an oracle of ghosts. Maximus Tyrius tells of a certain cave that was constantly frequented by a prophetic ghost. The ghost of Darius was called up on purpose to foretel his queen her destiny. And in the beginning of the 11th book of the Odyssey, Homer describes Ulysses as invoking the dead to acquire a knowledge of his future fortunes.

¶ 1 Samuel xxviii. 15.

\*\* Zechariah x. 2.

The superstitions of the Jews were probably fostered; and their number much increased; during the Babylonish captivity; for it is well known that the people of Chaldea were much attached to what have been called the occult sciences. So much addicted were they to the various arts of divination, and to the foretelling of future events by dreams and visions, that the practices of divining, of soothsaying, of witchcraft and of astrology, were regular professions among that people. And so honourable were these professions deemed, that those who belonged to them were called *wise men*; and those who stood at the head of these classes of society were, by way of eminence, and to distinguish them from the ordinary citizens of Babylon, called *Chaldeans*. Thus, in the book of Daniel, we frequently read of the magicians, astrologers, *Chaldeans* and soothsayers.\* According to the President Goguet, the Chaldeans were esteemed, by all antiquity, to have been the *inventors* of judicial astrology. †

I believe it may be very safely asserted, that whenever superstition has taken firm hold upon the mind, it is never to be eradicated. Accordingly, when the Jews returned from the Babylonish captivity, they not only transferred the profane rites of the Chaldeans from Babylon to Jerusalem, but they transmitted all those absurd practices from generation to generation, and ever afterwards continued to be a superstitious people. Thus, in the time of the apostles, we read of a Jewish damsel possessed of the spirit of Python, or of Apollo, who brought her masters much gain by soothsaying. ‡

The superstitious nature of the Jewish character may be farther illustrated by a variety of other instances; such as the notion of Satan having entered into Judas; the ascription of power over mankind to the devil; the supposition of demons inhabiting the air; of an angel descending into the pool of Bethesda, &c. To all these may be added, the practice of conquerors taking sorcerers with them

\* Daniel ii. 2, iv. 7, v. 7, 11, &c.

† Goguet. I. 228.

‡ Acts xvi. 16.



into vanquished countries to discover hidden treasures, as has been related by Sir John Chardin, and referred to by Isaiah, chapter xlv. 3, who, in prophecy, represents the Almighty as proclaiming to Cyrus, saying, "I will give thee the treasures of darkness, and hidden riches of secret places, that thou mayest know that I the Lord am the God of Israel."

The practice of cutting the arms and hands in times of great affliction to appease the Deity, cannot also be forgotten. This custom is evidently referred to by Jeremiah xli. 5; xlvii. 5; and xlviii. 37. Baal's prophets in their contest with Elijah, were guilty of a similar superstition. We are told, "they cried aloud, and cut themselves after their manner, with knives and lancets, till the blood gushed out upon them."\* The demoniac, whose story is related by Mark, † probably cut himself with sharp stones, on the same principle. This practice, however, was not confined to those who were in dread of the displeasure of the Deity, but was also employed, in conjunction with cutting off the hair from the forehead, ‡ as a testimony of sorrow for the loss of highly esteemed friends or relatives, as appears from Jeremiah xvi. 6, and Zechariah xiii. 5, 6; and that this voluntary wounding was not uncommon, may be presumed from the circumstance of Moses having thought it necessary to forbid the practice. "Ye shall not," says he, "cut yourselves, nor make any baldness between your eyes for the dead." §

Were I not expressly treating on the practices of the ancients, many instances might be adduced to shew, that the Arabs of the present day actually make gashes in their arms with knives, for the purpose of recommending themselves in the most effectual manner to the favour of their mistresses. ||

\* 1 Kings xviii. 28. † Mark v. 5.

‡ "Tears flow'd from ev'ry eye, and o'er the dead  
Each clapt the curling honours of his head."

*Homer's Odyssey.*

§ Deuteronomy xiv. 1.

|| *Harmer's Observations on Divers Passages of Scripture*, 2d Ed. 8vo. 1776, 41. 515.

In closing my account of the customs and practices of the ancient Jews, it may be remarked, that the devout followers of Moses are still extremely superstitious, particularly respecting the Sabbath, and the observance of times, and the management of culinary utensils, &c. Those who are curious in examining into the nature of these observances, may derive abundant information and amusement from the perusal of that part of the Mishna which has been translated by Dr. Wotton, together with this volume of Discourses on the Jewish Traditions. The notion of the modern Jews, respecting the sacredness of the Pentateuch, is, however, singular enough to deserve mention.

These books are usually written upon scrolls of parchment or paper, with a rod of wood or bone or ivory, firmly attached to each end of the paper or parchment; so that one part may be rolled upon one of the rods, while the other is unrolled for the purpose of being read; and this is a contrivance for preventing the necessity of the roll itself being touched by the hand, which would render it permanently polluted. It seems that these books do not become sacred until they are finished; but the moment the last letter is written, that moment the whole becomes holy, and care must be taken ever afterwards to preserve it from being contaminated. It is, therefore, immediately deposited in some secure place, where it can be in no danger of being approached by any living thing; for, if even a mouse were to run over it, it would inevitably be so profaned, that no devout Jew could ever after make any use of it.

I have, however, no intention of representing the Jews as a people remarkable beyond all others for their superstition; because, it is well known that in every nation of antiquity, where there has been a domineering priesthood, every kind of absurdity and superstition has been interwoven with the manners and habits of the people.

There is a sect of Indians who purify themselves with the dung and urine of the cow, and consider themselves polluted by the touch of a heretic: they wear a net over their mouths, lest they should swallow a fly by accident, and thus interrupt the progress

of a purified spirit in its purgatory; but with all this humanity, they think themselves obliged by their religion to let a heretic perish with hunger rather than relieve him. \*

The Tartars shave their heads, with the exception of a tuft of the size of a crown piece, which is suffered to grow to the length of seven or eight inches. It is by this tuft that the angel of the tomb is to carry the elect into paradise. †

If we look to the Romans, who can forget the ridiculous mummary which was observed in the consecration of their temples; ‡ their sacrifice of dogs and goats; their feasts of the Lupercalia; their augurs and auguries; § their lucky || and unlucky ¶ omens; their officers called *aruspices*, whose business it was to examine the entrails of the beasts offered in sacrifice, and from thence divine the success of any particular enterprise; the ridiculous story of a brazen target having fallen from heaven into the hands of Numa, during a dreadful pestilence which raged at Rome in the eighth year of his reign; the sacred fire of the Vestal Virgins, which was cherished with so much veneration; the Sibylline writings, and the mutilated priests of Cybele; the absurd custom of abstaining from marrying on certain days and in certain months of the year; their veneration for places which had been struck with lightning; or, the anxiety which was universally expressed to inhale into their own bodies, the souls of their departing friends? Of this there are innumerable instances. Augustus Cæsar expired, according to Suetonius, in the kisses of Livia. \*\*

Nicias, the Athenian general, was so superstitious, that an eclipse of the moon prevented him from taking ad-

\* Volney's Ruins, 8vo. Lond. 1807, p. 165.

† Ibid. 338.

‡ See Kennett's Antiquities, 8vo. Lond. 1763, p. 40.

§ The celebrated sphynx of Egypt was of this nature.

|| Suetonius in Vita Vitellii. Sec. ix.

¶ Ferguson, in his History of the Roman Republic, furnishes an instance of the dread of unlucky events, attended by a barbarity too shocking to be here related. See quarto edition, III. 541.

\*\* Suetonius in Vita Augusti. Sec. xci.

vantage of the only favourable moment for his retreat; this occasioned his own death, and all the disasters of the Athenians in Sicily. \* The intrepid Pelopidas, who had the honour and satisfaction of having delivered Thebes from the tyranny of its rulers, at last lost his life in consequence of the superstition of his troops, who were terrified at an unexpected eclipse of the sun, at the moment when they were about to march against Alexander. †

In like manner the Lacedemonians lost their expected share of the honour of contributing to the common safety of Greece, in the plains of Marathon, by not daring to take the field before the moon was at the full. ‡ Even at this day, the Italians are so superstitious respecting this luminary, that their fishermen, who go out by night, invariably take an awning with them to protect the fish from the baleful effect of her rays. Besides, no Italian will ever lie down to sleep where moonshine is likely to reach him. §

In enumerating the superstitions of the ancient Romans, I should have mentioned the still greater absurdity and impiety of the Apotheosis, a ceremony whereby this people placed their emperors, and some of their most esteemed senators, among the gods, and thus entitled them to divine worship.

S. P.

[To be continued.]

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

No. CCCXXIX.

*Proof of Intention from Tendency.*

The servant of a Scots Jacobite exile was unadvised enough to wear, in the streets of Rome, a pair of hose, after the fashion of his native place, of tartan, in which the red largely predominated; and red stockings being a distinctive mark of Cardinals, unfortunately for him, he was dragged before a tribunal to answer for the crime of wearing stockings of a colour ex-

\* Univ. Hist.

† Plutarch.

‡ Rollin's Ancient History, and Le Clerc de Septchenes on the Religion of the Ancient Greeks, 8vo. p. 251.

§ Swinburn's Travels.



clusively appropriated to the highest dignitaries of religion, and which could only tend to bring religion into contempt; and, as his *intention* was inferred from this *tendency*, it required no small interest to effect his liberation.

## No. CCCXXX.

*Prussian Court Mourning.*

Thieubalt, in his "Souvenirs" of Frederick the Great, gives several amusing traits of the Brandenburg family. In his Biographical Sketch of Frederick the *first* king of Prussia, who was an extremely vain man, and continually engaged in the most frivolous pursuits, he mentions the following anecdote of the queen, Sophia Charlotte, who was a woman of a very superior mind, and the sister of our George the First. In her last illness the queen viewed the approach of death with much calmness and serenity, and when one of her attendants observed how severely it would afflict the king, and that the misfortune of losing her would plunge his majesty into the deepest despair—"With respect to him," said the queen, with a smile, "I am perfectly at ease. His

mind will be completely occupied in arranging the ceremonial of my funeral; and if nothing goes wrong in the *pro-cession*, he will be quite consoled for his loss." Thieubalt adds, that the event proved the truth of the queen's opinion of her *august* husband.

## No. CCCXXXI.

*The late Mr. Henry Erskine.*

Mr. Erskine's character was truly estimable, and the just appreciation of his virtues extended far beyond the circle of his own family and friends; and it is a well authenticated fact, that a writer (or, as we should say, attorney) in a distant part of Scotland, representing to an oppressed and needy tacksman, who had applied to him for advice, the futility of entering into a law-suit with a wealthy neighbour, having himself no means of defending his cause, received for answer, "Ye dinna ken what ye say, Maister; there's nae a pair man in Scotland need to *want a friend* or *fear an enemy*, while Harry Erskine lives!" How much honour does that simple sentence convey to the generous and benevolent object of it!

## BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

SIR,

Jan. 20th, 1818.

WHEN you published an "Extract of a Letter from a Friend," [VII. 173,] on John xii. 31, in which the author attempted to maintain the idea of Mr. Wakefield, (New Translation,) that the "prince of this world" was Jesus himself, it was my intention, but I know not what prevented me, to have troubled you with some Extracts from a MS. in my possession which appeared to me to throw some just lights upon the passage. Perhaps your Correspondent, H. T. [XII. 487, 488], may be disposed to pay some particular attention to it, as it will confirm some of his observations, and throw light on some of his queries. I therefore now transmit it; only just observing, that both Mr. Wakefield and your former Correspondent appear to have overlooked John xiv. 30, and also 1 Cor. ii. 6, 8; and that the sense of *xpiotis* adopted in the following paper may possibly have been suggested by Leigh, who, in his Cri-

VOL. XIII.

2 M

tica Sacra, says, "Est autem crisis subita in morbo ad salutem aut ad mortem mutatio."

V. F.

John xii. 31, 32.—"Now is the crisis of this world, now shall the ruler of this world be cast out: And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me."

In the 20th verse the Evangelist informs us, "that there were certain Greeks which came up to worship at the feast," who, therefore, were probably proselytes to the Jewish religion, and, from their applying to Philip, who was of Bethsaida of Galilee, a country contiguous to Syria, were not unlikely some of the descendants of those Greeks who settled in Syria under the Syro-Macedonian empire established by the successors of Alexander, which is called in the Book of Maccabees the empire of the Greeks: many of whom had spread through a great part of Galilee, and mingled among the Jews. When our Lord

was in the borders of Tyre and Sidon, the woman, whose daughter he there healed, is said to have been "a Greek, a Syrophœnician by nation:" Mark vii. 26. Perhaps these Greeks might be of the same country, who in consequence of their proximity to, and intercourse with the Jews, had learned and embraced the Jewish doctrines, and attended the Jewish festivals: and if so, they were no strangers to the miracles and doctrine of Jesus, of whom we are told, Matt. iv. 24, that his fame was early spread through all Syria. Perhaps they might have heard of the miracle he had wrought in favour of their countrywoman, and the gracious notice he had taken of the strength of her faith; and this would, more than every thing else, awaken their attention and attach their hearts.

When, therefore, they came to Jerusalem, and found the whole attention of the people turned towards him, saw him introduced into the city in triumph, and heard the report of the recent, wonderful miracle which he had wrought upon Lazarus, their minds would naturally be impressed with a desire of conversing with him. For this purpose they applied to Philip, requesting to be introduced to him. For that they did not want merely to gratify a vain curiosity by the mere sight of him, as the words may seem to imply, is probable from this circumstance, that Jesus did not keep himself retired and unseen, but had entered the city with vast crowds attending him, and taught daily in the temple; so that it is probable these Greeks had already seen him. It seems therefore probable, that they requested, not a sight of him merely, but an intercourse and conference with him; and that this was the reason why Philip first consulted Andrew, and both together carried the request to Jesus, as a matter concerning the propriety of which they had some doubt; for which there could have been no occasion, had a bare sight of him been desired. We are not told whether Jesus granted the request; but since we never find that he refused any request, which proceeded from an honest heart, and afforded him an opportunity of doing good, it seems probable that they were immediately admitted, and were

present when he delivered the following discourse, which so nearly concerned themselves and the whole Gentile world.

This incident of some Gentiles requesting to be admitted to him, naturally suggested to the thoughtful mind of Jesus reflections on the general admission of the Gentile world to the privileges of his church, and on his own sufferings and death as previous and preparatory thereto, which was shortly to take place. "The hour is coming when the Son of Man shall be glorified," ver. 23, i. e., the season is now approaching, when my present state of humiliation shall be succeeded by a state of reward and honour; when I shall be invested with power to admit all men without distinction to the blessings of the church and kingdom of God. And if, previous to this, you see me pass through a scene of humiliation far deeper than any you have yet been witnesses to, let not this discourage you. For look into the operations of nature itself, and you will often observe a state of mortification and apparent destruction precede a state of revival, growth and fertility. "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth single; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit," verses 2, 4. Analogous to this in the moral world shall be the case with me, the head and root of the new dispensation; so far will my sufferings and death be from destroying my own hopes, and frustrating the purposes of my undertaking, that they will effectually secure both my glory and the interests of the kingdom of God, in the successful and extensive propagation of the gospel. If I die, I also shall bring forth much fruit. And as it shall be with me, your Master, so shall it be with you, my disciples, whom I shall employ to propagate my gospel in the world. In that service you must expect to grapple with sufferings which will put your fidelity to the test, and call for all your fortitude. In that situation "he that loveth his life shall lose it, and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal," ver. 25. Let not then the prospect of sufferings and death in the service of me and the gospel discourage you; "if any man serve me, let him follow me" in sufferings, and in that case he shall follow



me also in glory; for "where I am, there shall also my servant be; if any man serve me" faithfully, "him will my Father honour," ver. 26.

He goes on in verse 27: I will not, however, disown the innocent sensibilities of the human heart under the expectation of sufferings and death so near approaching, although I am fully assured of their glorious consequences. Yourselves also will experience the same sensibilities, when you shall come into a like situation; learn therefore from me how to bear and conquer them, with integrity inviolate, and duty unbetrayed. I will not, therefore, dissemble to you, that "now is my soul troubled" with the apprehension of the approaching hour. "What then shall I say" to Him, who is the all-sufficient refuge in trouble? Shall I say, "Father, save me from this hour," preserve me from impending sufferings and death? Such indeed are the petitions weak nature dictates in these circumstances; but this is not suitable to my character, or to the divine purposes concerning me; for "for this cause came I unto this hour," that the kingdom of God in the conversion of the world might be promoted, and the Son of Man glorified: wherefore, as more consonant to my own character and the divine appointments, I rather pray, "Father, glorify thy name," ver. 27; may thy perfections be more illustriously manifested, thy supreme authority more universally owned and submitted to, and the interests of thy kingdom more extensively promoted in every way which thou seest proper, even should it be by my sufferings and death. This is my supreme desire and most ardent petition, with regard to the events before me.

Immediately upon his offering this petition, a loud and audible voice from heaven replied, "I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again," ver. 28. This voice so sudden and unexpected, though heard by every one, was not equally apprehended by all; some, too much startled to distinguish intelligible sounds, imagined that it thundered only; others of calmer spirits heard and understood, and their opinion was, that "an angel spake to him," ver. 29. As soon as the people were a little recovered from their sur-

prise and alarm, our Lord proceeds, ver. 30, to explain the design of this extraordinary incident: "This voice came not because of me," on my account, or for my satisfaction; I was fully assured of the certainty of what the voice declared; "but for your sakes," that you might be assured that I always speak and act under the direction of God.

Animated by this fresh attestation from heaven, he proceeds in the 31st verse to foretel triumphantly what that success would be: that there should be a great crisis or change in the moral world, in consequence of his own sufferings and death. "Now" (i. e. very soon there will be—the thing is as certain as if it were already done; in which sense we find the word *now* used in many places) "now is the judgment [*κρισις*] of this world;" the moral world, is come to a crisis or trial, and a great change will be made from its present state. God will not any longer wink at the times of ignorance, but will openly take cognizance of the state of mankind; he will effectually promulgate his will and the terms of salvation, by the Redeemer whom he hath sent; will condemn wickedness, rescue mankind from slavery, and assert his own rightful dominion over all men, for the everlasting salvation of those who will obey him, and to render inexcusable those who shall persist to rebel against the light of truth and the offers of his grace. He adds "now shall the prince of this world be cast out;" by which expression he undoubtedly means Satan, or, the dominion and power of sin. He uses the same expression in the same sense, chapter xiv. 30, and xvi. 11. But in what sense does he mean that the prince of this world should be cast out? Certainly he does not mean that all manner of wickedness should be wholly suppressed and abolished; for this was never found to be verified; nor have we any reason to expect it in this world of imperfection. But our Lord is here speaking of what was shortly to take place. In what, then, was the dominion and power of sin most conspicuously manifested at that time in the world? Certainly in that idolatry, and its consequent corruptions, at that time so universally practised among

the Gentiles. By this mankind were turned from the acknowledgment, obedience and worship of the One True God, to the worship of demons, and every species of false and imaginary deities. Agreeably to this, when the Apostle Paul was commissioned to propagate the gospel among the Gentiles, it was to this effect, "to open men's eyes, and turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God," that is, from idolatry to true religion. In these words, therefore, our Lord seems to foretel the suppression of the whole system of idolatry, and that this was shortly to take place: "now shall the prince of this world be cast out:" he adds, "and I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." What our Lord meant by being lifted up from the earth the Evangelist himself explains in the words immediately following, "this he said signifying what death he should die." But perhaps it will be no rashness to suppose, that our Lord had a reference also to his subsequent ascension, and exaltation to glory and dominion over his church, conferred on him in reward of his obedience even to death on the cross. However, upon the whole it is plain, that in this text our Lord foretels a grand crisis in the state of the religious and moral world, a general extirpation of idolatry, and propagation of and success to the gospel revelation, in consequence of his death upon the cross; and all these grand events very soon to take place.

Thus I have endeavoured to illustrate the connexion, and explain the particulars of the whole passage connected with these words. I shall not detain the reader at present further than while I briefly hint a remark or two on what has already been observed.

First, it is obvious to take notice of the admirable spirit, the exemplary disposition and true dignity of our Saviour's character, as manifested on this occasion. It has been justly observed, that sudden incidents, and the little circumstances of life, more thoroughly discover the real temper and genuine character of any person, than the more important events and brilliant scenes, which the actors have been long expecting, and for which

there has been time for preparation. In these cases men are commonly recollected, and on their guard; in the other, they discover their tempers and hearts more freely, and act from undisguised nature. Now in this incident of a few Greeks desiring to see him, which seems a very inconsiderable one, we see how recollected and habitually thoughtful our Lord was to improve the minutest things into important reflections, and to pursue every subject into various views, and to its utmost extent; especially where he himself, and his own conduct, were concerned, or an opportunity offered to convey instruction or improvement to others. We see, also, that our Lord did not disown, or attempt to eradicate the tender and painful sensibilities common to the human heart; he even seems to have been subjected to them in a very great degree. In him we see nothing of the proud and self-sufficient philosophy of the Stoics, who pretended it to be the perfection of wisdom and virtue to extirpate the natural affections. Our Lord freely owned this, his soul was much troubled with the apprehensions of suffering and death: but then, how truly great and amiable does he appear, in supporting the dominion of reason and the influence of the religious principles in such a situation! In his troubled hour he looks up to God, resigns himself absolutely to his will, attends to the purposes for which he came into the world, makes it his supreme desire that God may be glorified, and the salvation of men effected, by what he was to suffer, and encourages himself by the prospect of the glory which he was to receive. Such was Jesus in the hour in which his soul was troubled. These were the principles which enabled him to look forward with a steady eye to the dreadful season near at hand, although the prospect made such deep impressions on his extremely sensible heart.

Secondly, as this incident of the request of these Greeks to see Jesus, and their probable introduction to him in consequence of it, seems to be the first dawning of the gospel on the Gentiles, it deserves to be remarked, that on this occasion, Jesus was attested to be a divinely commissioned

person by a voice from heaven in the presence of these Gentiles, in like manner as he had before been at his baptism, when he commenced his ministry among the Jews.

Lastly, if the supposition which I have mentioned before be thought probable, that the Greeks were immediately introduced to our Lord upon their request being offered to him, and that they were present at the delivery of the things contained in these verses, and at the answer of the divine voice from heaven, we may observe how well suited to their case are the chief matters that were now delivered; and I think this circumstance of the suitableness of the subject to their case, and to that of the whole Gentile world,\* seems to confirm the supposition, that they *were* immediately introduced, and heard these things spoken: and if so, they would go away fully satisfied by the testimony of the divine voice from heaven, that this Jesus was truly a divinely commissioned person, who always spoke and acted under the direction, and with the concurrence of God. They would have learned from him himself, that the benefits of his gospel were not intended to be confined to the Jewish nation only; but that a grand revolution was shortly to take place in the state of the moral world. That the empire of sin in the universal prevalence of idolatry was to be overthrown, that the world in general should be brought over to the faith of Christ, and the profession of his gospel, and that all this should be effected by means of his death and its glorious consequences. What could be more suited to the state of the Gentile world, or more joyful infor-

mation to these pious Greeks, provided they only understood it rightly? That the Jews, indeed, who were present, did not understand him, appears plainly from the nature of their objections against what he had spoken, which were raised on a quite different footing, ver. 34, &c. And indeed it was not fit they should; they could not have borne it, but would have immediately grown clamorous and outrageous in the highest degree, if they had apprehended a declaration that the Gentiles were by the gospel to be received into the church of God, or that the gospel was to be published to them at all: as they afterwards did, when this began to be done by the apostles. But yet our Lord, who spake as never man spake, might so adapt the manner and circumstances of his delivery to the Greeks, as might lead them to apprehend sufficiently his true meaning, though he thought proper to conceal it from the Jews.

However, let us not cease to adore the infinitely good God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that he appointed his Son to be a light to lighten the Gentiles, as well as the glory of his people Israel; that we behold the happy progress towards a completion of these glorious predictions, in the subversion of idolatry, that empire of the prince of this world; that we enjoy the light of his gospel, and are drawn to the profession of his faith, in consequence of his being lifted up from the earth in his death upon the cross; of his glorious resurrection from the dead, as a public pledge and pattern of the resurrection of all men; and of his exaltation to glory for this express purpose, declared by himself, "that where he is, his faithful followers may in due time be." Let us then be careful to secure to ourselves this character, by faithfully obeying his precepts and imitating his example; relying on the full accomplishment of his promise, that, at the time appointed by our common Father, "he will come again and receive us unto himself, that where he is, we may be also."

VIGILIUS POSTHUMUS.

\* It may also be observed, that the subjects here chosen by our Lord, appear to set aside the supposition of Crocius, quoted by Schleusner, as your Correspondent H. T. has noticed, that the Ἑλληνες here were Jews living out of Judea and speaking Greek; for the introduction to Jesus of such persons would never suggest to him the idea of the comprehension of "all men."



## REVIEW.

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

**ART. I.**—*An Account of the Rise and Progress of the Unitarian Doctrine, in the Societies at Rochdale, New Church in Rossendale, and other places formerly in connexion with the late Rev. Joseph Cooke; in Ten Letters to a Friend.* By John Ashworth. Pp. 80. Westall, Rochdale; Hunter and Eaton, London.

**O**NE of the strongest presumptive arguments in favour of Unitarianism, arises from the fact, that many of its ablest defenders and brightest ornaments have been converts from the ranks of its opponents. Examples are not rare, of serious and well-informed Trinitarians who have sat down to an examination of this subject, with the fullest conviction of the truth of their own sentiments; but who, in the course of the inquiry, have been so overpowered by the force of opposing evidence, as to be compelled, at all events, to avow a change of opinion. Against such avowal, the prejudices of education, the influence of early and friendly association, the tenderest affections, the best feelings and the dearest interests, have often pleaded with an earnestness and a power irresistible to every thing but the strongest impulse of religious duty. Every obstacle has given way to the energy of what we believe to be truth; and it has frequently been found, that when its voice has been listened to with calmness and seriousness, though it may have demanded the most painful sacrifices, yet those sacrifices have graced its triumphs, and at the same time borne witness to the integrity of its converts, and cast a beam of glory on the human character. For instances of this, we need not travel to the Churches of Geneva, whose “sad example” is so pathetically held up in “The Christian Observer,” of November last, as an “awful warning” to the members of our own establishment. Every one, acquainted with the history of Unitarianism, will immediately recollect the names of a Priestley, a Lindsey, a Disney and a Vidler; not to mention several of our most eminent and use-

ful ministers still living, against whose characters calumny itself dare not breathe a reflection, and whose conversion, rendered necessary in order to preserve the testimony of a good conscience, has been, in every worldly point of view, their greatest misfortune. Their sincerity cannot be questioned for a moment, and if their piety, their learning, and their facilities for a full examination of the controversy be considered, surely, the most determined opposer of Unitarianism must allow, that a system of Christian doctrine which can win over such men to its interests, possesses strong claims to the notice, and demands the careful attention of every impartial inquirer after truth.

Let it not be said, that this is an argument which may be brought forward in favour of all the systems of Christian doctrine, however opposed to each other; and that, therefore, its force is neutralized in favour of any system in particular; for were it true that as many Unitarians had become Trinitarians, as *vice versâ*, still there would be a presumption on the side of Unitarianism, because there are many circumstances which might naturally incline the judgment to such a change; but this is far from being the case. The exultation which has been manifested, almost indecently, on a late instance of this kind, is a proof that such instances are extremely rare.

These remarks have been suggested by a perusal of the pamphlet under our present consideration, which has given us almost unmingled satisfaction. The case of the Rossendale Unitarian church has been laid before our readers, in a former volume, [X. 313,] by *Dr. Thomson*, and has excited an interest highly creditable to their Christian sympathy. At the close of that account the Doctor promised that he would introduce to the public a more particular narrative, to be written by one of their own ministers, and this publication redeems his pledge. These Letters present us with the pleasing spectacle, not of an individual merely, but of two whole

congregations, amounting to several hundreds in number, engaged in a serious inquiry after divine truth. The result of this inquiry was, that they abandoned in succession the leading doctrines of reputed orthodoxy, and were brought to the knowledge and profession of Unitarianism. What adds considerable weight to the presumptive argument, arising from such cases as these, is, the remarkable circumstance that these congregations became believers in the strict *Unity* of God, without perusing any of the writings of its advocates, or to use their own language, without having read any Unitarian book but the Bible, and even without knowing that there were any Unitarians in the Christian world, besides themselves! Influenced by a sacred regard to truth, and guided by the teachings of Holy Scripture, interpreted by good sense, they proceeded cautiously and slowly, and were reluctantly compelled to give up a creed they had long cherished, and with it to sacrifice their best friends.

"The people, whose history these letters record, (says the author,) have now for a number of years been searching for truth. When they have relinquished a popular doctrine, it has, perhaps, uniformly been the case, that some of their friends have relinquished them. When they have embraced unpopular truth, they have had also to bear a large share of obloquy, contempt and persecution; nay, they have sometimes been shunned as infectious. This has given them more pain than they can express, and wounded their hearts more than their opposers are willing to believe. But what could they do? As honest men they could not fly from truth, though by so doing they might fly from some pain, and embrace their friends. They had no alternative, therefore, but to violate conscience and become hypocrites, or to be honest and forsaken, despised and condemned. The way to them was plain though painful and rugged; and their rejoicing now is the testimony of their conscience. They once thought themselves (such was their ignorance) the only people in the world who believed the truths contained in these Letters; they consequently looked

upon themselves as friendless and forlorn; but they are happy to find that in this they were mistaken. Through the good providence of God, they have found a large number of able and benevolent persons, who have shewn themselves friends. This has verified to them the truth of the old proverb, 'company in distress, makes the trouble less.' They are consoled; they are encouraged." Pref. p. iv.

With the same beautiful simplicity which distinguishes this passage, the author proceeds to relate the order in which he and his friends were led to call in question the doctrines of orthodoxy, with the arguments that led to their rejection, and to the adoption of more scriptural opinions. Some of these arguments appear to us original, and all of them will shew, that acute reasoning and sound judgment are not confined to the schools. This union of argument and narrative, is much more interesting than a merely argumentative discussion, however ably conducted; and on this account, like "Elwall's Trial," or "Eaton's History of the York Baptists," these Letters will form a useful first book to put into the hands of orthodox inquirers, and especially of Wesleyan Methodists, from whom these congregations have seceded, an object for which their cheapness still farther adapts them. We should, therefore, earnestly recommend them to the adoption of our numerous tract societies, did we not find from a perusal of their catalogues, that such recommendation is now unnecessary.

In reading this "Account," we have been highly gratified by the seriousness with which, with one or two exceptions, every subject is examined. Mr. A. seems fully aware that truth is alone valuable, when she is the handmaid of righteousness. Convinced himself, he is anxious to convince others, that religion is not a subject of doubtful disputation; and that its doctrines are not speculative, but intended to affect and amend and purify the heart of man. Under the influence of this feeling, he is solicitous that his friends should go on to *the fulness of the measure of the stature of Christ*, and that in the midst of the controversies, which their change of sentiments produces, they should be

careful to cultivate a devotional spirit, and a pious, benevolent temper. We cannot but share with him in this solicitude; and we trust that the congregations under his care, will attend to the weighty considerations which he suggests to them, on the last page of the Letters. Let them remember that they are now become as a city set on a hill, which cannot be hidden; that not only will the friends who have assisted them, expect their progress, but that their conduct will be closely and jealously watched by the religious societies which they have left. Their unavoidable mistakes will be magnified into faults, their faults blackened into crimes, and every deviation from strict rectitude be construed into an argument against their new opinions. We earnestly hope and pray that, through the divine blessing, the holiness of their characters will ever be conspicuous; and that they will continue ornaments of that simple and apostolical creed which they have embraced, that *there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.*

In an *Appendix* are given some edifying and affecting particulars of the Rev. J. Cooke's last sickness and death. We shall ever protest against the practice of judging a man's character and future prospects by the manner of his death, rather than by the conduct of his life; yet, as it may be generally expected, that the *righteous will have hope in death, and that precious unto God will be the death of his saints*, such examples of the power of religion in these awful moments, are useful and instructive. And as Dr. Thomson remarks, it is scarcely possible to read these particulars without uttering the devout aspiration, *Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his.*

B. G. \* \*

\*\* [The above initials will point out to many of our readers a highly-valued young friend, as the writer of this article. He is now in a foreign land for the benefit of his health, and the prayers of very many of our brethren will be joined to our own for the preservation of a life which promises so much Christian usefulness. Ed.]

*Unitarianism Weighed and Found Wanting, in a Series of Letters, addressed to the Rev. George Harris, and occasioned by his Evening Lectures in Renshaw Street Chapel.* By Robert Philips. 8vo. pp. 68. S. Taylor, Liverpool; Longman and Co. 1818.

AT the commencement of this year, Mr. Harris began a course of Lectures in defence of the doctrines of Unitarian Christianity, which he has continued every Sunday evening since, and which have been very well attended. This has excited the godly zeal of a Mr. Philip, a minister of the Independent denomination in Liverpool. Stimulated by the "hint" of an "excellent and endeared friend, that something was still wanted on the Socinian controversy, of a more popular character than critical disquisitions," the thought was suggested to him "of weighing the Unitarian system in the scales of prophecy and providence." "This plan," he observes in his preface, "he is now pursuing, and would not have published this specimen of it, had not the immediate interests of truth in Liverpool called for an answer to Mr. Harris." He could not, however, pass over in silence the public and pointed attack of Mr. H. upon all that Mr. P. holds most sacred and essential in religion without cowardice or indifference. And although he is "fully aware," that the spirit which breathes throughout the pamphlet will be called illiberal, yet he "cannot call Unitarians, Christian brethren, with a good conscience, nor without deeming the apostles unchristian."

The series of letters consists of seven. The object of the first letter is to state, that "it is notorious since Unitarianism took the place of Calvinism in the old and endowed chapels of the Nonconformists, both the number and the nature of the stated worshipers in those places are materially altered. The poor no longer crowd the aisles as formerly, and even the pews seem swept by a whirlwind." Now this statement, although its truth be so "notorious," we totally deny. It is not, "since Unitarianism took the place of Calvinism in the old and endowed chapels of the Nonconformists," that the poor no longer attend; for



where Unitarian Christianity has been preached openly and manfully, there we still find, "as in the days of Howe and Henry, crowds worshipping God in spirit and in truth." The charge, therefore, does not apply against Unitarian Christians as such; it merely applies to those among that body, who have never openly professed their principles; to those who have merely preached a system of ethics, and who, while Jesus and Paul have furnished them with a text, have enforced the obligations to virtue, by the same sanctions as a Socrates or a Tully; or, "by frequently using certain phrases, with a view solely to please a party, which may possibly, by an artful and forced explication, be made into somewhat rational, but which have been more likely to be understood in another more common and obvious sense." \* It is not, therefore, Unitarian Christianity which has driven the poor away, but Arianism, negative Unitarianism, and ethical preaching. The absurdity then of this argument must be apparent to all our readers. Indeed, after wading through five additional Letters, a little glimmering of light appears to have broken in even upon the mind of Mr. Philip, for in his seventh Letter, p. 63, he observes, "I do not blame your system at present for producing no moral effects on society; it cannot of course exert its influence where it does not exist, nor improve the poor who will not listen to it. It would, therefore, be unjust to condemn Unitarianism for not accomplishing, what it has not the opportunity of trying." One such fact as that of the society at New Church, Rossendale, embracing the principles of Unitarian Christianity, wholly from an examination of the Scriptures, without the aid of commentators, without even knowing that there were any persons in the world of similar sentiments, is quite sufficient to overthrow any objection to our principles derived from the non-attendance of the poor on Unitarian worship.

The second, third, fourth and fifth

\* Charge of the Rev. Richard Godwin at the ordination of the Rev. John Yates and the Rev. Hugh Anderson, in Liverpool, October 1, 1777, p. 26.

Letters, which alone bear any relation to the title of the pamphlet, are occupied in weighing Unitarianism in the scales of Prophecy and Providence. Mr. P. contends, that Unitarians are the predicted antichrists, because they deny that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, and also the Lord who bought them. And that, if Unitarianism be the truth as it is in Jesus, it would exhibit on its side all the signal interpositions of God since the Christian era; but that it cannot be true, because Unitarianism is a modern system, is but as a shoot of yesterday. These are, indeed, strong assertions, and our readers will no doubt be curious to see the proof which is to substantiate them. Alas! for them, the whole proof upon which these charges are founded, is 1 John iv. 3: "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God, and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come." From this passage Mr. P. argues, that the "expression 'come in the flesh,' intimates that he *might* have come *otherwise* than in the flesh, and, therefore, that he existed prior to his incarnation." And then, as if his inference had established the fact, with the greatest self-complacency he observes, how the members of the Galatian church must "have smiled at Paul's truism," his "silly truism, when he gravely wrote to them, that God sent forth his Son made of a woman." But is it necessary at this time of day to inform Mr. Philip, what is known to every child in ecclesiastical history, that in the very days of the apostles, so contrary to spiritual pride was it even then that all our hopes of immortality and bliss should rest upon the doctrines of a crucified man, a sect arose, "even now already is it in the world," which declared that Jesus Christ was not a human being in reality, but merely in appearance; that he had assumed a human body that he might become visible to the gross organs of sense, but that he was in reality an immortal spirit emanating from the Deity himself? It was, therefore, necessary for the apostles, in vindication of the truth of God, to assert that Jesus was really "come in the flesh," that he was really "made of a woman." Mr. Philip either

he knew or ought to have known this fact. If he did know it, he has been guilty of a pious fraud, in order to prop up a system which already totters to its base. If he did not know it, to have known a little more "of Northern discipline," would have done him no disservice. With respect to denying the Lord who bought them, the charge, if we were fond of such charges, might easily be retorted on our Trinitarian brethren; for if it be an infinite sacrifice which alone could purchase us from the wrath of an angry God, it must either be God who expired in agony on the cross, which is an absurdity and a contradiction, or it must have been a man who died, which reduces the doctrine to a nonentity.

Is it necessary also to teach Mr. P. the true nature of prophecy, as well as the simplest fact in ecclesiastical history? It is known to the merest tyro on this subject, that it was predicted there should be a falling away from the truth, which should continue for a long period of time; that the principal feature of this falling away should be a *love of mystery*; that the predicted antichrist should be *drunk with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus*, but that it should at last be destroyed, and all the nations brought into the kingdom of God, and under the power of his Christ. If Trinitarianism be the truth as it is in Jesus, "if ever since she, like a vessel was launched from the port of Judea, upon the sea of public opinion, she has not only rode out every storm, during eighteen centuries, but has touched at every shore, and colonized every island," then the prophecy is not only not yet accomplished, but it is absolutely and completely falsified. But if Unitarianism be the doctrine of the gospel, if that be the faith once delivered to the saints, then the prophecy has already been in part fulfilled, there has been a falling away, and a grievous falling away from the truth; darkness, gross darkness, has covered the earth for many ages, and the remainder of the prophecy shall eventually receive its full accomplishment, the small still voice of reason and of Scripture is even now beginning to prevail; "at this moment the Christian world feel themselves on

the verge of a grand moral era, error and superstition shall vanish like the morning cloud and the evening dew which soon passeth away, the truth of prophecy shall be vindicated, and the name of the Lord shall be one, and his praise one throughout the earth.

With respect to the sixth and seventh Letters, they bear no relation to the title of the pamphlet, and contain assertions and suppositions, which we shall not trouble our readers by detailing. The object of the one is to shew, "the manifest inconsistency between the tenor of Scripture and the tenor of Unitarianism;" that of the other, "that Trinitarianism has at present all the moral trophies on its own side." We willingly grant to our Trinitarian brethren all the advantage to their cause, which may arise from these two Letters: they are beneath criticism, and we should only be wasting the time of our readers by attempting it. And we take our leave of Mr. Philip, by seriously advising him to weigh well the "stubborn facts recorded" in these Letters, before they "fall back into a work of which they are the outline, and which is forthcoming."

**ART. III.—Thoughts on the Results of the various Inventions for the Abridgment of Labour, on their Co-operation with our Parochial System, and other Causes, in depressing the Lower Classes of Society, and on the urgent Necessity of Legislative Interference, with the Suggestion of a partial Remedy.** By the Rev. Wm. Edmeads, B. A. of St. Alban's Hall, Oxford, and Curate of Wroughton, Wills. Pp. 100. Longman and Co.

THE present condition of the labouring classes, and the means of alleviating the evils to which they are liable, have lately occupied a very considerable portion of public attention; which, indeed, has been drawn to the subject by the necessities of the times. Never before, in this country, was there such a deficiency of employment, or such an immense burden of parochial rates.

For ourselves, though we are convinced that the present enormous taxes have had a considerable share in producing this deplorable effect, by



depriving the industrious and enterprising of the means of remunerating the labourers whom they would otherwise employ, yet we are by no means disposed to deny that other concurring causes have likewise operated to produce this calamity; and those, which it is the design of this pamphlet to exhibit, may be regarded as the principal.

It must be evident to every one, upon the least degree of reflection, that the invention of machinery to facilitate the objects of labour, and every other means which contribute to its abridgment, must, in proportion to their success, diminish the necessity for the number of hands to be employed; and it is not impossible, but that at some future period, improvements of this nature may be carried to such an extent, that nine-tenths of the manual labour which is, even at present, requisite for our subsistence and accommodation, may be dispensed with. The artificial wants of mankind, by keeping pace with the general progress in knowledge and refinement, may serve, in some degree, to remedy the evils occasioned by such inventions and discoveries, but by no means entirely. Thus, while population is continually increasing, and even while the means of subsistence may also be increased, the demand for labour must necessarily be diminished by every successful contrivance for its acceleration.

Evident as these positions seem when stated, no writer that we know of prior to the publication of the present pamphlet, has ever attempted to develop their natural consequences. They may have incidentally occurred in disquisitions relative to the state of the poor, but who has sufficiently descanted on their effects, or prescribed a remedy for the evils which they must necessarily occasion?

The author observes, that, "There has been within the last few years, partially in agriculture, and generally in manufactures, a most unprecedented abridgment of labour by the application of scientific discoveries, by the invention, general introduction, and perfection of machinery, and by the accelerated progress of almost every species of manufacture through the hands of the workmen. It is impossible to form any accurate estimate of the less quantity of labour ne-

cessary to produce the same effect, at this period, compared with the relative labour and produce thirty years ago. It is probable, however, taking into the account every article of consumption arising from both real and artificial wants, that a fourth part of the labour necessary to produce them is dispensed with by the practical application of various arts and inventions. This abridgment of labour, great as it is, is not easily felt in a community rapidly improving in arts under the influence of an opulence widely diffusing itself. Its artificial wants keep pace with its facility of supplying them. This has been the general course of events during the period of prosperity, by turns, in all the civilized nations of the earth. Neither is the stagnation in the demand for labour, which has been so seriously felt in this country during the last two or three years, to be ascribed to improvements and inventions for the saving of labour, great as they undoubtedly are, and superior to whatever the world has ever before witnessed, in all the useful and ornamental arts of life. They have, indeed, been one considerable cause in contributing to that effect. But other great causes have concurred to produce in this country a defalcation of the necessity of labour. Amongst the most prominent is that excess of establishments in almost all our manufacturing concerns, created by a short-lived and unnatural monopoly. The monopoly of course created workmen as well as establishments; and when, on the restoration of peace, some of the channels of trade were obstructed, a re-action took place, which sent back upon society a large portion of unemployed and distressed manufacturers." P. 20.

Our limits preclude us from giving long extracts, otherwise we might cite from this pamphlet, several important and interesting facts, relative to mechanical inventions, and the various means of accelerating or diminishing manual labour; but for these we must refer the reader to the book itself.

The "legislative interference," and the "partial remedy," mentioned in the title-page, consist chiefly in regulating, or authorizing the magistrates to regulate the price of agricultural labour, so "that the wages of all men in actual employment, by individual masters, shall be sufficiently high to maintain a man, wife and four children." To such an interference there are evidently great objections. Still every one must concur with the writer in reprobating, what he justly styles



"the narrow, selfish policy of blending wages with parochial relief." Masters ought, of their own accord, to remunerate their labours, by paying them sufficiently to maintain a moderate family; but while the market for labour is overstocked, this can scarcely be expected; and the inevitable consequence will be a lamentable depression of the labouring classes. It seems, therefore, to be a choice of evils, and all that can be done is to choose the least.

In order at the same time to encourage industry, Mr. Edmeads would keep up a distinction "between the good and the worthless servant." He takes it for granted, that the most deserving will generally obtain employment; and proposes that such labourers "should constantly be entitled to a much higher rate of wages, than those who were thrown on parishes for employment and support."

On some few, but important points, we differ materially from our author. The national debt, for instance, he calls a "natural fiction." Alas! the taxes which have been levied to pay the interest of that debt, we should have thought would have been sufficient to convince every one, that whatever views might be entertained of it, it was at least no fiction.

Notwithstanding these differences of opinion, however, we consider the pamphlet before us as a valuable addition to all the suggestions which have been hitherto offered, with respect to the state of the poor. The views which it exhibits, are novel and important; and the subject is treated with considerable ability.

ART. IV.—*Belshazzar's Feast*. A *Seatonian Prize Poem, with Notes relative to the History of the Babylonian and Assyrian Empires*. By T. S. Hughes, A. M. Fellow of Emmanuel College, and Junior Proctor of the University. 8vo. pp. 58. Cambridge, printed for Deigh-

ton and Son; sold in London by Mawman, &c. 1818.

"**B**ELSHAZZAR'S Feast," is a poetical subject, and Mr. Hughes's verses upon it, if they do not give him a place amongst the acknowledged English poets, will at least secure him a respectable rank amongst the successful competitors for the Seatonian Prize. The story, with much of the imagery, is taken of course from the Jewish prophets, whose figures always delight the imagination. In copying these great models, our author has shewn great truth, not without ingenuity.

The few digressions from the story are so pleasing, that we are led to wish they had been more.

The selection of images in the following lines is truly poetical:

"O what is human joy? A transient beam  
Of moonlight quiv'ring on the chequered stream;  
An early dew-drop sparkling on the rose;  
A silver cloud which frolic zephyr blows."

The following reflections on the fall of greatness, are in unison with the subject:

"We reverence Virtue when she soars sublime,  
Yet feel for Greatness, tho' it fall, from crime.  
The low lie down, and none lament their lot:  
Who marks the ruins of the humble cot?  
But when th' embattled tower or lofty fane  
Strews with huge fragments the resounding plain,  
The awe-struck traveller, as he lingers near,  
Heaves the sad sigh, nor checks the falling tear."

The Notes are appropriate.

We perceive that the author is preparing for the press, "Travels in Greece and Albania."

## POETRY.

*Dudley,**March 11, 1818.*

SIR,

THE beautiful Latin Epigram, "In Somnum," which appeared in the last Number of the Monthly Repository, [p. 95,] is said to have been intended as an inscription for a statue of Somnus, in the garden of the late James Harris, Esq. of Salisbury. I believe it was first published in an interesting work entitled, "Pophami Selecta Poemata Anglorum," in three volumes, 12mo. 1774. It has generally been attributed to Thomas Warton, and is inserted as his, "on doubtful authority," with some variations, which I conceive are far from improvements, in Chalmers's "Works of the English Poets," XVIII. 131. It has no place, however, in T. Warton's "Poems on various Subjects," which were first collected and printed in an octavo volume, in 1791. I have been much amused by transcribing and comparing the different translations of this admirable epigram, which I have met with in the course of my reading. If you will be kind enough to insert them all, with the original, in one view, they may, perhaps, gratify the readers of the Monthly Repository.

I would take the liberty of adding, that I think there must be some error in the signature affixed to the translation in page 64 of your present volume. I have possessed that translation many years, though I am unable, at this moment, to assign it to its author.

J. H. BRANSBY.

## IN SOMNUM.

Somne levis! quanquam certissima mortis imago,

Consortem cupio te tamen esse tori.

Alma quies! optata, veni; nam sic sine vita Vivere quam snave est, sic sine morte mori.

## TRANSLATIONS.

Oh Sleep profound! though near allied  
To Death's still state, which we must  
dread,

Yet thou art welcome as a bride,  
To be the partner of my bed.

Embrac'd by thee, soft, gentle Rest!  
In fond oblivion let me lie:

For lifeless thus to live, how blest!  
Thus without death, how sweet to die!

*Rev. Mr. Cole.*

Come, gentle Sleep, attend thy vot'ry's  
pray'r,  
And, though Death's image, to my couch  
repair.

How sweet thus lifeless, yet with life to  
lie!

Thus without dying, oh, how sweet to die!

*Dr. Wolcott.*

Though Death's strong likeness in thy  
form we trace,

Come Sleep! and fold me in thy soft em-  
brace.

Come, gentle Sleep! that sweetest blissing  
give,

To die thus living, and thus dead to live.

*Anonymous.*

Come, gentle Sleep! to thee I sing,  
Thou balm of human woes!  
Soft Rest! oh, wave thy downy wing,  
And lull me to repose.

What though the true resemblance thine  
The shadows of the dead,  
For thee I wish, for thee I pine,  
To share my humble bed.

How sweet to draw the vital breath,  
Yet thus from life to fly;  
And thus, without a real death,  
How sweet with thee to die!

*Miss Bradford.*

Emblem of Death! come soothing, balmy  
Sleep!

Friend of my pillow! o'er my eye-lids  
creep:

Soft let me slumber, gently breathing sigh,  
Live without life, and without dying die.

*Mr. Meyler.*

Sleep! though Death thou dost resemble,  
Still I court thy shadowy aid;  
Fear nor hope shall make me tremble,  
In thy lap oblivious laid.

Then, while on my pillow lying,  
Envied bliss, oh, let me share;  
Death, without the pangs of dying,  
Life without the load of care.

*Rev. E. Cartwright, Author of  
Armene and Elvira.*

Come, Sleep! Death's image! to thy arms  
I fly,

Thus without life to live, thus without death  
to die.

*Anonymous.*

## VERSES

TO A

*Daughter on her Birthday.*

You've seen, dear Emma, years just ten,  
But I am with the aged men;  
My youth has pass'd full many a day,  
A few my hairs, and those are grey.  
Yet oft will memory bid me view,  
Some griefs and joys my childhood knew;  
And oft affection asks a measure  
Brimful for you, of virtuous pleasure;  
And that your share of pain and grief  
May have religion's blest relief;  
Whate'er betide your mortal days,  
That you may earn, not covet praise;  
And thus, nor can I add another  
To that best wish, be like your mother.

SENILIS.

February 2, 1818.

## THE CARRIER PIGEON OF THE EAST,

*A Sacred Song.*

BY T. MOORE, ESQ.

The bird let loose in eastern skies,  
When hastening fondly home,  
Ne'er stoops to earth her wing, or flies  
Where idler wanderers roam;  
But high she shoots through air and light,  
Above all low delay,  
Where nothing earthly bounds her flight,  
Or shadow dims her way.

So grant me, God, from every stain  
Of sinful passion free,  
Aloft, through virtue's purer air,  
To steer my course to Thee!  
No sin to cloud, no lure to stay  
My soul, as home she springs,  
Thy sunshine on her joyful way,  
Thy freedom on her wings.

## SONNET.

[From the Spanish of B. Argensola.]

Tell me, thou common Father! tell me,  
Why  
(Since Thou art just and good), dost  
Thou permit  
Successful fraud securely thron'd to  
sit,  
While innocence oppress'd stands weeping  
by?  
Why hast Thou nerv'd that strong arm  
to oppose  
Thy righteous mandates with impunity,  
While the meek man who lov'd and reve-  
renc'd Thee,  
Lies at the feet of Thine and virtue's  
foes?  
Why (said I in despair), should vice con-  
found  
All nature's harmony, and tower above,  
In all the pride and pomp and power  
of state?  
Then I looked upwards, and I heard a  
sound,  
(As from an angel smiling thro'  
heav'n's gate,  
"Is earth a spot for heaven-born souls  
to love?"

A.

## OBITUARY.

1818. April 7, at Dorchester, aged 16,  
EMMA, youngest daughter of Mr. Thomas  
FISHER. Her sudden and early removal  
from this terrestrial scene is deeply la-  
mented by her affectionate parents and  
friends.

Whilst the loss of her cheerful, amiable  
and benevolent disposition, will be long  
remembered with regret in the family cir-  
cle, the integrity of her life and the piety  
of her mind will justly endear her memory  
to surviving relatives. She was early  
taught to remember her Creator in the  
days of her youth, and the invaluable  
lesson, inculcated by parental love and af-  
fection, was gladly received and perma-  
nently recollected.

Happy would it be, if young persons  
more generally evinced that laudable dis-  
position of profiting by the good instruc-  
tion and pious counsels of their parents.  
They would then, like her, acquire a taste  
for those virtues which exalt and adorn  
our nature, experience those sublime de-  
lights which arise from the practice of  
religion, and the pleasing exercise of ra-  
tional devotion whilst here on earth, and  
be prepared for that better world and more  
glorious state of being, where the sorrows  
of time shall never interrupt the current of  
their joys.

L. L.

Dorchester, April 22, 1818.



## INTELLIGENCE.

*Proceedings of the Deputies.*

At a general meeting of the Deputies from the congregations of Protestant Dissenters, held at the King's Head Tavern, in the Poultry, on the 30th January last, a Resolution was proposed in consequence of a minute of the committee, relating to the prosecution of Mr. Wright of Liverpool, declaring it to be a case in which they ought not to interfere.

The gentleman who introduced the subject, assured the Deputation that it was not from any personal disrespect to the committee, that he had been induced to agitate the question. But, considering their decision to be at variance with the fundamental principles of their institution, and being apprehensive that it might operate as a dangerous precedent, unless accompanied with the special grounds upon which it had been formed, he moved to the following purport,—That the resolution of the committee relating to the case of Mr. Wright, should be regarded as confined to the special circumstances of the case. Upon which a long and interesting discussion took place. On the part of the committee it was contended, that they had acted to the best of their judgment, and with the most upright intentions, that the Protestant Society who were alive to every question tending to infringe the rights of Dissenters, had come to the same resolutions; that it was not peculiarly a dissenting case; that churchmen as well as dissenters, were amenable to the laws for whatever they might deliver from the pulpit, (if alleged to be of a libellous or blasphemous nature,) if, it was said, for example, any preacher were to read Paine's Works, or Hone's Parodies, from the pulpit, would the Deputation be bound to defend them? If that preacher who expressed himself so grossly on the character of the late lamented Princess, were indicted for a libel, would they be justified to interfere? Various other reasons were added to prove that the case did not come within their province, and that the committee were therefore justified in the course they had adopted.

On the other hand it was urged, that the conduct of the committee was most extraordinary. In the first instance they had considered that Mr. Wright ought to be defended, and had therefore retained Mr. Scarlett, the most eminent counsel on that circuit, and then suddenly, without assigning any satisfactory reasons, the case was abandoned; that it was unworthy of the Deputies to employ their means and powers in mere petty affairs, such as the disturbance of congregations, &c. and to neglect a case in which the great principle of religious liberty was so deeply concerned;

that it was the right of every dissenting minister to discuss any religious question; and if wrongfully or unjustly prosecuted while exercising that right fairly and decently, he was peculiarly entitled to the protection of that society; that it was neither just nor candid to compare the case of Mr. Wright to that of a person who should dare to read Hone's Parodies, or Paine's Works in the pulpit. Mr. Wright had done nothing amiss; he had discussed religious subjects in decorous language; he had opposed the opinion of the natural immortality of the soul; and contended that the hope and expectation of future life was founded in the New Testament, on the doctrine of a Resurrection of the Dead; in this opinion he was not singular. The late eminent bishop of Carlisle (Dr. Law) and others in the church, as well as among the various classes of dissenters, had advocated the same sentiment; that the prosecution of Mr. Wright arose not from religious motives, but from a narrow principle of political hostility; and to abandon the defence of an individual against such an unfounded charge, was a deviation from the principles on which the Deputation was founded, and stained their character as Protestant Dissenters with inconsistency. It appearing to some gentlemen, that the resolution did not go far enough, an amendment was proposed as follows:

"That the minute of the committee referred to be expunged; and that this Deputation declare their abhorrence of political hostility and prejudice being converted to purposes of religious persecution, as in the case of Mr. Wright of Liverpool; and that this Deputation, faithful to the principles of their constitution, will, upon all occasions, lend their assistance and protection to every man of every religious opinion while fairly exercising his religious rights."

This amendment after some conversation, being withdrawn, the previous question was moved upon the original resolution. On a division there appeared,

For the previous question 32

Against it 31

Majority 1

The meeting was very numerously attended, but owing to the length of the debate, many gentlemen had retired before the division.

At the adjourned general meeting, February 6, a deputy gave notice that he would propose a resolution at the general meeting in May, to the following effect: That, as religious liberty is the most valuable civil right, it is, among the important objects of this Deputation, to protect any

Protestant Dissenters who shall appear to be unjustly prosecuted for the sentiments they have delivered in the public exercise of the Christian ministry. J. C.

### *Christian Tract Society.*

THE ninth anniversary of this society, was holden on Thursday the 26th February, at the Old London Tavern, Bishopsgate Street. At the meeting for business, James Esdaile, Esq. was called to the chair. The report of the committee was read by the Rev. Thomas Rees, acting as Secretary *pro tempore*. It stated that the affairs of the society were much in the same condition as they were described to be in the report of the preceding year. The committee remarked upon the discontinuance of some subscriptions on the alleged ground, that a greater number of new tracts was not printed in each year; and pointed out the little reason there was for objecting to support the society on this account, even supposing it to be practicable to publish more new works, when the society's stock already contained so many tracts of approved merit, which might be circulated with the happiest effect among the poor. They observed, besides, that they had printed every manuscript sent to them which they had judged suited to the objects of the society, as to subject and literary execution. These, however, were but two in number, one from an unknown correspondent, the other from the pen of Mrs. Mary Hughes. Of the former, they had printed 2000, and of the latter, 3000 copies. They stated that they had besides, in the course of the last year, re-printed five of the society's former publications to the number of 9000 copies, making the whole number of tracts printed during their administration, 14000. From an abstract of the proceedings of the society, it appeared that there had been printed in all since its formation, 244,000 tracts, of which 208,400 had been circulated; and of these 22,500 were distributed since the last anniversary.

The society's present property was stated to be as follows:

Due to the society from sundry persons, part of the amount being stock liable to be returned	-	-	200	0	0
Estimated value of the stock on hand	-	-	209	12	0
			409	12	0
Due from the society for paper, &c.	70	17	0		
Balance due to Treasurer	13	8	1		
			84	5	1
Leaving in favour of the society a balance of	325	6	11		

Thanks were voted to Mrs. Mary Hughes, for her continued literary contributions; also to the Treasurer, to the Rev. Thomas Rees for discharging the duties of Secretary during the last year, to the Committee, the Auditors and the Collector, the Rev. J. Marsom.

The following gentlemen were elected into office for the ensuing year:—

James Esdaile, Esq. *Treasurer*.

Mr. George Smallfield, *Secretary*.

*Committee*:—Rev. Thomas Rees, Mr. Friend, Mr. Thomas Foster, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Hart, Mr. Bayley, Mr. Fennell, Junr, Mr. W. Smith, Mr. D. Taylor, Mr. R. Holt, Mr. J. Watson.

*Auditors*:—Mr. J. Taylor, Mr. Titford, Mr. Gibbs.

The Subscribers, and other friends to the society, to the number of about eighty, dined together; Mr. Alderman Wood, M. P. in the Chair; and the day was spent in a manner highly to the gratification of all present. Mr. Alderman Wood's praiseworthy conduct in procuring a reprieve for the two unfortunate boys, Kelly and Spicer, having been noticed, a very interesting conversation took place on the subject of capital punishment, and on the importance of directing the labours of the society to the moral improvement of the young of the lower classes of society, whose depraved condition led to so many of the disgusting spectacles exhibited at the Old Bailey, and in other parts of the kingdom. The company bore a willing and warm testimony to the benevolent exertions of their worthy Chairman, in the discharge of his official duties, to diminish the number of criminal offences, and ameliorate the condition of those persons whose circumstances furnished the strongest excitement to crime.

### *Association of Unitarian Christians residing at Gainsborough and neighbouring places.*

On Wednesday, April 1, 1818, was held at Gainsborough, a meeting of ministers and other friends of the Unitarian cause, residing chiefly in the northern parts of Lincolnshire and the adjoining parts of Yorkshire. In the morning, Mr. John Gaskell, pastor of the Unitarian Churches at Thorne and Stainforth, delivered a very interesting discourse on the importance of the friends of Christian truth, associating to carry on the Reformation from the errors and impositions of the Apostate Church, which, having begun in the days of Luther and his contemporaries, is now evidently proceeding with accelerated force; and anticipating the time when the simple, intelligible doctrines, and unostentatious but edifying government of the primitive churches shall be fully restored. The text was 1 John iv. 1: "Many false prophets



are gone out into the world." After the Sermon, it was unanimously resolved:—

1. That an association be formed of Unitarian Christians residing at Gainsborough and adjacent places, for mutual encouragement, to promote the cause of truth, and for the protection of our religious liberties.

2. That this association do meet twice in each year: that the next meeting be held at the Unitarian Chapel, in Hull, on Wednesday, September 30th, and that Mr. Wellbeloved, of York, be requested to preach on the occasion.

3. That the thanks of this meeting be given to Mr. Little, for his exertions to accomplish the institution of this association.

The gentlemen present afterwards dined together, Mr. J. A. Harrison, of Gainsborough, in the chair. Several appropriate toasts were given, and much free and interesting conversation maintained through the afternoon: in which the present state and prospects of Unitarianism, the Unitarian Fund and Academy, the Manchester College at York, the Monthly Repository and Christian Reformer, the Cause of Religious Liberty, and the labours of the worthy Missionary, Mr. Richard Wright, were prominent topics. A very general wish was expressed, that this association might concur with their brethren in London and elsewhere, in such efforts as may be judged proper, for the further protection of the civil and religious rights of Unitarian Dissenters; which, by some recent cases, appear to be still too much exposed to the malevolence of bigots. The company derived much pleasure from the communications of Mr. Francis Moat, relative to the churches at Thorne and Stainforth, whose zeal and prosperity we trust will excite many to emulation.

In the evening the congregation assembled again in the Meeting-house, and Mr. George Kenrick, of Hull, delivered a most suitable and impressive Sermon from Phil. i. 27: "Only let your conversation be as it becometh the gospel of Christ;" containing many important directions and advices, for Unitarians, as to the spirit and conduct which are best calculated to adorn their profession, to give weight to their character, and to crown their united and public exertions with success.

All the engagements of the day seemed to afford much gratification to those who were present, though in some measure alloyed by the absence of our worthy and zealous brother, Mr. Hawkes, of Lincoln, who was only kept from an occasion which he had anticipated with pleasure, by a severe indisposition.

R. L.

### *Manchester Presbyterian Quarterly Meeting.*

THE spring quarterly meeting in the district of Manchester, of ministers generally denominated Presbyterian, was held at Cockey Moor, on the 20th of last month. It is expected that the meeting in the autumn will be held at Stand, at the new chapel, now rebuilding; where in due course the late meeting should have been held. The occasion of opening a new chapel by our highly esteemed friends at Stand will no doubt attract many friends from a distance. Mr. Grundy, of Manchester, introduced the service, and Mr. Holland, of Bolton, preached to a very respectable and attentive audience. Mr. Grundy, in the regular course, will be the preacher at Stand. Besides fourteen ministers, who were present at the meeting, a small number of lay-gentlemen dined at a neighbouring inn. The topics on which different gentlemen delivered their sentiments were various, and some of them of great practical importance. Though I am well aware that it is not my province, as a reporter, to give publicity to the prevailing opinions of the meeting, on subjects of a local interest, and of too delicate a nature to be obtruded upon the notice of the public; yet I am fully of opinion that one of those subjects, divested of localities, should receive the most serious and sober discussion in another department of the Repository. It certainly greatly imports the interests of the rational Dissenters in this part of the country, to determine wisely and judiciously concerning the mode of proceeding to be now sanctioned, and hereafter to be adopted. *Verbum sat.*

Though unauthorized, I will add a word or two on the accusation of your Liverpool correspondent, [p. 224]. The appellation, Presbyterian, deceives no man of common information in Lancashire; and this at once effectually destroys the serious charge of duplicity; a charge which it is extreme folly (to say nothing worse) in an anonymous writer to attempt to prefer against a respectable body of men.

WILLIAM JOHNS.

April 13, 1818.

### *Meeting of the Rosendale and Rochdale Association of Unitarian Brethren.*

ON Friday the 30th ult. was held at Rochdale, the Half-yearly Meeting of the Unitarian Association of Brethren from Rosendale, Rochdale, Padiham and Burnley, Bury, Oldham, Whitworth, Lanehead, Lowerplace, &c. &c. The older Unitarian congregation meeting in Black-



water Chapel, under the pastoral care of the Rev. J. Elliot, kindly accommodated the brethren with the loan of their chapel, as the room in which the society (formerly in connexion with the late Mr. Cooke) usually meet, would have been insufficient to contain the numerous and highly respectable congregation assembled on this occasion. Mr. Edmund Grundy introduced the service with prayer, and Mr. Kay, of Heap Fold, read the Scriptures, and delivered a very admirable discourse.

After service the business of the association was transacted, and the plan of preaching for the next nine months was drawn up (see a similar plan in Ashworth's Letters, pp. 76, 77). The names of the several places stated above were called over, and the brethren from each place were requested to state what assistance they could give in the congregation, and what assistance they needed for the regular conducting of public worship. Mr. Grundy and Mr. Kay stated, that they had been obliged to discontinue worship in their room at Bury, from the family being ill of the typhus fever. They stated that it was exceedingly difficult to procure a suitable place for worship, and that it had been suggested, that it would be desirable to build a small convenient place, which it was estimated might be done for about £300. If the Unitarian public were disposed to favour this design, no doubt was entertained that a thriving congregation would be raised independent of, and without at all interfering with, the highly respectable Unitarian congregation long established in the town, and at present enjoying the pastoral care of the Rev. Wm. Allard.

Afterwards the names of the several preachers were called over, to ascertain if they were disposed to continue their labours, and the representatives of the congregations were requested to state any objections to the preachers, as their names were mentioned. No objections were started. All the preachers acquiesced, with the exception of Jonathan Rudman, who stated, at length, his unwillingness to be appointed to preach in some particular places where he said he believed they were weary of hearing him. J. Grime also stated his wish to be omitted in the plan, as he really did not feel his abilities equal to the discharge of the duties. The name of the Rev. James Kay (late of Kendal) was added to the plan.

About fifty persons sat down to a plain and economical dinner in the Assembly Room, and after dinner several young friends were admitted into the room, to be present at the discussion.

John Ashworth gave an account of the present state of the society at Newchurch,

in Rossendale; James Taylor, of the state of the Rochdale Society; Mr. E. Grundy, (the Chairman,) gave an account of the Oldham Society, and of the Society at Bury, &c. &c.

On the Chairman giving the thanks of the association to Mr. Elliot and his congregation for the use of their chapel, Mr. Elliot rose and spoke as follows:

"Mr. Chairman, for myself, the trustees and the congregation, I can truly say, it has been a great pleasure to them to lend their chapel on this occasion, and they require and deserve no thanks. Had a congregation, the most opposite in religious sentiments, asked for the loan of the chapel, it would readily have been afforded; how much more readily when it is opened to brethren, who differ in nothing, that I know of, except that they meet in different places of worship! You will say, perhaps, that your society owes its origin to the late Mr. Cooke. It does so, but may not Mr. Cooke be considered the great friend of *both* congregations, and the father of Unitarians in the town? Sure I am, that many members of my congregation were led by the labours of that excellent person to their present convictions, and I conceive both congregations are greatly, if not equally indebted to him. Before I sit down, may I be permitted to allude to a different and less pleasing subject? I was much struck last night with reading in Mr. Yates's Sequel, (p. 154,) the following quotation from Mr. Wardlaw's 'Unitarianism incapable of Vindication': 'Where are the hardened sinners whose consciences it has awakened? Where are the profligates whom it has reclaimed? Where are the worldlings whom it has spiritualized? &c. &c. Has it enlivened their delight in communion with God, and heightened their attachment to the exercises of the closet, the family and the sanctuary?' &c. &c. I am well aware that the insinuations contained in these questions, are most of them unfounded; and that the accusation veiled under and implied in these questions, is false and insidious; and that a satisfactory answer can be given to these questions so triumphantly put. But there is one of the charges to which, in my conscience, I believe the Unitarians must plead guilty; I mean their absence from 'the sanctuary,' their neglect of public worship. How listless, how desultory is the attendance on public worship at many of our chapels! In some confined to one part of the day merely; how discouraging to the minister, who has made preparations to meet his congregation!" Mr. Elliot pursued this subject at considerable length, and concluded with expressing his attachment to the cause, and the pleasure which he had experienced in

seeing so many of the friends of religious truth assembled on that occasion.

*Dr. Thomson* (of Halifax) addressed the meeting, and took up the topic which *Mr. Elliot* had introduced. He considered it as highly important, though but as a part of that general consistent religious character, which it was incumbent upon Unitarians to cultivate and observe. The Doctor went minutely into the several parts essential to a consistent religious character, and urged upon the brethren present, to avoid the appearance of evil, and to live down every reproach which had been cast upon the Unitarian cause. In allusion to *Mr. Wardlaw's* questions, the Doctor in conclusion, observed, "If there be room for the question, Does Unitarianism make its professors 'more sober, just, holy and temperate?' I trust this reproach will be wiped away; that we shall feel not merely, as individuals interested in cultivating that holiness of heart and life, without which no man shall see the Lord; but as members of a religious body, the character of which is in some degree confided to our individual keeping. I will suppose two mere men of the world in conversation: 'There go the Unitarians!' says one, on seeing a congregation issue from its chapel, or it may be its registered room: I trust the other will be able to reply, 'Whether they be Unitarians, I know not; but I do know that they are good men, good masters, good servants, good fathers, good children, good husbands, good wives, good friends; in every relation of life good members of society, just, righteous and good men.'"

*Mr. John Ashworth*, in a very interesting and affecting manner, pursued the subject. He said, as a minister, he had no reason to complain of the attendance of his people on public worship. Indeed, he had often wondered, and thought himself highly favoured, that he had met with such uniformly attentive and numerous congregations; more particularly as he was one of themselves, a brother amongst brethren, born, living and educated, so far as he had had any education, amongst them, and working with them and amongst them for his daily bread. "In this respect," said *Mr. A.* "I thank my brethren, and I consider their attachment to me as an attachment to the cause. There is one thing, however, which has given me great concern; I have mourned over it, and wept over it in secret, and though I have said little about it in public, (as it is painful for me to speak in censure,) I cannot but avail myself of the present opportunity of alluding to it: I mean the neglect amongst us of attendance at our Social Meetings, as we have termed them, since we left the Methodists. I have seen these means of grace too often neglected: there are those

present, and now in my eye, and others not here, whose absence on such occasions I have noticed and lamented. I will say no more. I wish what I have said may render it unnecessary for me ever to mention the subject again; but that we may all, more and more, maintain the truth in holiness of heart and uprightness of life, and that all who name the name of Jesus may depart from iniquity."

The *Rev. James Kay*. "I feel obliged to you, *Mr. Chairman*, and the brethren present, for the kind manner in which they have remembered me on this occasion, and have wished me better health. It has been a great pleasure to me to meet you on this occasion, and to deliver to you that address which I wish were better worthy of the thanks which you have just given me. If I might venture an opinion on the subject of public worship, the neglect of which has come into discussion, I would say, that I fear it arises in a great degree from the little connexion and intercourse which exists betwixt the ministers and societies. Too frequently the minister sees little of his congregation, except on the Lord's day. Were there more union, more connexion, more intercourse,—were the minister and people more parts of the same whole,—there would be a reciprocal interest kept up; a member of the congregation would feel himself as little at liberty to be absent as the minister himself, and would be as prepared and zealous to hear, as the minister was prepared and zealous to teach." This subject, and others of great interest, occupied the attention of the meeting.

*Mr. Jonathan Rudman* said, "In allusion to the questions of *Mr. Wardlaw*, I think, Sir, there is one plain and sufficient answer to be given. These reproaches are not true. I believe the Unitarians are quite as good as, or better than their neighbours. I was for the greater part of my life, which has not been a short one, amongst the Methodists; I was also amongst the Calvinists: amongst both these I saw and knew of immoralities, which I have not yet seen or heard of amongst the Unitarians. If I see reason to think the Unitarians worse than their neighbours, I will leave them too; but at present I see no such reason."

The next meeting of the Association was fixed to be held in the New Chapel at Oldham, in Easter week, and it was requested that *Mr. Elliot* would be one of the preachers.

In the evening, the *Rev. John Beattie*, of Elland, preached to a very numerous and attentive congregation. *Mr. Ashworth* conducted the devotional services. *Mr. Beattie's* sermon was founded on Acts xi. 21.

The preachers' names, according to the printed plan, are *J. Ashworth*, *J. Rudman*, *J. Taylor*, *J. Wilkinson*, *J. Driver*, *J. Peel*,



John Wilkinson, J. Kay, E. Grundy, J. Grime, J. Robinson, J. Pollard, R. Hudson, J. Schofield.

This association is remarkable for the extent of its labours, and the number of its labourers. All of the preachers are laymen, (as they are called,) persons engaged in trade, and many of them in daily labour, with the exception of the respected name of Mr. Kay, added to the list at this meeting, and whose valuable services cannot fail to be most useful to the cause.

H. H.

#### *Manchester Unitarian Fellowship.*

THE first annual meeting of the Manchester Unitarian Fellowship, was held on Wednesday, Jan. 14th, 1818.

After the proceedings of the former meetings of the Fellowship were read by Mr. Barrow, the Secretary; the Treasurer, Mr. Hall, read the following report:

"This, my fellow-members, is the first annual meeting of the Manchester Unitarian Fellowship, and I am happy to congratulate you on the success with which our efforts have been attended. You feel, I doubt not, a deep interest, in attending to the report of the proceedings of this association during the first year of its existence, and in being made acquainted with its actual state at the close of that period.

"You are well acquainted with the motives in which this association originated. You conceived that a society of persons, though not individually rich, acting upon the plan which we have adopted, and especially if their number should become considerable, would have it in their power to promote the interests and aid the progress of religious truth and rational Christianity:

"*First*, By granting seasonable assistance to Unitarian congregations for the erecting of chapels, or on any other pressing occasion.

"*Secondly*, By granting subscriptions or donations to liberal religious institutions. And,

"*Thirdly*, By affording an easy way for young people, and for those who cannot well afford to pay annual subscriptions, to avail themselves of the advantages arising from the Unitarian Book and Tract Societies.

"These objects are surely important, because they have a direct tendency to aid the interests of truth and virtue; and it is hoped that you will discover from the tenor of this report, that the constitution of the Manchester Unitarian Fellowship is happily calculated to promote them.

And here you will allow me to express a wish, in which, I doubt not, you will heartily join me, that societies formed upon this model, or at least for the same

purposes, should become general among the Unitarians. If all the friends of truth every where, not only felt a pleasure in its advancement, but also personally assisted in producing such an effect, how greatly accelerated would its progress become!

"The rich individuals of our denomination, though their contributions be ever so liberal, must necessarily, from the smallness of their number, yield but a limited supply; but by the plan we have adopted, the young people of our different congregations, and even the labouring class in numerous instances, would by reason of their number, produce funds or pecuniary supplies, exceeding any thing of which we can yet boast, and that with greater ease and certainty. This will readily be admitted, when it is considered, that upon our plan one hundred subscribers produce the annual sum of twenty-five pounds.

"At the commencement of the Fellowship there were only about thirty subscribers, and two collectors; at the present time the number of subscribers amounts to one hundred and three, and there are five collectors: there is also the most encouraging prospect of a still farther increase.

"It seemed advisable to the Fellowship to grant no pecuniary aid in consequence of any application from Unitarian Societies, &c. before the expiration of one year, as its resources could not be sufficiently ascertained before that time, and as the claims of its members for books and tracts could not be known before the end of the year. For these and some other reasons, it was thought proper not to embarrass the Fellowship by a liberality which it could not afford. In future, however, the Fellowship, according to the rules and regulations, will cheerfully take into consideration the claims of our Unitarian brethren, and afford them such assistance as its funds may be able to bear; and it is to be expected that cases of this nature will form the principal subject of our future reports, though they are necessarily excluded from the present."

The above report having been read, the Treasurer laid a statement of his accounts before the meeting, by which it appeared that a net balance remained in his hands of £17. 11s. 8d. The meeting then proceeded to sanction some alterations proposed in the rules, and to choose the officers of the Fellowship for the ensuing year.

J. H. Treasurer.

Manchester, Feb. 1st, 1818.

#### *Protestant Chapel at Oporto.*

A VERY interesting scene was witnessed at Oporto, on Sunday, the 2nd of November last, the opening of an English chapel for the celebration of divine service, the first and only Protestant Church in the Peninsula. Besides the merchants, the British



and Dutch Consuls attended; several English officers in the Portuguese service, masters of vessels, travellers and seafaring men joined the congregation. The chaplain (a truly excellent divine) delivered a very appropriate and impressive discourse on the occasion, which was heard with deep attention. The sacred edifice is a small but elegant building, and reflects great credit on the piety and taste of the British factors — *Edinburgh Weekly Chronicle*, December 24, 1817.

**Additional Contributions to Union Chapel, Glasgow [p. 75].**

Dr. Gairdner, Edinburgh	-	-	1	1	0
Collection in the High-Pavement Chapel, Nottingham	-	-	17	5	6

**Colchester Unitarian Society [p. 218].**

By Mr. Eaton:

Mr. Taylor, Bocking	-	-	5	0	0
Mr. Courtauld, Ditto	-	-	5	0	0

**LITERARY.**

THE Editor of Dr. Priestley's Works begs leave to inform the subscribers that Vol. V. will be ready for delivery on Friday, May 29, at Mr. Eaton's, 187, High Holborn, where those subscribers who have not received the former volumes are requested to apply for them.

In the press, a *Manual of Prophecy*, or, a short Comparative View of Prophecies contained in the Bible, and the Events by which they were fulfilled. By the Rev. Peter Roberts, A. M., Rector of Llanarmon Dyffryn Ceiniog, Vicar of Madeley, and Author of *An Harmony of the Epistles, Letters to M. Volney, &c.*

Mr. T. YATES will shortly publish "*Indian Church History, or Notices relative to the first planting of the Gospel in Syria, Mesopotamia and India. Compiled chiefly from the Syrian Chronicles, with an accurate Relation of the first Christian Mission in China.*" The work will develop some interesting facts hitherto unknown to the ecclesiastical historians of Europe.

In May a new Edition of *President Edwards's Life of David Brainerd* will be published, handsomely printed in demy 8vo.

A new Edition in 2 vols, 8vo. of Schmi- dius's *Congordance to the New Greek Testament*, will speedily be published.

Dr. T. SMITH, of Yeovil, who sustains with great respectability the twofold character of an Unitarian minister and a physician, has just published a *Second Edition* enlarged in 8vo. of his *Illustrations of Divine Government*, the object of which is similar to Mr. Cappe's [p. 148], viz. to vindicate the Divine Character and to shew that the result of the Scheme of Providence will be glorious to God and happy to all intelligent creatures. We rejoice to find that there is a demand for works like these, which treat on the philosophy of religion, and address the heart through the understanding.

**NOTICE.**

THE Anniversary Meeting of the Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty, will be held at the Albion Tavern, Aldersgate Street, on Saturday, May the 16th, at half-past ten precisely.

## MONTHLY RETROSPECT of PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR,

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

THE House of Commons has presented an appearance very uncommon,—the minister in a minority; and that on such a question as could not have been expected to be brought forward, unless he had decisive proofs that it would be most powerfully supported. The death of the ever-to-be-lamented Princess, placed the Royal Family in such a situation as does not often take place in private life. In a large family, of which the youngest of the children was about forty, not one had a child, and there seemed to be a prospect that the reigning dynasty would end with the death of the last of them. But if in the English branch there was a want of heirs in the third generation, this was not the case with the original stock; as in those of Bruns-

wick, Orange, Hesse, Denmark and Prussia, there is no deficiency. Still this did not seem to compensate for the probable defect in the English line; and soon after the death of the Princess, rumours were spread abroad of several approaching marriages in the Royal Family.

The allowances granted to the princes of the blood are very great, placing them in a situation, in point of annual income, on a level surpassed by very few of the landed proprietors of the country; and they are relieved from the usual anxiety attending other persons, as, in case of a marriage, and issue from it, they are sure of ample provision for their children. The allowance in general was about twenty thousand a year, free from all taxes; and

they had, besides, emoluments and occasional supplies, which enabled them to live in a state of splendor equal to their rank. This, however, was not thought sufficient, and a plan was formed for increasing it to a very large amount; which, in the present distressed state of the nation, seemed far to exceed the bounds of decency and propriety.

Before this plan was submitted to parliament, the minister had a meeting of the principal members of the oligarchy, before whom it was laid, and on whom reliance was placed for their concurrence, and such support as should secure its progress through the House of Commons. It is evident, that they were thunderstruck at the proposal; but what passed in the private chamber is not known, and it can be inferred only by future proceedings. The project was brought into the House of Commons, where it was opposed by some of the principal adherents of the ministry; but it was not declared that they had expressed their dissent at the private meeting. This forms an extraordinary feature in this transaction; for it seems strange that they should not have imparted their disapprobation to the minister; or if they had done it, that he should persevere in a measure which could not be carried but by their concurrence. Be this as it may, the House and the people were astonished at this refractory spirit, as well as the perseverance of the minister in opposition to it.

An animated debate took place, in which the extravagance of the minister's proposal was set forth in glowing colours; an appeal was forcibly made to the state of the country, and the impropriety of adding such additional burdens was expatiated upon with great energy. An inquiry was called for into the income of the princes, and hints thrown out of their sufficiency for the expected change of their situations. The contest was carried on with vigour, and it ended in a division, in which the minister was in a minority.

Thus baffled in his first measure, he was obliged to be content with what he could get, and there he had the mortification to encounter another difficulty. For, when the disposition seemed evident to increase the incomes of the princes by six thousand a year in case of their marriage, it was urged, that the Duke of Cumberland, already married, should be placed on the same footing. This was unfortunate, for it was renewing the history of the ill success of a similar application on his marriage; and this question was decided against the minister, by the House refusing to add to the income of the Duke, but allowing the six thousand a year to be paid to his wife in case of her surviving him. This case could not occur without many observations, which may be matter of future

history. The lady expressed her thanks in a very handsome manner to the House for the grants; and the Duke has still an income, which would be the envy of the princes of Germany in his rank of life.

The debate did not pass over without many ludicrous allusions, by which Mr. Canning excited the laughter of the House. As usual, he did no good, but rather harm to his cause; for his mode of speaking could not possibly bring over the wavering, and it could not be gratifying to his own party to see their measure exposed to the jokes which his witticisms excited. Among them it was started, that one of the dukes had bent his thoughts to matrimony merely for the good of the nation, and that without the allowance, we should be deprived of the benefit which might be expected from a connexion of this kind; and it seems that the nation is now really in that state. A marriage, however, of one of the royal dukes is said to be on the tapis, and one of the princesses has given her hand to a prince of Germany.

In the debate also were allusions made to the royal establishment at Windsor, and the wealth supposed to be possessed by the heads of the Royal Family. If this is really so considerable as some persons imagine, it should seem that the princes might very fairly be expected to derive as other children some assistance from that quarter. The head cannot, from unhappy circumstances, enjoy the splendor appropriated to his rank; and where can the superfluity be so well placed as with his children? These, with similar remarks, made the debate very interesting.

But the defeat of the minister gave occasion for the use of a very fallacious argument. It was urged, that the Commons of England had manifested their power, and that they were not to be overawed, as was frequently insinuated, by ministerial influence. The error lies in the use of the term Commons. The minister was not beat by the opposition, that might arise from the disapprobation of the people of the first extravagant proposal, but from that of the oligarchy: for it must be kept constantly in view, that the votes of the House depend on the combination of three elements;—the power of the crown, the power of the people, and the power of the oligarchy, oftentimes designated by the appellation of the boroughmongers. In this combination, if the power of the people is represented by thirty, that of the crown may be by forty, that of the oligarchy by a hundred and ten. The oligarchy cannot, from its nature, be ever unanimous: the crown must naturally have great sway with it, and several of its members will take the popular side. In this question, it was natural that those members whose seats depended on the people, should



oppose the extravagant grant, as their consent to it would materially affect them in the approaching election. On comparing the vote of the House with the state of the elements, by which that vote seems to have been guided, it should seem that five-ninths at least of the oligarchy were against the measure, or it might amount to nearly two-thirds of that body. The issue of the question proves only the superiority of the oligarchy to the crown, when it takes the popular side; and in the great question of the coalition ministry after the American War, the popular and regal elements were for some time in a minority; and the victory obtained by them at last would have been much more difficult, if the oligarchy had not been in its nature incapable of the consolidation on which its then leaders, unfortunately for themselves, too much depended.

But a question of far greater importance, and which comes home to the bosom of every one impressed with feelings of humanity and morality, has been brought forward, and is now under discussion in the House. This is the state of the country as affected by the Bank. Upon this subject, very important information has been produced, and the nature of the case will be clearly understood, by comparing the state of the country previous and subsequent to the time when the Bank stopped payment. A table has been laid before the House, of the number of capital convictions and acquittals for forgery in these periods, for a great number of years; by which it appears, that in the fourteen years preceding the time the Bank stopped payment, there were three capital convictions, and one acquittal, the total number prosecuted being four.

The twenty-one subsequent years present a most distressing picture. In the year 1800 were twenty-nine capital convictions, and fifteen acquittals, making the whole number of prosecutions forty-four. In 1801 were thirty-two capital convictions and fifty-four prosecutions. In 1802 thirty-two capital convictions and sixty-three prosecutions. In 1817 thirty-two capital convictions, ninety-five convictions for having forged notes in possession, and fifteen acquittals, making in the whole, the number of prosecutions one hundred and forty-two. This account is of itself sufficiently alarming; but to make it complete, we should also have the sums of money expended by the bank in prosecutions, and the number of persons charged by them for either forgery or having had forged notes in their possession.

In the twenty years, ending with the last day of December, 1817, there have been three hundred and eight capital convictions, five hundred convictions for having forged notes in possession, one hundred and sixty-two acquittals, and nine hundred

and seventy prosecutions. The average, therefore, of these years, makes the capital convictions fifteen, the convictions for having forged notes twenty-five, acquittals eight, number of prosecutions forty-eight. But when we contemplate the average of prosecutions for the two last years, which is a hundred and thirty-one, the increase of this crime, in the latter part of the above period, shews, to what little effect our sanguinary law has been put in execution.

The table farther gives us the state of this crime in the present year to February 25th, that is for a space less than two months. In which were four capital convictions, twenty-one for having forged notes in possession, one acquittal, making the total number of prosecutions twenty-six: from which, if the increase of crime goes on as in the two last years, the total number of prosecutions for this year, will not be less than one hundred and fifty-six. But let us hope that the Parliament will look this evil steadily in the face, lest in time the human sacrifices to Mammon should far exceed those to Moloch, in the ancient commercial city of Carthage.

In reviewing this statement, the number of convictions for having forged notes in possession, must strike us, and this is a case that may happen to any individual; and when we consider into whose hands bank notes may fall, suspicions cannot fail of arising in our mind, that in such a number of cases innocent persons may have been confounded with the guilty. For what proof is there of a note being forged? This depends entirely upon the prosecutor; and a question ought to be asked by the House of Commons, whether the Bank has ever been deceived itself, and paid a forged note for a real one? If this has ever been the case with the Bank, what is the situation of persons taking their notes? And with a poor ignorant individual with death staring him in the face, may he not have been induced to submit to a less punishment, though he was not conscious to himself of any guilt, than run the risk of a condemnation, which might end in deprivation of life?

Again it may be asked, what is the real nature of this crime? If a person forges a note for a hundred pounds upon an individual, and that sum is advanced to him, on the note, and on its being traced to him, he is incapable of restoring the money, some one must be loser of one hundred pounds. But is it so with the Bank? What is a bank note? It is a piece of paper properly signed, and bearing the words, I promise to pay so many pounds. But on its being presented to the promiser, does he really pay these pounds? No such thing. He gives in exchange only other certain notes with the same import. The notes themselves cannot be considered in



any other light than as fictitious notes, and it becomes the Legislature to pause before it assigns such a tremendous punishment for a forgery upon a fiction.

The tables produced on the state of this crime, and its penalties, must make a deep impression: and it will lead to the farther inquiry, how far death can be made in propriety a punishment for the offence? It is a great mistake to suppose, that nations are at liberty to make what laws they please, and to enforce them by what penalties they please. It is true, that they have the power, but they must ever bear in mind, that there is One higher than the highest who regardeth. We have his sanction for putting to death the man, by whom the blood of man is shed: but how far the penalty of death is to be applied to inferior crimes, is a very serious question. No country in Europe presents a similar scene; and the tables of crimes and punishments in general, for the last two or three years, affords sufficient ground for the examination of the whole of our criminal code.

Mr. Canning afforded much matter for public animadversion by his jokes on the sufferings of a poor old man, and he has given proof how sensibly he can be affected by observations on himself. A pamphlet was in circulation, but not published by any bookseller, in which he received the chastisement due to his unprovoked gibes. A copy, it seems, was sent to him, and a letter afterwards appeared in the public papers with his signature, written in the most vulgar terms, in which he challenges his unknown adversary to give him what is called satisfaction by duel. The consequence was, that the suppressed pamphlet was reprinted, and had an immense public circulation, with the appendix of the two last letters that passed between him and his adversary. Our sentiments on duels are well known, and we shall always reprobate the conduct of every man, whatever may be his situation in life, who thus attempts to break the laws of God and his country. That Mr. Canning, who is known by his satirical writings on all his friends, should be affected by a satire on himself, is not surprising: for it is well known, that many who can be amused by exciting a laugh against others, can little

bear a joke against themselves. But it was not expected that Mr. Canning should so far let passion get the better of his reason, and display his sensibility in so gross a manner. His greatest enemy could not desire to inflict a greater punishment than he has inflicted on himself, and he reminds us of the serpent, which is said sometimes, when he is aiming a deadly blow at the object of his vengeance, to sting himself unwarily, and be the author of his own death.

The courts of law have got rid of the appeal of battle, after a very long, very tedious, but very ingenious argument on this question. The whole history of this absurdity of our ancestors was well detailed, and it ended in the appellant being set free, and the court being freed from the appointment of a day for battle, which could only have excited the laughter of the public; as it is evident, that in these days a battle before the judges would have only tended to bring the courts into contempt.

In France a case of murder occupies the attention of the public, and so much so, that it might seem to be a sub thrown out to the world to prevent an inquiry after more important concerns. The Pope continues to be refractory, and their Concordat is at a stand still. Libels continue to be published and to be circulated. The adventure of the Duke of Wellington seems to have arrived at its termination, but his Grace figures away at Paris, and is supposed to be employed in the arrangement of very important matters.

Poland has presented the desirable scene of a representative assembly, in which the Sovereign made a most able address, and it must be the wish of every one, that their debates will be animated with the same desire for the welfare of the country, as he has expressed.

Spain has received its ships from Russia, but they are represented to be very inadequate to the purpose for which they have been obtained. To what quarter they are to sail, it is not at present known: but the news from Mexico revives the hopes, that that region is not so much at the mercy of the mother country as was apprehended. The South of America seems to be in a state to defy all attempts on their liberty.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from Dr. Jones; Amicus Veritatis; Senex Occidentalis; L. H.; B. Little; Simplex; H. X.; Unitarian Baptist Church, York; South Wales Unitarian Quarterly Meeting. Dr. Thomson's on Unitarianism in the East Indies, and two or three other communications, were accidentally mislaid this month.