

THE
Monthly Repository.

No. CLXVIII.]

DECEMBER, 1819.

[Vol. XIV.]

Lufton,

September 17, 1819.

SIR,
OBSERVING in your last Number [p. 512] an Obituary of the late Rev. Josiah Townsend, of Ealand, it brought to my recollection a letter which I received from him some years ago, containing some account of his father. This narrative I designed to lay before the public, in a work which was then in course of publication; but as I do not intend to pursue that work any further, I have sent it you for insertion, in case it suits the design of the Monthly Repository.

W. W.

“The Rev. MEREDITH TOWNSEND was the eldest son of the Rev. John Townsend, a Baptist minister, who was well-known to many as having been a school-master and an occasional preacher in London, and who died June 3, 1766, aged 81. Concerning him it is particularly worthy of remark, that, after he settled in London, he became member of a Baptist society there; and that, for having communicated occasionally with the Independent society at Stoke-Newington, (then under the care of the Rev. Samuel Snashall,) he was censured, if not expelled, by the church, as walking disorderly.

“His eldest son, the subject of the present memoirs, was born at Pool, in Dorsetshire, August 23, 1715, O. S., and was about seven years old when his father removed to London. It was (he writes) in the 18th year of his age, that some very deep impressions were made on his mind by hearing a sermon from a young man; which impressions continued, though with great variations. He was baptized at eighteen by Mr. Wilson, minister to the society in which Mr. Abraham Booth lately laboured. But, when he had studied the controversy about baptism more particularly, the result of his inquiries was, that he became a Pædo-baptist; in consequence of which all his own children, excepting one which died the day

after its birth, were baptized in their infancy.

“Mr. M. Townsend’s thoughts were, on occasion of a fit of illness, strongly turned to the ministry. Having pursued grammar-learning for some time, he was placed under the care of the Rev. Mr. Eames, September 4, 1738. When he came out into the ministry, he preached occasionally in and about London, and became assistant in a school of great repute at Peckham, in Surry. On February 5, 1741—2, he was chosen assistant (his own words are) ‘to the amiable Watts and the excellent Price;’ whom he never afterwards mentioned but in terms of the highest respect. But after having spent four years in that situation, being much discouraged by the little success which seemed to attend his labours, he left London, and went to Hull, June 2, 1746, upon an invitation from the congregation at Dagger-Lane Meeting, to be assistant to their pastor Mr. Wildboar. On July 20 following, he was chosen to this service, and accepted of it; and on May 10, 1749, he was ordained co-pastor with Mr. Wildboar, as appears from the certificate of the ministers concerned in the solemnity. While at Hull he was prevailed upon to print a few poems, the strain of which is very serious and spiritual; but he did not prefix his name to them. He also published a sermon there from Isa. xxvii. 8, on occasion of the defeat of the rebels; which he dedicated to the congregation in Berry Street, London. And it may not be improper to add in this place, that he afterwards published a sermon from Rev. ii. 10, which was preached Sept. 27, 1761, being the Lord’s-day after the coronation of their present Majesties. On May 10, 1748, he was married to Mary, youngest daughter of John and Rebecca Basnett, of Peckham, a devout person, and one who loved God with all her heart; with whom he lived happily for almost twenty-eight years.

She died at Stoke-Newington, Feb. 8, 1776, aged 61. They had five children; of whom two only, a son (the late Rev. Josiah Townsend) and a daughter, now survive their excellent parents.

“ Mr. Townsend’s residence at Hull was not of long continuance. His usefulness and comfort were destroyed by the prevalence of a very unchristian spirit in the society with which he was connected. He, therefore, accepted an invitation given him to succeed the Rev. Samuel Snashall, as pastor of the congregation of Protestant Dissenters at Stoke-Newington, in Middlesex: and, accordingly, after taking a most affectionate leave of his friends at Hull, on Lord’s-day, April 5, 1752, he left them the day following. At Stoke-Newington he was the much-esteemed shepherd of a numerous and respectable flock; and no one who ever sustained the ministerial character, could more justly have addressed to his hearers (had not his well-known humility and modesty forbidden it) the appeal of Paul to the Thessalonians: ‘ Ye are witnesses, and God also, how holily and justly and unblameably we behaved ourselves among you, as ye know how we exhorted and admonished and charged every one of you, as a father doth his children, that ye would walk worthy of God, who hath called you unto his kingdom and glory.’ Most of his early connexions at Newington took leave of this world before him, of whom a list is given, and to whom a very honourable testimony is borne, in an obituary found among his papers. Those of them who remain (it is not doubted) will long regard his memory as precious; and will be ready to attest, that he faithfully declared the gospel according to the views he was led to entertain of it, and especially as a doctrine according to godliness; that in public prayer he was fervent; in preaching, plain, serious and earnest; in the administration of the Lord’s Supper, and in his addresses to young people, remarkably affectionate and pathetic: that his temper was unassuming; his conversation, whenever an opportunity could be found or made of introducing any thing serious, instructive: and that, in consequence of the pru-

dence and peaceableness of his behaviour, he had not an enemy living or dying. For the space of thirty-seven years did the congregation at Stoke-Newington enjoy the benefit of his ministerial labours. But in the year 1787, the total failure of his voice, brought on most probably by pulpit exertions, which always exceeded his strength, obliged him to resolve on retiring from public services. The congregation, therefore, over which he presided, invited the Rev. Mr. Hodgkins to be his assistant, and, two years afterwards, to be his successor. After bearing an important part in the ordination of Mr. Hodgkins, and once more administering the Lord’s Supper to his beloved flock, he quitted them in July, 1789, to their mutual regret.

“ From Stoke-Newington Mr. Townsend removed to Fairford, in Gloucestershire, and took up his abode for seven years in the house of his son, who was then minister to a small congregation there: but on the removal of the latter from Fairford to Ealand, in Yorkshire, he chose to fix his residence in Bath, that he might be near his daughter. And here he received, what he had long been wishing and waiting for, a release from infirmity and pain. He had been frequently exercised, for many years, with very painful attacks of the stone and gravel. The summer before his death he suffered from one, which was peculiarly violent and distressing, and from which his constitution received a shock he never recovered. He continued enfeebled in body, but cheerful in mind, till the night of November 17, 1801, when, having occasion to get out of bed, he fell on the floor, and was unable to rise without help. When his daughter once and again lamented this accident as unfortunate, he gently chid her, saying, ‘ Why do you call that unfortunate which may be the method that Divine Wisdom has thought fit to make use of to bring about what I have been so long wishing and praying for?’ He continued perfectly collected to the last, complained of nothing but increasing weakness, and discovered a full persuasion that his end was drawing near. Frequently would he say, ‘ I have been quietly and, I hope,

patiently waiting for thy salvation, O Lord; and, I trust, the time of deliverance is not far distant.' He saw no one for many days before his death, excepting his own family, and even them but for a little while at a time. It was thought that he wished to be alone, as finding it a hinderance to his devotions to say much to others; but what he did say was most pertinent, and shewed how much his thoughts were directed upwards. The evening before his death he was remarkably cheerful and even facetious: but on his daughter rejoicing in his good spirits and cheerfulness, he answered, as if he would say, 'Do not build upon this, it is but transient.' And so it proved. His attendant said that she heard him praying at intervals till four o'clock of the next morning. Having been a little relieved from a pain in the chest, (of the return of which he complained,) he ordered her to go into the next room and take a nap, as he was about to do the same. She watched for near half an hour; when, not hearing him cough as usual, she returned to his chamber, and found his eyes closed, his breath departed, and every appearance of his having gone off in his sleep without a struggle. What a singular answer to his prayers, that he might have a gentle, easy dismissal! Often had he been heard to say, 'Oh, that it might please God to permit me quietly to slip away without any noise or bustle!' Thus, then, were his wishes granted. He fell asleep in Jesus on the morning of the Lord's-day, December 13, 1801, in the 87th year of his age. 'Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace.'

A WORK has lately been published at Paris, entitled "*Discursos sobre una Constitucion Religiosa considerada como Parte de la Civil Nacional*," by M. LLORENTE, the author of the *Critical History of the Inquisition, &c.*, in which a series of articles are proposed to the rising Republics of South America, as the foundation of their religious constitutions. They are so liberal in their spirit, though the work of a Catholic, that we are only doing the author an act of justice by introducing some of them to our readers.

The Roman Catholic religion is declared to be the religion of the state, whose ministers shall be paid from the national funds; but the exercise of every other religion shall be equally protected, and its professors entitled to equal civil rights.

No other symbol of faith shall be recognized but the Apostles' Creed and the seven sacraments. Neither confession nor communion, nor attendance at mass shall be compulsory. Saints' days shall be abolished, and the bishops and vicars shall be enjoined to ascertain that the services of the church be conducted with simplicity and devotion.

Fasting shall not be imposed; it is an act of individual fervour and devotion.

The church shall have no power to dissolve the matrimonial bond. That power exists only in the Supreme Council of the nation. No perpetual religious vows shall be allowed, nor any vows which impose celibacy. The clerical profession shall be no impediment to matrimony.

The clerical orders shall be archbishops, bishops, presbyters, deacons and subdeacons. Their duties are particularly defined in several following articles. If any complaints be made against an ecclesiastic, they must be made to the order which ranks immediately above him; if redress be refused, the Supreme Council of the nation shall take cognizance of the same.

No reference shall be made to the Pope on any subject of pure discipline; the Episcopal authority being wholly competent to the government of the diocese; and no bull shall be promulgated without the consent of the National Council.

The ecclesiastical division of the country shall be the same as the civil; the capital of every province being the centre of the ecclesiastical body.

The Pope shall have no veto over the appointment of the Episcopal body.

On these and other articles the author enlarges to prove their consistency with the early practice of the Christian Church. He will recognize no novelties which have a later date than the third century, and takes for granted that the spirit of Christianity is as friendly to religious as to civil free-

dom. He insists that the early Fathers constantly appealed to the reason and the moral conviction of their converts, and that if other weapons are necessary now, the doctrine they are leagued with to defend, must be inconsistent with the original purity of the Christian faith. He shews the selfishness, the ambition, the fraud, which built on the foundation of the gospel the scaffolding of priestly encroachments and kingly despotism. Confession, indulgencies, tithes, the monastic system, spiritual courts and other antichristian institutions, were made the instruments of their profligacy and plunder and aggrandizing power.

He denies the right of the church to require any other profession of faith than the admission of the great fundamentals of Christianity, that which has been the belief of all Christians in all ages. He asserts that the communion of the Lord's Supper was a simple act of faith in the early history of the church, and ridicules the extravagant notions connected with fast and feast-days.

He argues at length against matrimony being considered either as a sacrament or a religious rite. It was clearly not established by Christianity, nor did the Christian Church pretend to interfere with it for many centuries.

As authority for opposing the intervention of the Pope in matters of discipline and internal arrangements, he quotes with approbation the constitution of the Gallican clergy in 1791. He shews that the authority possessed by Rome in the early ages emanated from it, not as the apostolic see, but as the capital of the empire; and that Alexandria, Antioch, and other places, held their station in ecclesiastic matters, because they were cities of second and third rank, politically considered.

He proposes a great diminution of the clerical orders; their excess being a serious burthen on the state, unnecessary for the maintenance of religion, unfriendly to industry and to liberty. While he enforces the necessity of their being amply provided for, he shews the desirableness of something like an equalization of their revenues.

As to the celibacy of the clergy, he

supposes, on the authority of the Christian Fathers, that John was the only unmarried apostle; that, till the fourth century, the clergy were universally allowed to marry. He shews how this corruption gradually insinuated itself into the church, and what a convenient instrument it has been for detaching men from the common interest of the human race,—and proves, from the examples of the Protestant churches, how friendly a reform on this head has been to their respectability and to their general virtue.

He recommends that the monastic orders be silently annihilated by the non-admission of noviciates; a simple and admirable arrangement which was adopted by the Spanish Cortes during the short era of their government.

On the whole, these "Discursos" do infinite honour to the spirit of the times: they shew that a more extensive charity is pervading our brethren, and they give hope of that brighter day in which one bond, that of Christian affection, shall embrace the whole world.

J. B.

Paris, Nov. 8, 1819.

London,

November 20, 1819.

SIR,
PERCEIVING on the back of your last Repository an advertisement of a Sermon by the Rev. G. Harris, of Liverpool, with a List of the Unitarian Chapels and Congregations in England, Scotland and Wales, I procured it for the indulgence of my curiosity. In the Preface, the Author, speaking of the title *Unitarian*, says, "He has confined it to that part of the Antitrinitarian body who believe in the proper unity of God, and the humanity of Jesus Christ—particularly as he considers *the truth* to be as much opposed to *Arianism* as to *Trinitarianism*!" After this definition of *Unitarian*, it was with no small surprise I met with the following reputed *Arian* chapels and congregations in his *List of Unitarians*. "Carter-Lane, St. Paul's, Rev. J. Barrett; Hanover-Street, Long-Acre, Mr. Lane; Jewin-Street, Aldersgate-Street, A. Rees, D. D.; Monkwell-Street, Cripplegate, J. Lindsay, D. D.; Worship-Street, Finsbury-Square, J. Evans, A. M.;"

as well as "Broadstairs, Mr. Christopher." Now, I ask for information whether these worthy pastors, with their respective flocks, have undergone any recent change of religious sentiment; or whether the preacher, in making up his *Unitarian* List, forgot his definition, and so unwittingly proclaimed to the world the truth that *Arians* are Unitarians; thus proving himself to be under the operation of gospel charity. Mr. Richard Wright, I observe, has assisted in drawing out the List, but he is a liberal gentleman, and has no concern with the contracted definition of Unitarian given on the occasion. Each of the above ministers, or some of their congregations, may probably call for an explanation. I am far from imputing to Mr. Harris intentional misrepresentation. He says, "Inaccuracies pointed out he will correct." Indeed, it is possible that, belonging to that class of modern Unitarians who have predicted the speedy extinction of *Arianism*, he has, in the superabundance of his youthful zeal to swell out the List of Unitarians in England, Scotland and Wales, fondly mistaken the prophecy for its accomplishment! Expecting a ready insertion of these remarks in your valuable Miscellany, which I have taken from its commencement, I beg leave to declare myself a lover of truth and consistency, as well as

AN UNITARIAN OF THE OLD SCHOOL.

P. S. It is a curious circumstance that Mr. Christopher, of Broadstairs, here proclaimed as an *Unitarian*, entertained so great an antipathy to Unitarianism, as to have declared from the pulpit, not long ago, its alliance to Deism! An intelligent gentleman of the Gravel-Pit Congregation, Hackney, happening to be present, called on Mr. Christopher at the conclusion of the service, and before the congregation, for an explanation. Mr. Christopher, to his honour, acknowledged his inaccuracy, and will, no doubt, be more liberal on future occasions.

Clapton,

August 5, 1819.

SIR,

YOUR Correspondent (p. 406)

will, I trust, excuse me if I assure him that there is no *Act of Parliament* to declare "Dissenters"

sprinkling or dipping" to be "baptism," but that the whole question remains within the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts. Under such sanction, he will, I believe find that "the clergy have done in this affair" only what they ought to have done, and that "for their conduct" they have the most satisfactory *precedent*. I here take for granted that Mr. Read is correct in stating that the "young lady" who applied for *confirmation*, "had only been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." Had there, on the contrary, been evidence that the words used, "twenty one years ago," were, *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*, his charge against the clergy would have been fully established; and "the bishop of the diocese," with such evidence before him, by deciding "that it was *safer* to go through the baptismal form," would have opposed himself to the opinions of bishops, of no light authority, in other times.

The Established Church, or, as it has been more correctly expressed, the Established Sect, regard, as it is well known, all *baptism* which is not administered by an Episcopal clergyman, as *lay-baptism*. On the validity of such *baptism*, there has been, within the *Establishment* itself, no small controversy. The earliest of which I am aware, was in 1573, between Dr. Whitgift, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, and the celebrated Puritan Cartwright. The latter, in conformity, as it appears, with the judgment of the foreign Protestants, thus argued, in his Defence of the "Admonition to the Parliament:"

"As for the baptizing by laymen, considering that it is not only against the word of God, but also founded upon a false ground, and upon an imagined necessity, which is none indeed, it moveth me nothing at all, although it be very ancient; for so much as the sacrament dependeth chiefly of the institution and word of God; which is the form and, as it were, the life of the sacrament, of which institution this is one, and, of the chief parts, that it should be celebrated by a minister."

Dr. Whitgift, in his "Defence of the Answer to the Admonition," thus replied:

"Whereas you say, that the mi-

nister is one of the chief parts, and, as it were, the life of the sacrament: in so weighty a cause and great a matter, it had been well if you had used some authority of Scripture, or testimony of a learned author. For so far as I can read, the testimony of learned men is, that the essential form, and, as it were, the life of baptism, is to baptize *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*; which form being observed, the sacrament remaineth in full force and strength, of whomsoever it be ministered, or howsoever by ceremonies or other additions it is corrupted."

I quote these passages from "A Defence of the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of England against some Modern Innovations, 1712." This *Defence* was anonymous, but is attributed, in MS. on the title-page, to "Dr. Turner, Vicar of Christ-Church, London, and of Greenwich." Of these *innovations* one was, "baptism, administered by *laymen*, invalid." On this subject Mr. Nichols thus writes:

"In 1711 there arose a controversy concerning the validity or invalidity of lay-baptism, in which some of our bishops and learned divines were divided in opinion. The occasion of this dispute was as follows: 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 the following ingenious tracts in defence of what he had done: one entitled, *Lay-Baptism Invalid*, 1711; a Defence of it in the same year; and in 1712, a tract intituled, *Dissenters' Baptism null and void*." *Lit. Anect.* IV. 227.

Besides Dr. Turner's Defence, he appeared again in 1713, under the title of "A Country Clergyman." The *validity* of *lay-baptism* was also maintained in "The Judgment of the Church of England," and "The Second Part of the Judgment, 1712." These were attributed to Bishop Fleetwood, who declares it the judgment of the Church of England, that *lay-baptism*, seriously conferred in *matter and form* prescribed by Christ, is not to be reiterated, although it was irregular, for want of a proper

administrator." To the same purpose the *Upper House of Convocation*, under Queen Anne, thus addressed the *Lower House*: "We, the president and bishops, have thought it incumbent on us to declare, that such persons as have been already baptized in or with water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, though their baptism was irregular for want of a proper administrator, ought not to be baptized again." The *High Church Doctors*, Hickes and Brett, contended on the other side; connecting this subject with their doctrines of the *divine right* of the priesthood, and "the necessity and authority of sacerdotal absolution."

In 1714, the same question was discussed between several clergymen and some Dissenters at Exeter, on the following occasion, as described in "A Caveat against the new Sect of Anabaptists, lately sprung up at Exon," attributed to Mr. Withers:

"One Mr. Benjamin Reed, 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, who might have passed his life in obscurity if he had not made himself famous for having somewhat to do in so remarkable an affair. The godfathers were two clergymen, Mr. King and Mr. J. Walker." (Pp. 3, 4.)

This pamphlet was followed by "A Defence of the Caveat against the new Sect of Anabaptists, &c., in Answer to Mr. Reed's Reply." By Hubert Stogdon, of whom there is, I believe, some account in one of your early Volumes. [IV. 57, 121 and 247.] In both pamphlets, the charge against the clergy turned upon this

fact, that "they knew Mr. Reed had been baptized with water in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost." (*Defence*, p. 50.) Of the late discussion of this subject, occasioned by a clergyman's refusal to bury any whom he regarded as unbaptized, and the judgment of Sir J. Nicholl, you have given a full account (V. 198, 199). I will only add, that the *Deputies*, acting on that judgment, have never ventured to interfere, unless it could be proved that the form in *Matthew* was used on the occasion. I have, I am aware, gone further than was necessary to acquit the clergy in the opinion of your Correspondent, but I thought much of the above might be new to some of your readers, especially as I find that Dr. Towers, who wrote Cartwright's Life in the *Biog. Brit.*, (III. 280,) has not mentioned the subject there, nor in his account of Cartwright annexed to Whitgift's Life (*Brit. Biog.*, III. 362—364). In 1767 and 1784, when Dr. T. wrote, the question about lay-baptism was, I believe, entirely at rest.

The Nonconformist (p. 428) will, I am sure, excuse me if I attempt a correction of the note to his very informing paper, and hazard a remark upon it. "Lord Shaftsbury," the reputed "unbeliever," and the contemporary of *Bolingbroke*, was never "Lord High Chancellor." That office was filled, in 1672, (a short period of lenity towards Dissenters,) by his grandfather, who was, I apprehend, a *state-christian*, and as exemplary in that character, according to a well-known story, as that *most religious king*, his royal master. The author of the *Characteristics* does not appear to have filled any office which required the qualification of the communion, unless it were "the Vice-Admiralty of the County of Dorset," from which, according to *Biog. Brit.* (IV. 268), he was removed "on the accession of Queen Anne."

It has been doubted whether "Anthony Collins wrote against *Christianity*," or, rather, against what *Osborne* denominated *Parliament Faith*. Archdeacon Blackburne, who is well known to have written the *Memoirs* of Thomas Hollis, there considers Collins's "ill-will to revelation a matter far from being out of doubt;"

while he commends "his avowed enmity to ecclesiastical usurpation." (*Biog. Brit.* IV. 27.) The "ludicrous and profane manner" which the *Nonconformist*, on the authority, I suppose, of common fame, attributes to Collins, ill accords with the complexion of his life and the circumstances of his last hours, as they are described in the *Biog. Brit.*, not only by Dr. Kippis, but in the previous life by Mr. Broughton, a clergyman who had certainly no predilection for the author of the *Essays* "On Freethinking," and "On the Thirty-nine Articles." Had this story been regarded as authentic, it would, probably, have been mentioned (IV. 26) with Whiston's severe censure of his "old friend" for having received "the holy communion." Collins's "compliment to custom," if he used the expression, was, I think, as justifiable as the conduct of the late Duke of Grafton, who is declared (VI. 469, 951 and 721) to have frequently received the communion, the form of which must have been abhorrent to the opinions and feelings of a serious Unitarian.

However Collins attained to magistracy, he appears to have exercised it with a persevering regard to the public interest, and if examples were sufficient for such a purpose, professed Christians have abundantly justified reputed unbelievers in doing what an unprejudiced observer is liable to consider as evil, that good may come. Of this, I think, that eminent Nonconformist, Sir T. Abney, afforded a striking instance.

In the *Memoirs* annexed to his *Funerel Sermon*, in 1722, we are told (p. 77) that "occasional communion with the Established Church he accounted lawful, and all along practised it, when expressing his charity, or holding a capacity for any considerable service made it necessary." He had adopted the accomodating scheme of his early pastor Mr. Howe, which *Defoe*, whom Mr. Howe unjustly charged with having "written his piece against Occasional Conformity, in order to reflect upon Sir Thomas Abney," very ably exposed, as may be seen in *Biog. Brit.* (V. 27, 28). Yet when the Bill against Occasional Conformity passed in 1712, and Sir Thomas, urged (*Mem.* p. 57) by "the Resident of Brunswick, who vigo-

rously represented to him how far the interest of his master might depend upon his continuance in his post, was prevailed on to continue," he declined all public worship, probably because he objected to join in the devotional services of the Church, though he had frequently qualified for an office, and thus had declared, if actions have any meaning, that he was a *bonâ fide* Churchman. This indecorous desertion of the public worship of the Church, to which every magistrate was considered, by law, as belonging, and confining himself to worship in his family "for seven years," his biographer, the Rev. Jeremiah Smith, his Nonconformist minister, (p. 58,) softly calls a "restraint," which "he endured, (though not without a pious grief,) that he might be capable of serving his country, and securing the interest of King George." Dr. Watts, in his Dedication to Sir Thomas Abney of two sermons, preached to his family at Theobalds, during that period, uses the same language, and denounces (Works, 1800, I. 155) "that unrighteous law," the Act against Occasional Conformity, of which, however, those who had qualified under the Test Act, and thus affected to be *Churchmen*, had no right to complain. Indeed, such Nonconformists as Sir Thomas Abney and his friend, another Alderman, Sir John Fryer, appear to have been as *wise in their generation* as any *children of this world*; for while they received peculiar homage from their own party, as the heads of the Nonconformists, they secured, by their *occasional Conformity*, their full share of the honours which the law bestowed on Churchmen.

"A Dissenter" (p. 430, Note) "may sit in the House of Commons;" but, I suspect, that all the members of the House are considered as members of that Church, of which they have sworn that the King is *supreme head*, and are all liable, though never likely to be called upon, to receive the *communion*. For the House, I apprehend, has power to repeat such *orders*, as have been frequently enforced in other times.

In 1614, the Commons made "an order, that every member of their body should take the sacrament, at St. Margaret's." (*Parl. Hist.* V. 278.) In 1627 there was a similar order,

enjoining the immediate *receiving*, on all who then "sate in the House," and directing "those which have not sate in the House, not to come into the House till they have received the communion." During the Short Parliament, April, 1640, there was the same *order*, and two such orders at the commencement of the Long Parliament. In 1661, this *order* was repeated: It is *resolved* that, on a *Sunday* appointed, "the sacrament of the Lord's Supper shall be administered at St. Margaret's, according to the form prescribed in the *Liturgy*, and that all the members shall then and there receive the said sacrament, and that whosoever shall not then and there receive the said sacrament, shall not, after that day, come into the House, until he shall have received the said sacrament." A committee is then appointed, who are to receive from the members a *note*, describing their names and the places they represent, "and the said persons, so appointed, are likewise to take particular notice of every member of this House, at such time as he receive the said sacrament;" perhaps to detect any who might not actually *receive*, or not in both kinds. In 1666, this *order* was repeated, probably for the last time.

I quote all the above except the *Order* in 1614, from a 12mo. volume, printed 1756, containing "Orders, &c. collected out of the Journals." To these may be added the following passage between James I. and *Usher*, communicated by the latter to *Sully*, and quoted from Parr's Life of Usher, (p. 17,) in Harris's *Lives*, 1814 (I. 91). From the *classical* conclusion it appears that *James* wanted more money than the Commons chose to entrust with him.

"I was appointed, by the Lower House of Parliament, to preach at St. Margaret's, Westminster, Feb. 7, 1620. Feb. 13, being Shrove-Tuesday, I dined at court, and betwixt four and five kissed the king's hand, and had conference with him touching my sermon. He said, I had charge of an unruly flock to look unto the next Sunday. He asked me how I thought it could stand with true divinity, that so many hundred should be tied (upon so short warning) to receive the communion upon a day, all could not be

in charity, after so late contentions in the House: many must needs come without preparation, and eat their own condemnation. He bad me to tell them, I hoped they were all prepared, but wished they might be better; to exhort them to unity and concord; to love God first, and then their prince and country; to look to the urgent necessities of the times, and the miserable state of Christendom, with *bis dat qui citò dat.*"

Your Reviewer (p. 439) has, I doubt not, fairly quoted "Sir M. Wellwood," and if the Baronet had dealt as fairly with Dr. Priestley, he could not have justly charged him with deducing, from the doctrine of *Necessity*, "conclusions of the most pernicious tendency." The passage professed to be quoted, is the former part of the seventh paragraph of Sect. xi., which is in Vol. III. of the Works, p. 518. Dr. Priestley is there considering a difficulty occurring to "persons firmly persuaded of the truth of the doctrine of *Necessity*," who yet deem it "not possible to act upon it," and "ask how it is possible for a *Necessarian* to pray for the pardon of sins." Having adopted Dr. Hartley's well-known distinction "between the popular and philosophical language, as corresponding to two very different views of human actions," he proceeds to shew that, if a Christian *Necessarian's* "faith be what Dr. Hartley calls a *practical* one, either in the doctrine of *Necessity*, or the principles of Christianity, that is, if he really feels the principles, and if his affections and conduct be really directed by them, so that they have their natural influence on his mind, it will be impossible for him to be a bad man;" or that "a truly practical *Necessarian* will stand in no need of the sentiments either of self-applause or self-reproach. He will be under the influence of a much superior principle, *loving God and his fellow-creatures*—from motives altogether independent of any considerations relating to himself." Thus the author introduces the following passage, which the biographer of Dr. Erskine affects to quote. How he quotes, the words *prudently* omitted by him, and here placed between brackets, will sufficiently discover: "[It is acknowledged that] a *Necessarian*, who [as such] believes that

[strictly speaking] *nothing goes wrong*, but that every thing is under the best direction possible, [himself and his conduct, as part of an immense and perfect whole, included,] cannot accuse himself of having done wrong, in the ultimate sense of the words. He has, therefore, in this strict sense, nothing to do with repentance, confession, or pardon." It is not surprising, after this specimen of the biographer's *Christian sincerity*, that he entirely omitted, in his quotation, the following conclusion of the paragraph, which would have proved his charge against Dr. Priestley to have been nothing better than a calumny:

"But then, if he be really capable of steadily viewing the great system, and his own conduct as a part of it, in this true light, his supreme regard to God, as the great, wise and benevolent author of all things, his intimate communion with him, and devotedness to him, will necessarily be such, that he can have no will but God's. In the sublime, but accurate language of the Apostle John, he will dwell in love, he will dwell in God, and God in him; so that, not committing any sin, he will have nothing to repent of. He will be perfect, as his heavenly Father is perfect."

Mr. Belsham is still, where I hope he will long continue, *in arena*, and can speak for himself, should he deem such an animadverter deserving of his notice.

J. T. RUTT.

P. S. Since I sent you the letter on *Defensive War*, (p. 409,) I have remarked, in a note by Mr. Granger, (B. H. II. 245,) a specimen of *Christian animosity*, seldom, if ever, paralleled. Speaking of *Montrose's* exploits against the anti-royalists in Scotland, he says, "It is worthy of remark, that in the memorable battle which he gained in September, 1644, the word of the rebels was, *Jesus and no quarter.*" I question whether *Old Mortality* has any thing to exceed this among his *Covenanters*.

Brief Notes on the Bible.

No. IX.

Matt. xix. 26, "With God all things are possible."

THIS text is so generally quoted in a sense beyond its import, that

a special consideration of it may not be unacceptable. It is very promptly applied to rebut the objections of common sense to the doctrine of the Trinity; and a pretty summary answer, in the absence of a better, and a very convenient one it is.

I feel myself on tender ground, but have an humble trust that it will not fail me.

No doctrine can lack a foundation upon scriptural expressions, wrested in their primary and absolute sense, as the Catholics, to come no nearer, have well exemplified. Jesus said, * "If ye have faith, as a grain of mustard seed, *nothing shall be impossible to you.*" This will be acknowledged, I presume, as equivalent to the language of the text. But who will be found to stickle for the literal construction of such a passage?

I can believe implicitly many things, upon both divine and human authority, which my reason cannot reach, but none which contradict it.

With God, though I admit that all things are possible, yet it is in the restrictive sense of *all possible things*.

Many are not possible to Him.

He himself, in the plenitude of his omnipotence, cannot contravene what his own laws and constitutions have once ordained immutable.

Nor can He, in any instance, betray versatility.

It has been assumed that God *could not* pardon the sins of mankind, except his justice were satisfied by an *atonement*; such as confounds the human intellect, and makes depreciated reason stand aghast!—which, indeed, might come in a parenthesis, as an orthodox impossibility with God.

Out of which, however, in the form of a negation upon it, arises the moral impossibility that God could, upon that assumption, exact from his creatures a virtue transcending what his own nature is capable of, namely, the forgiveness of all offences and injuries *without atonement*.

God cannot be unjust. He cannot visit limited sin with unlimited punishment.

Having declared, † "I am the Lord: that is my name; and my glory will

I not give to another," he cannot give his glory to another.

And that * "Before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me;" and † "I, even I, am he, and there is no God *with me*;" he cannot have an associate in his divinity.

And having promulgated † "There shall be one Lord, and his name *one*;" he cannot make it *three*.

(These are but selections from a host of corresponding passages.)

He is not efficient to make two and two five, or two and three but four. He is incapable of the attempt.

So, by parity of statement, not even by any presumable operation of the Divine will or power, which are synonymous, could three persons, each of them God, be one God, and *only* one.

The proposition, involving a numerical contradiction, states an impossibility, in the face of that irreversible system of order and consistency which has the Supreme Being for its author. §

So impossible is it even for their Creator to realize the conceits and gratuitisms of his creatures.

If any one should oppose, to my view of this momentous subject, God's power to work miracles, or disturb his own establishments, I would simply ask him whether he would have the Trinity considered as a standing miracle, and whether his orthodox brethren would thank him for such a concession?

I presume that none, but a fanatic, will tax the language I have used, for the sake of perspicuity, with irreverence.

That any mathematician should avow himself a Trinitarian, is, of all strange things, perhaps, the strangest. Yet how many have believed in witchcraft! How many in the existence of an evil spirit, possessing the divine attribute of ubiquity, and busy in the seduction of every human being from the allegiance due to his Creator! What, in such cases, wherein we see minds of the sublimest capacity pros-

* Matt. xvii. 20. † Isaiah xlii. 8.

* Isaiah xliii. 10. † Deut. xxxii. 39. † Zach. xiv. 9.

§ See my "Unity of God," M. Repos. Vol. IV. p. 595.

trate at the shrine of an *early-imbibed* superstition, what can be said, but, with a sigh, alas, poor human nature!

Waving, as not relevant to my purpose, a main branch of the argument, that the doctrine of the Trinity is a human device, gradually and proveably superinduced upon the Scriptures; I desire only to enter my protest against such a sweeping perversion of the text as I have aimed to correct, and to remark how sorely they must feel themselves pressed, who seek to shelter themselves under it.

BREVIS.

Chichester,

Nov. 18, 1819.

SIR,

BEING a Christian from conviction that the evidences in support of that faith are full and satisfactory, and adopting the Unitarian creed from a like conviction that it approaches nearer to the truth as it was in Jesus than any other explication of Christianity, I cannot be supposed to have any admiration for the writings of Paine, or for the publications of Carlile. But I cannot conceal my regret, that it should be now thought necessary to visit with punishment any individual for making known his sentiments respecting the Christian faith. It is, I think, paying our well-paid clergy but a bad compliment, to suppose that their talents could not completely answer his objections: it is paying Christianity itself a bad compliment to hint that it requires the support of the law to its defence: and it is demonstrating a sad ignorance of the nature of real religious liberty, and a sad inconsistency in the dispensing of this blessing, if, while we send missionaries to other lands, to shew Pagans the folly of idolatry, we will not suffer an individual in our land to shew us the folly of our creed, provided it appears to him that the wisdom of God belongs not to it.

The ignorance of Scripture which Paine evinced, was pointed out in a masterly manner by Mr. Gilbert Wakefield; and like ignorance was betrayed by Mr. Carlile, in his endeavour to identify Unitarians with Deists; for no ignorance can be greater than that which would rank unbelievers in the Trinity as unbelievers in Christianity. Still, however, Unitarians are

offenders at Common Law, according to the jargon of barristers, as much as Mr. Carlile; and, therefore, he was quite correct in endeavouring to shew that if they are suffered to broach their opinions, he ought to be suffered to broach his. This being the case, I own I am indignant, and most deeply do I regret when I hear Unitarians approving Mr. Carlile's prosecution and conviction. Are they not, in this case, using against him an argument and weapon which the orthodox could use equally against them? But, what is still worse, do they not, by this conduct, plead guilty, in fact, to a charge sometimes made against them, that, had they the power, they would be as intolerant as other sects?

Throughout the writings of Unitarians, it is often expressed, and more frequently insinuated, that their system is liberality itself. While your Catholics and your Protestants have alternately burned each other, each of them being debased with an anti-christian spirit, we are told that Unitarianism forbids all such proceedings. True, remarks the orthodox believer, but this is easily accounted for; you have never yet had the power to persecute. How much, alas! is this observation strengthened, when Unitarians, though not themselves having power to persecute, join the hue and cry with those who have.

It is consistent enough for the descendants of the "man of sin," be they found in Papal Rome, or in Protestant countries, to "rejoice and be exceeding glad," when, under the pretence of holy zeal, they are able to reek their infuriated passions on a defenceless mortal. But for those who plume themselves to be peculiarly the followers of the meek and lowly Jesus, thus to act, shews that their blood is still infected with the impurity which flowed in the veins of the Mother of Abominations.

Let Unitarians express their regret that any should be found blind to the beauties of their Christian faith. Let them, by argument, fortify their children and the ignorant around them, against any moral poison: let them endeavour to convince, and heal the erroneous and sickly judgment of the Deist: but let them not be absurd enough to suppose this conviction, or this happy result, can arise from ma-

nacles or a prison: let them not, for the sake of courting the popularity of imperfect Christians, act upon a rule which is contrary to the directions of him who forbade the fire from heaven to fall on the Samaritans; who declared that man was frequently ignorant of the real spirit he possessed, when he shewed a willingness to be the avenger of the Almighty's honour; and which rule, if rigidly acted on towards themselves, might, simply because they form the weaker sect, consign them to a dungeon.

Perhaps, Mr. Editor, your next Repository will teem with such sentiments from your liberal Correspondents: if so, let my effusion be destroyed; but if not, I beg to record my settled conviction on this affair, in the hope that, though an humble individual, I may be, in some degree, useful in preserving among our body that consistent liberality which forms their greatest glory.

J. F.

Mansfield,

SIR, *September 28, 1819.*

IN your Reviewer's very excellent and judicious critique upon Dr. Hodgson's Sermon on Stephen's Prayer, [pp. 505—508,] I observe he has adopted the hypothesis stated by the late Rev. Timothy Kenrick, and, if I mistake not, by other Unitarian writers before him, to explain the scene described, Acts vii. 55, 56, which, though ingenious, does not appear to me satisfactory. Should the following observations serve to throw any light upon the subject, or lead to any better explanation, the writer will think himself gratified by their insertion in your valuable work.

The explanation of the historian's language may, perhaps, be found by referring to the accusation which was brought against Stephen, and to some passages in the histories of the Evangelists. At the close of Acts vi. it is said, that they, "who were not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit by which Stephen spake, suborned men, which said, 'We have heard him speak blasphemous words against this holy place and the law, for we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs, which Moses delivered to us.'" From the

tenor of this testimony it is evident, however his language had been misinterpreted or misapplied, that Stephen had been speaking of the destruction of Jerusalem, and the consequent dispersion of the Jews, involving the discontinuance of many of their sacred customs, undoubtedly predicted by the prophet Daniel, and more pointedly by Jesus himself. When standing before the high-priest and the council, Stephen entered into a brief history of the Jews, and concluded by asserting, that they had rejected and murdered the Just One, of whom Moses and the prophets had spoken, and very plainly intimated, that they would bring upon themselves the judgments which had also been predicted as the consequence of their impenitence and unbelief. This was in fact acknowledging the most aggravating part of the crime, which was laid to Stephen's charge, and we accordingly find, "that when they heard these things, they were cut to the heart, and they gnashed on him with their teeth." Let us now refer to the language in which this event, the destruction of Jerusalem, is spoken of by Jesus Christ, Matt. xvi. 27, 28: "For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and then shall he reward every man according to his work." The coming to which Jesus refers is particularly evident, for he adds, "Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom." But his language is more striking, chap. xxiv. 29, 30, which is the conclusion of what Jesus had been saying of the destruction of Jerusalem: "Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of heaven shall be shaken, and then shall appear the Son of Man in heaven, and they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory." This, we may presume, was the only vision which Stephen saw. The conduct of the high-priest and of the Jewish council, not less than that of the elders and the Scribes, who were stirred up against him by his accusers and the false witnesses, convinced Stephen

that the prediction of Jesus would be fulfilled, and that the pride and obstinacy of the Jews were hastening that event; and lifting up his eyes to heaven, in the ardour of anticipation he exclaimed: "*Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God.*" It is probable Stephen's meaning was well understood, and, therefore, the Jews "cried with a loud voice, and stopped their ears, and ran upon him with one accord, and cast him out of the city and stoned him."

As to the apostrophe of Stephen, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," for there seems no reason to consider it as a prayer, it must be recollected, that the mind of this first martyr was strongly impressed with the figurative representation which Jesus had given of his appearance as the Son of Man, in the fulfilment of his prediction, and with the connexion of the event with the circumstances of those who would be witnesses of it. His own immediate danger would naturally bring to the mind of Stephen many of those declarations and admonitions of Jesus, which he addressed to those who might endeavour to escape from the impending calamity by unjustifiable means, by a mean denial of their relation to him, or by the concealment of their profession, as his followers; such as the following: "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess before my Father, who is in heaven; but whosoever shall deny me before men, him also will I deny before my Father, who is in heaven." "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it, and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it; for what is a man advantaged if he gain the whole world and lose himself, or be cast away; for whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my word, of him shall the *Son of Man* be ashamed, when he shall come in his own glory and in his Father's, and of his holy angels." It is scarcely possible that these passages should not have been in the mind of Stephen, connected as they are with the very language of Jesus, to which he referred: and therefore it was particularly natural that he should exclaim, at the moment when he was sacrificing his life in the cause, and as a

proof of his attachment to his master, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," accept the offering of my life, which I am now making, rather than deny thee, or the import and meaning of thy words. But surely this can be no warrant for our addresses to Christ, seeing we are not in similar circumstances, and have no reason to suppose that he is present with us, and can either hear or answer our requests. But on this subject we have the express authority of Jesus, in his instructions to his disciples: "In that day," that is, when he was taken from them, "ye shall ask me nothing; verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the FATHER in my name, HE shall give it you." It is evident that the historian did not consider this ejaculation or apostrophe of Stephen's as a prayer, for he afterwards observes, that he *kneeled down and prayed*, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." Nor is it conceivable that one "who was full of the holy spirit and of faith," could have acted in direct opposition to the instructions of Jesus, or could have been unmindful of the example and instruction of his Master: "Thou shalt worship Jehovah thy God, and him *only* shalt thou serve."

J. W.

SIR,
WHILE reading the excellent criticism on Stephen's Prayer, by Hodgson, in your Number for August last, [pp. 505—508,] it brought to my recollection a note in Temple's Letters to Randolph, published in the year 1778, 8vo., and, with your permission, I have copied it for insertion in your valuable Miscellany, as it is out of print, and many of your readers may be unacquainted with it. It is as follows. See p. 213, note.

PHILALETHES.

In the whole New Testament there is no command to pray to Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ himself and his apostles uniformly direct all prayer to be addressed to God only. There is, I am persuaded, no passage in the whole book, that records an instance of proper prayer addressed otherwise than to the person of the Father, except Acts vii. 59, where Stephen, at his

martyrdom, is represented as using these words, "*Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.*" This, it must be owned, is a direct invocation of the *Lord Jesus* by prayer; and is, in my opinion, one of the greatest difficulties in the Sacred Writings. That Stephen at so solemn a moment, and filled, as he was, with the holy spirit, should have prayed to an improper object, is to me inconceivable. To say that Jesus Christ was present in vision to Stephen, though, if the fact could be proved, it might be allowed great weight, seems to be cutting, not untying the knot. For, considering the time that must necessarily elapse, it is as difficult to conceive that the vision continued till the moment of his martyrdom, as to suppose that he would end his life in the violation of his Master's often repeated command.

The following conjecture, if it should be found sufficiently probable, would remove the whole difficulty, and with all submission to better judgments, I propose it to the consideration of candid and learned Christians.

The reading of our printed copies is *Κυριε Ιησους, Lord Jesus*; but eight MSS., one of great antiquity (see Wetstein in loc.), read *Κυριε Ιησους Χριστε, Lord Jesus Christ*. It is certain St. Luke did not originally write both; nor could those, whose books had *Κυριε Ιησους*, have added the word *Χριστε* by way of explanation. *Κυριε Ιησους* effectually ascertains the person. Whence then arose the various reading? Nothing will more naturally account for it than to suppose *Κυριε* (*Lord*) simply, to have been the genuine reading; which being understood by different owners of MSS. to mean the *Lord Jesus*, some by way of interpretation would write on the margin the word *Ιησους*, others *Ιησους Χριστε*. Subsequent transcribers would take some the one, some the other expression, as they met with it in the respective MSS. from which they copied, into the body of the text, and thus the original reading would be gradually lost. Take away this single word, and all appearance of inconsistency is removed from a text which otherwise seems not easily reconcilable with the rest of Scripture; the prayer will no longer be addressed to

Jesus Christ, but to the *God and Father of Jesus Christ*, according to the prescription of Jesus Christ himself, "*When ye pray, say, our Father.*"

This conjecture may expose me to the chastisement of Dr. R. I propose it only to the consideration of cool and dispassionate men, who will understand it, as the real truth is, to be proposed with all diffidence, and from the best of motives, a desire to turn the attention of abler critics to this, I think, very difficult text. Conjectural readings, adopted merely by way of accommodating an hypothesis, are never allowable. A worse reason cannot be imagined. Such readings, however, may sometimes be probable in the highest degree; and if no other instance of prayer, properly so called, indisputably addressed to Jesus Christ, can be pointed out in Scripture; if all prayer is commanded to be addressed to God only, the evidence here stated for the conjecture in question, may possibly be great enough, if not to justify the proposer, yet at least to exempt him from the severity of censure.

SIR,

Clapham.

SOME remarks of mine, which you were so obliging as to insert in the Repository, [p. 356,] respecting the doctrine of atonement, have occasioned two letters in reply, on which account I hope you will allow me to trespass on your patience a little further. My friendly antagonist Mr. Jevans, [p. 550,] if so I may call one from whom I do not know that I at all differ, appears not to have exactly understood my meaning. I will lay the blame of this at my own door, and suppose that I did not express myself clearly. Certainly, there are no things more difficult formally to explain than some of our commonest and simplest ideas, especially when they have become encrusted and disguised by the clumsy workmanship of science, falsely so called. But I was, I must confess, rather surprised that Mr. J. (p. 550) should endeavour to express what he conceived me to mean in language very foreign to the style of my letter. The error which he attributes to me, and which he combats, is, "that the death of Christ is not to be considered as making any

change in the mind of God." Now, I think that to explain the atonement, by referring to changes in the mind of the Deity, is to interpret Latin in Greek, or Greek in Hebrew. I did not, therefore, refer at all to this point, nor use any words of like import, as may be seen, if any of your readers think it worth while to turn to page 356. But as the subject is on the table, I would reply to Mr. Jevans, that, in the same sense as the sacrifices, and other things mentioned by Mr. J., changed the mind of God, I believe that this effect was produced by the death of our Lord. That change was manifested by the repeal of that sentence of death which passed upon Adam, and which, after overshadowing the world above four thousand years, was for ever done away by our Lord's resurrection. However, as this language is not scriptural, and appears to me rather to obscure than illustrate the subject, I would rather avoid the use of it. On the other hand, I beg to say that Mr. J. perfectly meets my views, when he says "that we cannot adopt a surer method to come at the truth concerning the effects of the blood and death of Christ, than by considering what is said concerning the nature and effects of the Jewish sin-offerings." They were not appointed as confirmations of the truth, or as examples of conduct, but they were manifestly the considerations or conditions on which it pleased God, on those several occasions, to suspend his displeasure. Just so the Scripture appears to me to represent the death of our Master: it was the consideration on which it pleased God to suspend the curse of Adam, and establish the new covenant of life and immortality. The point at which I aimed was this, that there appears no ground why either the atonement of the death of Christ, or those made by the Jewish sacrifices, should be referred to those mystical views about the satisfaction of the Divine justice, which the Calvinists so continually inculcate, rather than to the impressions which they were calculated to make on mankind. Mr. J. supposes "that the sacrifices were designed to lead the offerer to consider the evil of his ways." I supposed this very same end to have been

designed by our Lord's death, and to have been the source of its atoning virtue. Not that I presumed that the whole efficacy of his death turned on this point: I only proposed it as one very intelligible part of it; for more may be yet concealed behind the impenetrable veil which hides the spiritual world. After this explanation, I trust that Mr. Jevans will suppose that there is nothing in my views materially differing from his own, or which deserves his reprehension.

In reply to your Correspondent F. B. [p. 552], I will first endeavour to point out the peculiarities which distinguish the high Calvinistic atonement, or rather satisfaction, from the doctrine which I meant to defend. It rests, I conceive, on a peculiar hypothesis, on which the other does not rest in *any the least degree*. That hypothesis is this; that the nature of the Divine justice is such, that when once a sin is committed, the full punishment of that sin must inevitably be inflicted, no other remission being possible than that of substituting an innocent person in the place of the guilty: thus that the justice of God is as an unrelenting creditor, who will be paid the uttermost farthing, though, indeed, he is not so careful by whom that payment is made. Furthermore, as the same party contends that the guilt of sin is infinite, so it follows that for the least offence, an infinite punishment or an infinite satisfaction becomes immediately inevitable; which amounts to this, that if any creature should sin, either the Deity himself must bear the punishment, or that creature must suffer everlasting and infinite torment. This is, strange to say, the popular doctrine: in this, but a few years ago, as F. B. says of himself, I was a devout believer; but so repugnant does it now appear to me to Scripture and every endearing view of God; so does it mar the fair face of creation, and turn the universe into one house of mourning, that I could not think of defending any doctrine involving such principles. My aim is of a far simpler kind: it does not belong to me, if it does to any man, to invent hypotheses and frame systems on such subjects as these: and if I attempted to bring forward any new or subtle

explanations, I should stand convicted of palpable folly. My view regards no more than the plain connexion of two great events; it is more of an historical than doctrinal complexion, according in this with that fine remark, "that Christianity is a religion of facts." The two facts are, first, the sufferings and death of our Lord Jesus Christ; secondly, those privileges and blessings which were conferred on mankind by his resurrection; or, in other words, that forgiveness of sins which we receive in him. Before I go further I would observe, that this forgiveness of sins, which we thus receive, is by no means to be confounded with that general favourable disposition, with which a penitent is always regarded by God: I am not for adopting the strange language of those who speak of the death of Christ as giving efficacy to repentance; let us not judge by supposed cases, but by the real facts—the facts which the gospel records and predicts, and no others. These facts may be briefly stated: our Lord Jesus, being without sin, suffered and died; that is the first: the second is, that having risen again, he has brought life and immortality to light, and is exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance to his people, and remission of sins. Now the question relates to the dependence of the latter of these events on the former, and may be stated thus: Does not the Scripture represent the former of these events as *appointed* by the Divine wisdom *to prepare the way for the latter, and that in consideration of mankind being sinners; and the latter event involving the forgiveness of their sins?* I must leave this question, Sir, with F. B. and your readers—we cannot all see things alike; but to my mind the answer shines unambiguous with the clear and steady light of truth. I will not trouble you now with texts; I think there is none clearer or stronger than the simple statement, that "Jesus died for our sins." I care little about the word atonement, or any other theological phrase; only let such expressions as that just quoted, be used as freely and fearlessly as they are in the New Testament, and I shall desire no more. The connexion between the steps of our redemption, as pointed out in

Scripture, should not be lost sight of or lightly regarded; for, no doubt, to bear it in mind concerns both our holiness and our comfort.

F. B. considers the atonement as turning on the Deity of Christ: in answer, I avail myself of the words of an able defence of Unitarians, lately published. (*Appeal to Scripture and Tradition*, p. 140.) It is there said, "The atonement is commonly thought to be interwoven with the divinity of Christ, but erroneously. The atonement, or propitiation, does not of itself prove Christ's divinity or his superangelic nature: the *simple humanity* of Christ's nature *does not of itself disprove the atonement.*" The Jewish sacrifices were atonements in the appointed cases; Job's offering was an atonement for his friends; an act of Phinehas made atonement for the whole people of Israel: why then should an Unitarian think the mediation of the Lord Jesus an insufficient atonement for the sins of the whole world? These things do not depend on weight and measure, but on the good pleasure of the only wise God. The question is simply, "Cui dabit partes scelus expiandi?"

THOMAS FOSTER BARHAM.

London,

December 1, 1819.

SIR,
HAVING been repeatedly told that I ought to have taken some notice of Mr. Procter's letter, which appeared in the *Monthly Repository* for November, 1818, p. 688, respecting the state of sundry Presbyterian Chapels in the county of Stafford; and observing that the subject is again alluded to in your last Number, at p. 673, I now send you such information as I am in possession of, respecting the one at Newcastle-under-Line, and hope that this may induce some other persons to furnish you with similar communications from Stone and Stafford.

Twenty-five years ago, the Old Presbyterian Chapel at Newcastle was used regularly for public worship, and though the congregation was small, some of the most respectable people in the town and neighbourhood belonged to it. By the death of a gentleman of great opulence and considerable consequence in the county

of Stafford, which happened in the beginning of the year 1795, the number of the trustees of the chapel was reduced to three, and in consequence of this a new trust, comprising the principal people of the congregation, was formed, and the deed was executed before the expiration of that year.

Notwithstanding this had been effected, several members of the congregation left the chapel immediately afterwards, in consequence of the minister having contracted habits of intemperance; and from that time other persons left it by degrees, until the place was entirely deserted. The building was then let to the members of the Established Church for a school, and was occupied by them for many years; during which time it suffered very shameful dilapidation, and became unfit for a place of public worship.

I was, however, surprised a few months ago at being applied to as one of the trustees, respecting an intended revival of the old interest, and craving my co-operation and assistance. Since then, I am informed that some of the old members have obtained possession of the building, and that the roof was taken off, only about a fortnight ago, preparatory to its undergoing a thorough repair; and that the Presbyterian body at Newcastle are determined to exert themselves to render the chapel comfortable, and to procure, as soon as possible, a regular minister. But as their numbers are small, and the expenses of repairing the building will be very considerable, I believe they do not expect to realize their intentions without the assistance of other congregations.

S. P.

*Walthamstow,
December 4, 1819.*

SIR,

ALLOW me to join Mr. Howe, [p. 661,] in recommending to the attention of our Unitarian friends the Society for the Relief of Aged and Infirm Dissenting Ministers. For what reasons they have hitherto been backward upon this occasion, I have no right to inquire. But if there are any who think that it will wound the

VOL. XIV.

5 D

feelings of ministers in distress to be relieved by this Society, I can only say, that to me this apprehension appears altogether groundless. It will not, I conceive, wound any man's feelings to receive assistance from a fund which was not raised in consideration of his individual case, but with a prospective view to the case of all who should be circumstanced as he is; nor will any man be ashamed to acknowledge himself poor, whose profession has been known to exclude the means of rising above poverty. The situation of Dissenting Ministers, who are solely or chiefly dependent upon the emoluments of their profession, does not appear to me to have been sufficiently considered. Their sensibilities are commonly somewhat refined by education; their office introduces them to the intimacy of men comparatively rich, and thus they contract a familiarity with the comforts and accommodations of what are called easy circumstances; the whole of their active life is not unfrequently one continued struggle with difficulties; and, at length, when overtaken by age and infirmity, they may, without any fault of their own, be thrown upon the support of precarious charity. Surely, to men thus circumstanced it will be cheering and consolatory to find that, while they are labouring to promote the best interests of mankind, the peculiarities of their condition are not overlooked, but that the more wealthy part of the Dissenting community are cheerfully contributing to a society, which has for its object the support and comfort of their declining years. It will be to them a delightful argument that they have not laboured in vain in inculcating the lessons of that Master, who left it as his last injunction to his followers, that they should love one another. What objections of any weight can be urged against the Institution in question, I am unable to conceive. But I shall, I trust, be excused if I remark, that those reasonings ought to be founded on clear and certain principles, which are allowed to stop the hand of charity. Benevolence may, indeed, be exercised indiscreetly; but it is better for a man's self that it should be indiscreetly exercised, than that it should

be checked by scrupulous and, perhaps, mistaken calculations of the good or evil by which its exercise might be followed. But no imaginable evil, that I can see, can possibly result from any support which is likely to be given to the Society for which Mr. Howe is pleading, and for which I sincerely hope that he may not plead in vain.

E. COGAN.

SIR,
THE respect I have entertained for your Correspondent Mr. Luckcock led me to expect from him rather an apology for his hasty accusation of Mr. Russell, the Resident at Hyderabad, than a vindication of it; rather a frank acknowledgment of having precipitately, I will not say "twisted," but, mistaken, the import of the quoted extract from his dispatch, than a perseverance in imputing to that gentleman sentiments and feelings disgraceful to humanity, and neither expressed nor implied in the voucher produced for them. I will notice very briefly what Mr. L. has further advanced, (p. 686,) and, to save time, in the order of its arrangement. Mr. L. observes, "*I merely said, 'It does not appear that Mr. Russell had any hand in this work of blood; but it gives him unmingled pleasure, without a particle of regret or commiseration.'*" Merely this! But, even this is begging the very question; for it is not deducible from the extract, that the murder of the Arabs was a source of either pleasure or pain to Mr. Russell, whose duty it was to state the circumstance, and which he has done "simply and drily." Mr. L. adds, "That the word '*pleasure*' [not applied to the miserable fate of the garrison] should be so conspicuous, without an iota of palliative, is a sufficient presumption that he sat down with feelings of exultation, untempered by the humanity which the case so strongly called for." This is, indeed, a sufficient presumption! somewhat similar, in common parlance, to making bad worse. But, is Mr. L. to be informed that the introduction of an "iota of palliative," or of the minutest observation upon the massacre into Mr. Russell's official dispatch, would have

been liable to animadversion as an obtrusive impertinence, and, perhaps, to censure as a departure from his province? Was it for him, in his station, to insinuate any disapprobation, or any private opinion, of the military operations which it devolved upon him to transmit an account of?

Mr. L. has incautiously drawn a bitter inference from premises that fail him, and, instead of handsomely retracting it, would support it by a *paraphrase*! He then appals us by bringing the probable circumstances of the tragedy before our eyes, as though I had inclined to palliate it; and spends his eloquence in arraignment of the system (which he does not charge me with advocating) that engenders such proceedings; all which has as much to do with the point at issue between him and me, as the battle of the frogs and mice. My unshaken position is, that Mr. Russell's communication intimated no sentiment or feeling of any description upon the event so justly deplored; and, therefore, Mr. L. has suffered himself to publish an unwarranted imputation upon a gentleman some thousand miles absent; which it was the purpose of my "pitiful cavil," or appeal to the plain sense of a document, (your readers will judge whether) to repeal.

But, is it true (I do not ask it offensively) that Mr. L. had *merely said* what he has quoted from himself? Is it nothing, speculating on Mr. Russell's undeclared sentiments, to have dragged him, in the face of his country, to the bar of final retribution as a culprit, abstaining only in words from anticipating the sentence of the divine assessor on his imputed delinquency?

Mr. L. has *merely* gone this length; and, to redeem Mr. Russell from such a woeful predicament, have I volunteered myself in your pages, I hope not intemperately. I have done with the subject, Sir, only remarking that Mr. L. has called to my recollection the old ballad of Katherine Hays, who had as little mercy on her husband, as he on Mr. Russell,

"And, finding no hole in his coat,
She *picked* one in his skull."

BREVIS.

The Nonconformist.
No. XV.

(Concluded from p. 685.)

On the Sentiments of the early Continental Reformers respecting Religious Liberty.

THE specimens already given must suffice of the sentiments of the Lutheran school on religious liberty. The opinions held by the Reformers of Switzerland come next to be considered. At the head of these stands Zuinglius, whose labours were contemporary with those of Luther, though they acted wholly independently of each other. Zuinglius wrote a treatise on the Office of the Magistrate: but though in this work he assigns to the magistrate the duty of preserving and protecting the Church, and states several things about punishing certain offenders capitally, he never drops the least hint of his right or duty to put reputed heretics to death. His language would, on the contrary, rather seem to imply that he considered him not to be invested with the power of the sword in such cases. "The obedience," he observes, "which is due to magistrates should by no means be carried so far, nor has God committed to them such power, as that they should rule the minds and consciences of men." * And again, "God has ordained that we should be obedient to magistrates, who bear the sword committed to them, in those things which relate to the intercourse of life, to business, friendship and society; but," he adds, "let not the magistrate punish any other offence which relates to the internal consciences of men, for the judgment of these things is in the hand of God." †

* "Nequaquam autem, ea quæ illis (Magistratibus) debetur obedientia tam procul extenditur, nec tantum potestatis ipsis divinitus commissum est, ut in animas quoque et conscientias hominum dominentur, et imperitent." Minus Celsus, ut supra, fol. 116, b.

† "Deus enim oportet, nos esse subditos Magistratui, qui gladium sibi commissum gestat, in hisce rebus nimirum quæ vitæ conversationem, commercia, amicitias, socialitiam, adeoque ipsam vitam hanc corporalem affinem, et ad humanæ justitiæ leges,

Zuinglius was succeeded in the Church of Zurich by Bullinger, a man of great talents, and a zealous promoter of the Reformation. Bullinger is thought to have maintained in some of his earlier works, that errors in opinion should be wholly left to the Divine judgment: but if this be the case, his ideas at a later period were very different. "There are," he remarks, "some blasphemies, so impious and horrible, that they cannot even be heard, much less be tolerated; some which tend directly and openly to the subversion of the state, unless they be suppressed in time." "Those who pertinaciously err, who labour to draw others with them into error, and to keep them in their mistakes; blasphemers, disturbers, and subverters of the Church, may lawfully be put to death." *

The opinion expressed by this writer concerning the fate of Servetus, will both illustrate his sentiments upon religious liberty, and shew the temper and spirit with which he regarded those who dissented from the popular creed. "Servetus," he writes, "was indeed burnt at Geneva, but not without the advice of the other Evangelical Churches of the Helvetic Republic, to the most honourable Senate of Geneva, which had applied for their opinion. For many ages there have not been seen blasphemies so foul, atrocious, monstrous and abominable against the Divine Majesty, and the purity of the true faith, as this most filthy monster of a man, and disgraceful wretch, has published in a printed work, and has impiously,

et præscriptum possunt referri." "Nec ullum aliud facinus persequetur, quod internam hominis conscientiam spectat; horum enim judicia in manu Dei sunt." Minus Celsus, fol. 117, a.

* "Sunt quædam adeo blasphema, impia et indigna ut ne audiri quidem, nedum ferri possint. Sunt quæ recta et palam tendant in subversionem Reipublicæ, nisi in tempore sopiantur."

"Pertinaciter errantes, et alios secum in errorem abducere, inque erroribus retinere contententes, blasphemæ, et perturbatores imò subversores ecclesiarum jure cædi possunt." Vide Bezæ, de Hæreticis à Civili Magistratu puniendis Libel. (8vo. 1554,) pp. 265, 266.

wantonly and pertinaciously defended even to his death. For whatever he had for about twenty-five years, imbibed from all the schools of the Jews and Turks, whatever also he had collected from the execrable blasphemies of heretics, or from the infernal sinks and sewers, he has transfused into his book, and presented as a Circean, or rather Tartarean, cup to the people and nations. But all laws, as well divine as human, of emperors, princes, states and people in their right mind, command that blasphemies should be punished. This, when the most honourable Senate of Geneva did in virtue of its sacred office, it did what it ought."*

From Zurich we proceed to Geneva,—where the conduct of Calvin, in instituting the proceedings against Servetus, and aiding in bringing him to the stake, leaves no room for doubt or hesitation as to his sentiments concerning religious liberty. The part which he acted on that occasion he has not blushed to avow, and has vindicated and justified, in an elabo-

* It seems impossible to do justice to the language of the original in a translation. Let the reader, if he so please, make the attempt. "Exustus est quidem Genevæ M. Servetus, sed non citra consilium reliquarum rerumpublicarum Helveticarum Evangelium profitentium, ad amplissimum Genevensis Senatum petiit. Et multa jam secula non viderunt unquam adeo fœdas, atroces, prodigiosasque et abominandas in Dei Majestatem fideique veræ sinceritatem blasphemias, atque spurcissimum hoc hominis monstrum propudiumque libro edito in lucem profudit, et in mortem usque impiè, procaciter, et pertinaciter, defendit. Nam quicquid annis plus minus 25 hausit ex omnibus Judæorum et Turcarum scholis, quicquid item ex omnibus hæreticorum execrandis blasphemias, ceu ex sentinis et cloacis infernalibus collegit, hoc totum, transfusum in detestandum opus typis excusum, ceu poculum Circeum immo Tartareum, populis et gentibus propinavit. Jubent autem omnes leges divinæ pariter et humanæ, Imperatorum, Principum, urbiumque, et populorum saniorum de blasphemias sumere supplicium. Quod cum amplissimus Genevensis Senatus fecit, pro pio suo officio, quod debuit fecit." Bullinger, in præf. ad Jos. Simleri Lib. iv. de æterno Dei Filio. Item. Apud Bock, Hist. Antitritin. II. 379.

rate treatise, composed expressly with this view,* and written in a spirit congenial with the deed it attempts to defend. It would seem that Calvin, on his first joining the Reformers, held more tolerant sentiments towards those who differed from him in their religious tenets, than he avowed in the latter part of his life. This appears from a passage in the first edition of his Institutes, which was afterwards suppressed or altered.†

* *Defensio Orthodoxæ Fidei de Sacra Trinitate, contra prodigiosos Errores Michaelis Serveti Hispani, ubi ostenditur Hæreticos jure gladii coercendos esse, et nominatim de homine hoc tam impiè, justè et meritò sumptum Genevæ fuisse supplicium. Per J. Calvinum. 8vo. 1554.*

† I record this fact on the authority of the Answer to Calvin's book against Servetus, which bears the following title:—"Contra Libellum Calvini in quo ostendere conatur Hæreticos jure gladii coercendos esse." 12mo. 1562. The first edition of the Institutes was published at Basil, in 8vo. in 1536. This work was, however, little more than a rough draught of the treatise. The second edition, considerably enlarged, was printed at Strasburgh, in folio, in 1539. It is disputed among Bibliographers, whether the author prefixed his name to this edition. There appears to have been a copy in London bearing his name on the title-page; but there was a copy of the same date in the Library of the Sorbonne at Paris, with the fictitious name of "Alcuinus." It would seem, besides, from the dedication to the London copy, that the name of Alcuinus had been originally prefixed to that also, and that the title-page had been cancelled, in order to insert the name of the author. The dedication begins as follows:—"Potentissimo, Illustrissimoque Monarchæ, Magno Francorum Regi, Principi ac Domino suo, ALCUINUS." See Vogt, *Catalogus Historico-Criticus Librorum Rariorum*, &c. p. 162. As these early editions of Calvin's Institutes are of extreme rarity, and as the Answer to his book against Servetus is also scarce, I shall transcribe the passage referred to in the text:

"Qui vero aut nobiscum non consentiunt in eandem fidem, aut etiam si confessionem in labris habent, Deum tamen, quem ore confitentur, operibus abnegant (ut quos videmus in omni vita sceleratos ac perditos, peccandi voluptate ebrios, malisque suis indormientes) hujusmodi omnes suis se inditiis produnt non esse ad præsens ecclesiæ membra. In hunc usum

After stating that those who do not agree with us in faith ought only to be excommunicated, and then be "left

constitutæ sunt excommunicationes, quibus à fidelium consortio abdicarentur atque expellerentur ii, qui fidem Christi falso obtinentes, vitæ nequitia, effrænique peccandi licentia nihil aliud sunt quam scandala ecclesiæ; ideoque indigni qui Christi nomine gloriantur. Primum ne cum Dei contumelia inter Christianos nominentur, ac si sancta ejus ecclesia foret maleficorum et publica improborum hominum conjuratio. Deinde ne frequenti consuetudine alios corrumpant perversæ vitæ exemplo. Postremo ut eos ipsos pudore confusos suæ turpitudinis pœnitere incipiat, ac ex ea pœnitentia resipiscere tandem discant. Tales quidem judicare possumus pro tempore ab ecclesia alienos, quantum cernere datur, ac secundum eam quam diximus noticiæ regulam. Verum ne sic quidem desperandi à nobis sunt, quasi extra manum Dei abjecti, ac omnino nephas quampiam expungere ex electorum numero, aut desperare quasi jam perditum, nisi quos certo constet verbo Dei jam damnatos, ut si quis data opera ac destinata malitia veritatem oppugnet, ut opprimat Evangelium, et nomen Dei extinguat, et Spiritui Sancto resistat. De iis enim jam ore Dei pronunciatum est, cum dixit, non remitti peccatum in Spiritum Sanctum, neque in hoc seculo neque in futuro. Quod raro adeo à nobis sentiri potest (si unquam tamen potest) ut sanioris sit consilii expectare diem revelationis, nec temerè judicio Dei præire: plus licentiæ ne nobis in judicando arrogemus, nisi volumus Dei virtutem limitare, ac misericordiæ ejus legem dicere, cui quoties visum est, pessimi in optimos mutantur, alieni inseruntur, extranei cooptantur in ecclesia, ut sic hominum opinionem eludat, et temeritatem retundat, ne sibi judicandi jus supra quam decet usurpare audeant. Danda potius opera, ut mutuo candore alter de altero quam poterit optimè fieri sentiamus; alii aliorum facta et dicta vicissim in optimam partem accipiamus, non, ut suspicaces solent, obliquè ac sinistrè torqueamus. Quod si qui ita perversi sunt ut de se benè sentire non permittant, eos tamen in manum Dei committamus, bonitatisque ejus commendemus, meliora de his sperantes, pacem et charitatem alamus, nec stolidè irrumpentes in secretiora Dei judicia, errorum tenebris nos involvamus. Et ut unico verbo absolvam, non personam ipsam, quæ in manu atque arbitrio Dei est in mortem abdicemus, sed tantum qualia sint cujusque opera æstimemus ex lege Dei, quæ boni et mali regula est. In hunc

in the hands of God, and commended to his goodness," he adds, "nor are those persons alone to be thus treated; but Turks also, and Saracens, and other enemies of true religion; so far are those methods from being to be approved, by which men have hitherto attempted to bring them over to their faith, while they have denied them water and fire, and the common elements; have withheld from them all the offices of humanity, and persecuted them with the sword."

The language he employs, in his Treatise on the Punishment of Heretics, is, however, very different. A summary of the sentiments maintained in that work, which sets out with explicitly denying the right of private judgment in religion, is comprised in the following passage:—"We know that there are three degrees of errors: some we allow ought to be pardoned; for others, moderate chastisement should suffice, so that only open impiety ought to be punished with death. Paul repeatedly exhorts believers to bear with one another, although there may be some disagreement among them; that is, if any trifling superstition or weakness have taken hold of the mind of simple persons, they are to endeavour to correct

sensum accipiendæ sunt excommunicationes, non quibus dejiciantur ex spe salutis, qui coram hominibus abdicantur ex ecclesiæ grege, sed ut in viam redeant, quemadmodum Paulus scribit se tradidisse hominem Sathanæ in interitum carnis, ut spiritus salvus fieret in diem Domini, hoc est, (ut ego quidem interpretor,) conjecisse in damnationem temporariam, ut in æternum salvus fieret. Itaque tametsi familiarius versari aut interiorem consuetudinem habere cum excommunicatis per ecclesiasticam disciplinam non liceat, debemus tamen contendere quibus possumus modis sive exhortatione ac doctrina, sive clementia ac mansuetudine, sive nostris ad Deum precibus, ut ad meliorem frugem conversi in societatem ac unitatem ecclesiæ sese recipiant. Neque ii modò sic tractandi sunt, sed Turcæ quoque ac Saraceni, cæterique veræ religionis hostes, tantum abest ut probandæ sunt rationes quibus eos ad fidem nostram adigere hactenus moliti sunt, dum aqua et igne, communibusque elementis illis interdiciunt, cum omnia illis humanitatis officia denegant, cum ferro et armis persequuntur."

it with patience, rather than be eager to punish it with violence. As to the second kind of error, although it deserves chastisement, it is to be treated nevertheless with moderate severity: only that care must be taken that the wickedness and contumacy of those who are endeavouring to break the unity of faith, be not increased by indulgence. But when religion is overthrown at its foundation, when detestable blasphemies against God are promulgated, and souls are hurried to perdition by impious and pestilent tenets, and when a defection from the one God and his pure doctrine is openly attempted, it becomes necessary to recur to that extreme remedy, lest the deadly poison should spread further.* Quotations need not be multiplied to shew what were Calvin's ideas on this subject. Indeed, to detail them at length, with the reasons by which they are supported, were to transcribe the greater part of this "Golden book," as Beza has designated it. Here then we shall leave him, and proceed to notice his friend Beza, who has stood forward, with a kindred spirit, as his defender and eulogist.

Beza's sentiments are to be seen in many incidental observations in his different publications, but principally in a letter which he addressed to Dudith, and in his celebrated book

* "Scimus enim tres esse errorum gradus: et quibusdam fatemur dandam esse veniam, aliis modicam castigationem sufficere, ut tantum manifesta impietas capitali supplicio plectatur. Fideles sæpius Paulus hortatur ut se invicem tolerant, quamvis aliqua sit inter eos dissensio: nempe, siqua levis superstitio et inscitia simplicium mentes occupat, ut eam patientia corrigere potius studiant quam intemperanter ad vindictam efferveant. Secundum errorum genus etsi castigationem meretur, mediocris tamen adhibenda est severitas: tantum ne indulgentia alatur eorum improbitas et contumacia qui fidei unitatem scindere cuperent. Sed ubi à suis fundamentis convellitur religio, detestandæ in Deum blasphemiae perferuntur, impiis et pestiferis dogmatibus in exitium rapiuntur animæ, denique ubi palam defectio ab unico Deo, puraque ejus doctrina tentatur, ad extremum illud remedium descendere necesse est, ne mortale venenum longius serpat." *Calvini Defensio Orthod. Fidei*, &c. 8vo. 1554, p. 31.

on the right of the Civil Magistrate to punish Heretics,* a title which has been aptly paraphrased "The right of the Civil Magistrate to be the Church's or the Presbytery's Hangman." In the former work, advert- ing to a remark of Dudith's that Beza and the Protestants contended that liberty of conscience should be allowed, he thus replies: "By no means, as this liberty is understood, that is, that every man may worship God as he pleases. For it is a mere dogma of devils that any person should, if he wishes, perish. Pastors, therefore, should not only, as far as lies in their power, prevent their sheep from perishing, but should also admonish and chastise them, and at last, if necessary, after other remedies have been tried in vain, drive them from the rest of the flock." "That is a diabolical liberty which at this day fills Poland and Transylvania with so many plagues, which no other region under the sun would tolerate."† But his ideas are developed more at large in the latter publication, wherein he fully explains the policy he would recommend and pursue as the substitute of that "diabolical liberty" of conscience which was so much the object of his abhorrence. It must suffice at present to say of it, without citing the author's words, that he argues at great length, and with much bitterness of language, that heretics may lawfully be put to death, by the civil magistrate, and he refers to the cases of Gentilis and Servetus as in-

* *De Hæreticis à Civili Magistratu puniendis Libellus, adversus Martini Bellii Farraginem, et novorum Academicorum Sectam. Theodoro Beza Vezelio auctore. Oliva Roberti Stephani. 1554. 8vo.*

† "Jactabimusne libertatem conscientis permittendam esse? Minimè, ut hæc quidem libertas intelligitur, id est, ut quo quisque modo volet Deum colat. Est enim hoc merè diabolicum dogma, sinendum esse unumquemque ut si volet pereat. Itaque nec pastores ovem patientur perire, quantum in se erit, sed monebunt, corripient, ac tandem si opus fuerit, cæteris frustra tentatis remediis à reliquo grege repellent." "Et illa est diabolica libertas, quæ Poloniam et Transylvaniam hodie tot pestibus implevit, quas nullæ alioqui sub sole regiones tolerarent."

stances of the just exercise of this authority.

We have now to state the sentiments of the third class of Reformers, whose opinions it was proposed to consider—those of the Established Church of Holland. A few words will suffice on this head, as these divines, after the example of Baldwin at Wittemberg, have embodied their thoughts on the subject of religious liberty in an academical thesis, proposed, by authority, to be discussed in the theological schools. This curious document they have intitled “A Disputation concerning lawful Homicide.” “In order,” they say, “that it may the better appear what idolater, heretic, and blasphemer is to be adjudged worthy of death, we will give a definition of each.” Accordingly they proceed as follows: “The idolater is deserving of capital punishment who, disregarding admonition, openly, designedly, and obstinately, so as to disturb the church and seduce others, substitutes some ideal object for the one true God, or joining some creature to him, as his companion, worships it with the one God, or who honours the true God alone, but not in that lawful manner prescribed in the Sacred Writings. The heretic is he who, separating himself from the church of which he had before, by an outward profession, declared himself to be a member, maintains an error which is opposed to the foundations of faith, and to the prophetic and apostolical doctrine delivered in the Scriptures, and from which, though often and properly admonished, and convinced from the word of God, both publicly and in private, he refuses to desist; who will not acknowledge the truth revealed in the writings of the apostles and prophets, but rather with invincible and pertinacious impiety rejects it, strives to wound the peace and harmony of the church, and opening the school of his perfidy, both in public and in private, endeavours, as far as he is able, by his writings and speeches, to introduce the faction and gangrene of his pestiferous doctrines into the church, or to cherish it after it has been introduced by others.

“The blasphemer is he who publicly, with deliberate purpose, obstinately disregarding admonition, either

slanderosly and contumeliously utters something unbecoming concerning the true God, attributing to him that which does not comport with him, taking away that which does pertain to him, and transferring to a creature that which belongs to God alone; or else by an impious act impedes and tramples upon true divine worship, or endeavours to impede and trample upon it. Whoever,” they add, “is found guilty of either of these crimes, as they are here stated, ought to be punished with death by the magistrate.” *

* Disputatio de Homicidio legitimo—ad disputandum proposita in Collegio Theologico. Illustrissimis D.D. Ordinum Hollandiæ et Westphrisiæ, Anno 1602.

§ vii. “Quo autem melius constet quanam morte dignus Idololatra, Hæreticus, Blasphemus sit judicandus, singulorum definitionem proponemus; deinde, qui tales reperiuntur quales descriptio exigit, eos occidendos esse, rationibus ex jure divino humanoque ex saniorum hominum testimonio petitis probabimus.”

§ viii. “Capitali supplicio dignus *Idololatra* est, qui palàm, data opera, neglectis admonitionibus, obstinatè ut turbet Ecclesiam, et alios seducat, vice unius veri Dei fictum aliquem habuerit, aut præter unum illum, creaturam aliquam ipsi quasi socium adjungens coluerit, aut denique verum quidem Deum solum, sed non legitimo in sacris literis præscripto modo, honoraverit. *Hæreticus* est, qui ab ecclesia, cujus se membrum externa professione antea declaraverit, seipse separans, errorem fundamentis fidei, et Propheticæ Apostolicæque doctrinæ in Scripturis traditæ adversantem tuetur, de quo tamen sæpe et rite admonitus convictusque ex verbo Dei, tam publicè quam privatim contemptis admonitionibus non vult desistere, nec veritatem in scriptis Apostolorum et Prophetarum revelatam agnoscere; sed potius invicta et pertinaci impietate ei resistens, ecclesiæ pacem et concordiam lacerare contendit, suæque perfidiæ ludum publicè et privatim aperiens, pestiferi dogmatis factionem et gangrænam scriptis conscionibusque suis, quantum in se est, vel in ecclesiam Dei invehere, vel ab aliis invectam fovere. *Blasphemus* est, qui publicè, deliberato animo, neglectis admonitionibus, præfractè, vel maledica lingua, contumeliosè de Deo vero, indignum quippiam effutit, tumtribuendo ei quod ipsi non competit, tum adimendo quod ei proprium est, tum transferendo in creaturam quod est Dei solius, vel facto impio cultum divinum verum impedit, conculcat, aut impedire et conculcare conatur.”

The classes which have been enumerated comprise the three great divisions of Reformers who retained, among other relics of Popery, the doctrine of the Trinity. It would have been easy to swell the extracts with passages from the works of other eminent persons of these schools, especially from those of Brentius, Musculus, Wolfgang Capito, Bucer and Peter Martyr, who all concurred in the sentiments which have been quoted, so far at least as to admit that the civil magistrate might lawfully coerce and punish reputed heretics and blasphemers, who publicly professed and taught their opinions. But the limits of this essay will not allow of quotations from their writings, and they are unnecessary, in such a brief summary, to illustrate the subject.

A compendium of the sentiments of the early Reformers respecting religious liberty would, however, be defective without including the opinions which were held and acted upon by some of the Antitrinitarians of the same period. The persecution of Francis David in Transylvania, requires that some notice should be taken of Blandrata and Faustus Socinus, who are connected with that disgraceful transaction, either as instigators or abettors. Of Blandrata it will be sufficient to state, that the whole of the proceedings against David had his approbation, and were, most probably, planned and conducted by him. That Socinus countenanced the prosecution, so far at least as related to the deposition and imprisonment of the venerable superintendant, must be received as matter of authentic history.* It is further evident, that in doing this he acted in conformity with his principles, it being his declared opinion, that, in certain cases, men might lawfully be restrained by the civil power. Writing

* For a detailed account of the proceedings relative to Francis David, the reader is referred to Dr. Thomas Rees's *Historical Introduction to his Translation of the Racovian Catechism*, pp. xlv. &c. The conduct of Socinus, in this persecution, has been considered, and the charges preferred against him, have been stated and examined, by the writer of the present essay, in the *Nonconformist*, No. V. Mon. Repos. XIII. 382, &c.

to Martin Vadovitz, a professor in the Academy of Cracow, and alluding to some persecution he had experienced, he thus expresses himself:—"But you will ask, Why do you affirm, that although you were an Heresiarch, and an obstinate one, you ought not to have been treated with this great severity? I answer, because when there is a freedom from sedition, and the pursuit of self-interest, then the Heresiarch does not labour under a fault of the will, but of the understanding. Therefore, as we restrain, and, if it be necessary, confine in chains, mad and frantic persons who would otherwise be injurious to others, and at the same time greatly pity them; so an Heresiarch of this sort ought not to be treated with the utmost severity, but should meet with pity: and the only thing to be regarded is, to hinder his endeavours to propagate his doctrine, and if it cannot be otherwise done, by chains and a prison."*

The preceding statements are taken from the writings and conduct of persons of the first celebrity in their respective communions, and may be regarded as the standard of opinion on the subject of religious liberty in the several countries in which they resided. It must not be concluded, however, that these views were held universally among the friends and promoters of the Reformation. There is abundant evidence to prove that sentiments far more just and liberal were embraced and avowed in the same period, by persons of distinguished learning and character. This may fairly be inferred from the general feeling of disapprobation which the proceedings against Servetus excited throughout Europe, and the necessity under which Calvin and his associates found themselves of entering upon an elaborate defence of their conduct. But, in addition to this, it is to be observed, that several very able works appeared shortly after this atrocious murder, reprobating the whole transaction in the strongest terms, and maintaining the most enlarged principles of religious freedom. In the number of these may be first

* Toulmin's *Life of Socinus*, pp. 104, 105. *Socini Opera*, I. 476, b.

mentioned the work, purporting to be the compilation of Martin Bellius, to which Beza's treatise is professedly an answer; a work, of which it may be conjectured, from his manner of speaking of him, that Beza knew the author.* Another work appeared, anonymously, about the same period, under the title of "An Answer to Calvin's Book, in which he endeavours to shew that Heretics may be lawfully put to Death."† The

* "De Hæreticis, an sint persequendi, et omnino quo modo sit cum eis agendum, doctorum Virorum tum veterum, tum recentiorum Sententiæ. Liber hoc tam turbulento tempore pernecessarius, et cum omnibus, tum potissimum Principibus et Magistratibus utilissimus, ad discendum, quodnam sit eorum in re tam controversa, tamque periculosa officium." Magdeburgi, 1554. The contents are, "1. Martini Bellii præfatio, in qua quid sit hæreticus, et quidnam cum eo agendum sit, demonstratur. 2. Aretii Cathari sententia, in qua apertè ostenditur hæreticorum punitionem ad magistratum non pertinere. 3. Joannis Witlingii de Anabaptistis, et cæteris qui hæretici habentur sententia, quæ idem docet. 4. Aliorum Authorum, tum veterum, tum recentiorum eadem de re sententiæ. 5. Basilii Montfortii refutatio eorum, quæ pro persecutione dici solent."

Bock (Hist. Antitrin. Vol. II. p. 639) states that Beza, in his Life of Calvin, attributes it to Lælius Socinus; but on referring to that work it will be seen that he expressly ascribes it to Castalio. His words are, "Celuy-ci (Sebastien Chastillon) qui auoit tousiours tenu de la perfection Anabaptistique mais secrete-ment et entre les siens, ne faisant au surplus difficulté de s'accommoder à chacun, estant aussi grandement irrité de la mort de Seruet, se descourrit ouuertment, premierement en vn liure qu'il fit imprimer en Latin et en François, sous vn faux nom de Martin Bellie: aux erreurs et blasphemies duquel ie respondi lors." "L'Histoire de la Vie et Mort de feu Mr. Jean Calvin, &c. Par Theodore de Beza. A Geneve, 1663." 12mo, p. 79.

† "Contra libellum Calvinii in quo ostendere conatur Hæreticos jure Gladii coercendos esse." The first edition of this very scarce work was printed in 1554. It was reprinted in Holland in 1612, according to Sandius, but according to Vogt, in 1662. This difference respecting the date has probably been occasioned by the manner in which it is printed on the title page, which is as follows—MDLXII; but may not this be read 1562? Sandius

writer's plan is first to give Calvin's own words, dividing his work into sections, and then to answer these sections, *seriatim*. At the end are appended some smaller pieces relating to the same subject. This is a very masterly performance. It has been ascribed severally to Castalio and Lælius Socinus. The internal evidence appears decisive against the former conjecture: the latter is most probably correct.* After this appeared an elaborate and able treatise against the capital punishment of heretics, which has also been attributed to both Castalio and Lælius Socinus, but which bears on the title page the name of the real author, Minus Celsus, a native of Sienna, and one of the early Italian Antitrinitarians.†

(Biblio. Antitrin. p. 20) calls this "a dialogue between Calvin and Vaticanus." But this is not correct. It assumes the dialogue form to the eye, from the extracts from Calvin's book, having his name prefixed to them, and the answers to them being headed "Vaticanus." This work is referred to by Mosheim, in his Life of Servetus, under the following title: "Dissertatio, qua disputatur quo jure quove fructu Hæretici sunt coercendi Gladio vel Igne, vel Dialogus inter Calvinum et Vaticanum." Vogt, ut supra, p. 164.

* Bock, following Mosheim, declares himself of opinion that it was written by neither Castalio nor L. Socinus. Hist. Antitrin. Vol. II. p. 639.

† In Hæreticis coercendis quatenus progredi liceat: Mini Celsi Senensis Disputatio. Ubi nominatim eos ultimo supplicio affici non debere apertè demonstratur. Christlingæ, 1577. This work afterwards appeared under the following title: Mini Celsi Senensis, de Hæreticis Capitali Supplicio non afficiendis. Adjunctæ sunt ejusdem Argumenti Theodori Bezæ et Andree Dudithii Epistolæ duæ contrariæ, &c. 1584. The extracts from this work given in the preceding pages, are transcribed from this edition which is the only one in my possession. There is a copy of the first edition in the British Museum. On collating the two editions I perceive that the body of the work, as far as the signature *h*, or p. 224, is identically the same in both, having the same typographical errata. The only part of the original work that appears to have been actually reprinted is that comprised in pp. 224—230. To the second edition are added the letters of Beza and Dudith, and the original preface has been exchanged

Though Faustus Socinus has expressed himself as averse to unrestrained Christian freedom, the Unitarians of that period are not to be considered as equally narrow in their sentiments. It would be no difficult task to produce passages from their writings which breathe a spirit of liberality worthy of the cause in which they stood forward so honourably as advocates and confessors.* But exclusively of incidental expressions which lie scattered in their publications, there exist two works in which the subject is professedly treated, and in which their sentiments are fully explained and openly asserted. The first, in order of time, is a tract, intitled *Vindiciæ pro Religionis Libertate*, bearing on the title the name of Junius Brutus, but which was really written by John Crellius.† The immediate object of the author is to shew that the Catholic government might safely grant full liberty of worship to the Unitarians as long as they conducted themselves peaceably. The work was written in consequence of the attempts that were making by the Catholics of Poland to subject the Unitarians in that country to some severe restrictive measures. The other is an anonymous

for a dedicatory epistle from "Valens Titus Ligius" to "Christophorus Cnapius Saxonus."

Schelhörn seems now to be considered as having set the question to rest concerning the author of this book. In his "*Amœnitates Literariæ*," Vol. VII. p. 86, he ascribes it to Minus Celsus, whom he shews to have been a person of some note in Italy among the literati of his time. See also Vogt, p. 187; Bock, Vol. II. p. 641; Zeltner's Notes to Ruarus's Epistles, p. 186.

* See particularly the admirable preface of A. Wissowatius, J. Stegman, to the Racovian Catechism, on "The Liberty of Prophesying." Rees's Racovian Catechism, pp. xcv. &c.

† Bock, Vol. I. p. 149. "That Crellius was the author of this work (which some have doubted) is proved by the MS. acts of the Synod, held at Racof in 1635, when it was ordered that Ruarus should take measures to have Crellius's book on the Maintenance of Peace and Faith towards Heretics (which is certainly the same work) printed in other countries." It is inserted in the folio edition of the collected works of Crellius, in the Biblioth. Frat. Polon. Vol. III. p. 521.

piece composed by Schlichtingius, and intitled *Apologia pro Veritate accusata*. It was addressed "to the States of Holland and West Frisia," in consequence of a decree passed by them against the Unitarians, in September 1653, and the applications of the ecclesiastical authorities to the magistrates to enact against them laws of still greater severity.* In both these tracts the fullest liberty of conscience is contended for by the illustrious authors.

From the representations which have now been made, a tolerably correct estimate may be formed of the sentiments of the early Continental Reformers on the subject of Religious Liberty. It is painful to observe that so many of those eminent persons, who have so well merited the applause of mankind by their honourable and successful stand against the tyrannical usurpations of the Church of Rome, should have admitted into their minds principles so hostile to the just rights of conscience, and so inconsistent with the conduct they had themselves pursued. In forming our estimate of their character, it is, however, but fair to grant them the full benefit of that equitable law, which requires that men should be judged by the principles of their times. Great allowance ought, no doubt, to be made for the circumstances in which they were placed, and the difficulties they had to encounter. It would, perhaps, be expecting too much from human nature were we to look for the most correct and enlarged sentiments on religious freedom from persons who had been nursed in the cradle of intolerance, and accustomed to bend their minds with implicit submission to the will of their spiritual superiors. But the largest concessions which justice and candour can demand for them will not go the full length of their justification in the intolerant and persecuting measures to which they too frequently resorted. Least of all will it allow that the bitter animosity, the cool, steady and relentless spirit of vengeance, with which, in some instances, they pursued men, for a mere difference of opinion, to the block and the

* Bock, Vol. I. p. 815.

stake, should be passed over, in any age, without reprehension.

Let it be considered, however, that whatever apology their circumstances may plead for the narrow views of religious liberty entertained by the early Reformers, and the persecutions into which their principles betrayed them, no excuse of a similar kind can justify or even palliate the same principles and conduct in the present age. Thanks to the ameliorating influence of Christianity, which has been silently and gradually, but, at the same time, effectually improving the human heart, and correcting the institutions of civil society, it is now no longer a question to be argued, at least among Protestants, whether it be lawful to put reputed heretics to death. Let it be hoped that the time is not far distant when it will also be deemed absurd and monstrous, a gross violation of Christian freedom, and of the rights of human nature, to subject men to any degree of inconvenience and suffering, to civil disabilities and penalties, for the opinions they may conscientiously hold on the subject of religion.

It may be remarked, in conclusion, that the first and fatal error of the early Reformers, and the cause of all their subsequent mistakes concerning religious liberty, was to ally religion with the state, and call in the aid of the civil magistrate to maintain their creed and worship. This should operate as a warning and admonition to after times. For it is not too much to say, that perfect freedom, which is every man's birthright, will in vain be hoped for until religion shall have been repudiated from her unholy union with political authority; until she shall be permitted to stand and to rule independent and alone; swaying her mild sceptre with all her native grace and benignity, inspiring every breast with love, and diffusing around universal harmony and peace.

R. S.

SIR,

AS the names of two of my most intimate friends, who cannot now answer for themselves, are mentioned in your very valuable Repository, (p. 658,) I think it a duty incumbent on me to state the fact more correctly than it is there given. In speaking of the Unitarian Society

established for the circulation of Books, it is said, that in the original formation of the Society the word "idolatrous" occasioned considerable discussion. The adoption of it, according to the statement of the writer, who represents himself as the originator of the Society, "cost the Society several of its most respectable members, and particularly the whole body of Unitarians then existing in the University of Cambridge, amongst whom were Mr. Jones, the late celebrated tutor of Trinity, and Mr. Tyrwhitt, of Jesus College." Mr. Jones had been my private tutor, and we ever after lived on most intimate terms of friendship, of which a public testimonial was given in the University, and it will never be erased from my mind. In a similar manner I was connected with Mr. Tyrwhitt, with whom I was particularly intimate for the greater part of the time that I was a resident member of Jesus College, and afterwards our intercourse was kept up by letter and occasional visits to the University. I might add here that his friendship to me was marked at his death by the kind notice taken of me in his will.

I remember perfectly well our secession from the Unitarian Society for the distribution of Books, and I can confidently state that my two friends above-mentioned and myself left it on other grounds besides those stated in your Repository. I have not before me the prospectus which was then in our hands, but I recollect thus much, that it did not agree with the views which we entertained of our Saviour's character. We certainly did object to the term *idolatrous*, not only because we thought it not a proper term to be used, when it is strictly analyzed, but also because it was an offensive term, and introduced without any necessity.

Mr. Tyrwhitt retained the same opinion to his death, and I have not altered mine. In some of your preceding Numbers I have given my reasons for differing from Mr. Belsham in his definition of Unitarians: and, according to his description of them, Mr. Tyrwhitt and myself are equally excluded from belonging to that body. Indeed, Mr. Tyrwhitt would have expressed himself with some degree of indignation, if, because he was an

Unitarian in the true sense of the word, the dogmas of Mr. Belsham annexed to it were supposed to be part of his creed.

Mr. Belsham has certainly a right to use words in what sense he pleases; but it does not follow, that the sense he chooses to give it is the true sense of the word. He may say, if he pleases, that he is an Unitarian, and nobody else is an Unitarian but who believes according to his standard of faith. That may be the law for those within his pale:

Illâ se jactet in aulâ

Æolus.

There is and will be, I am persuaded, a body of Unitarians, however small, who will be contented with the short creed given by our Master: "This is life eternal to know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent:" and to all who hold this faith they will be happy in holding out the right hand of fellowship, though they may entertain very different opinions on certain points, which Mr. Belsham lays down as essential to Unitarianism. In this small number I profess to be.

W. FRENCH.

Bristol,

December 8, 1819.

SIR,
MR. BELSHAM'S communication, respecting the proceedings at the last annual meeting of the *Western Unitarian Society*, appears to me to require some notice on the part of those who supported the alteration to which he refers.

As a part of my case, I must beg you to insert the Notice which was given of the approaching Meeting in your Number for June [p. 396].

"Agreeably to the resolutions of the General Meeting of 1818, it will be referred to the ensuing Meeting, to consider the propriety of altering that part of the Preamble which relates to the doctrinal principles on which the Society is founded, so as to open it to all who worship the Father as the only true God, and worship him alone.

"The part of the Preamble referred to is as follows: '—declaring it to be the fundamental principle of the Society, in which we all agree, that there is but one God, the Creator and Governor of the universe, without an equal or a vicegerent, the only proper object of religious wor-

ship; and that Jesus Christ was the most eminent of those messengers which he has employed to reveal his will to mankind, possessing extraordinary powers similar to those received by other prophets, but in a much higher degree.'"

On this Notice I have only to observe, that the Resolution at Ilminster was expressed more loosely, *to include Unitarians of every description*; and that it was directed to be inserted in the Catalogues, and I think in the Monthly Repository; but that the above Notice was sent when the writer was from home, and he had no document to refer to.

To explain the share which I took in the proposed alteration, I must be indulged in a retrospective detail.

About the time when the W. U. S. was to be held in Exeter, (1811, when Mr. Kentish delivered his excellent discourse on the *Connection between the Simplicity of the Gospel, and the Leading Doctrines of the Protestant Cause*;) its exclusive constitution formed the subject of discussion. Some, who on the ground of Christian duty united with us in the Exclusive Worship of God even the Father, and in the close bonds of Christian communion, and were very solicitous to promote, and to see promoted, the great principles which separate the Unitarian from the worship and communion of every other body of Christians, felt painfully that the limiting restriction of our Preamble prevented them from uniting with us in our exertions; which, but for that profession or test, they could conscientiously have done. I represented that the expression respecting the person of Christ was worded so generally, that some who did not believe in the Simple Humanity, had felt themselves at liberty to join us. The answer was, If the expression is not *designed* to exclude the believer in the Pre-existence, why not make it less definite? I was myself satisfied that by the original constitution of the Society, it was so designed; but I saw no reason why it should be so limited, as to exclude those whom Mr. Belsham himself allowed to be Unitarians. And if it could not be so far altered, my own wish was, that it should be made more definite.

On conferring with the two friends whose opinions were likely to decide

the question,—the able Preacher of the year, and my present highly-respected Colleague, (both of whom had been among the earliest supporters of the Society, and to the latter of whom it was under constant obligations for his judicious and zealous attention to its concerns,)—I found it met, so decidedly and unhesitatingly, with their disapprobation, that the question was not publicly agitated: and there the matter dropped.

Near the close of the year 1813, my friend Mr. Worsley, of Plymouth, communicated to me his conviction, that as the seat of the W. U. S. was so remote from the western part of Devon, and from Cornwall, it would promote the local interests of Unitarianism, if an Association for Devon and Cornwall was formed, upon a plan similar to that of the W. U. S., and which might be open to those who were not disposed to contribute so much as the subscription of the parent Society. I agreed with him on the desirableness of the plan, provided we adopted as the basis, that “*God, even the Father, is the Only True God, the Primary Source of all the blessings we enjoy through Christ Jesus, and the Only Proper Object of Religious Worship.*” This was agreed to. The first meeting of the Devon and Cornwall Unitarian Association, was held at Plymouth, in 1814, when 134 joined us, chiefly from those who had not before been connected with any other Unitarian Society;* and our venerable and pious advocate, Dr. Toulmin, preached before the new Association, the sermon which he afterwards delivered before the W. U. S. at Yeovil. The two Societies had a common and most harmonious meeting at Exeter, in the year 1817, when Mr. John Kenrick delivered that masterly discourse, entitled *Unitarianism the Essence of Vital Christianity*, with which most of your readers must be well acquainted.—At a previous meeting of the W. U. S. at Bristol, 1815, when Mr. Fox delivered his eloquent and interesting *Reply to Popular Ob-*

jections against Unitarianism, some allusion was made, in the Report of the Committee, to a diminution of numbers caused by the establishment of the Devon and Cornwall Association; and it was stated in reply, that for every one that was lost, several were gained to the open avowal of the great principles of Unitarianism, and active exertions for the dissemination of them. The conversation at that time, respecting the basis of the Association, led Mr. Fox to say (to the best of my recollection) that he was not aware he had been preaching before a Society which made the doctrine of Simple Humanity an essential point of Unitarianism; and that he could not be a member of any Society which made it an *exclusive* bond of union.*

I do not recollect any thing more connected with the subject, till the spring of 1818, when Mr. Rowe received information from Mr. Fawcett, of Yeovil, that it was wished by some to propose at the ensuing meeting of the W. U. S. at Ilminster, an alteration in the Preamble of the Society, in order to open the door for the admission of those Unitarians who were now excluded. We could neither of us conveniently attend the meeting; but seeing in Exeter a friend who proposed going, I requested him to suggest to the meeting, that, as the subject was an important one, and few comparatively would be present, if it were moved at all, it should merely be to resolve that the question should be discussed at the next annual meeting. This suggestion was adopted. At the Ilminster meeting Mr. Yates of Birmingham was present; and the Members urged him to undertake the office of Preacher for the ensuing year: but he declined; and he was understood to state, that he could not be the Preacher of a Society which, from the then somewhat unsettled state of his mind on

* It was explicitly laid down as a principle, that “*union with this Association shall in no way imply approbation of all the books which may be admitted into the Catalogue.*”

* I trust that Mr. Fox and another of our ablest advocates, whom I shall soon have to mention, will excuse my adverting to their opinions. These assisted in deciding my mind, as to the course I should pursue on the question. They may have seen good reason to change them; and I am sure they ought to change them, if they have seen such reason.

the subject of the Pre-existence, he could not join as a Member. *

As the subject was publicly brought before the Society, I was solicitous that it should be fully discussed and laid to rest one way or other; and I more than once expressed, in our Committee meetings, my intention of delivering my sentiments at the annual meeting. I conceived that however expedient it might have been, when the Society was first instituted to make the avowal of the Simple Humanity an essential feature, (since, at that time, the Arians, however near in sentiment, were almost as much opposed to the believers of the Simple Humanity, and as much afraid of them, as the Trinitarians themselves were, and generally speaking were in no way disposed to unite with them in public efforts to oppose even the great errors of modern orthodoxy,) yet that the time is come, when the middle wall of separation, *in spirit and mutual co-operation*, ought to be broken down: that the great distinction now is, between the Trinitarian and the avowed Unitarian: that there is at least one doctrine, on which the believers of the Simple Humanity differ, which is vastly more momentous than that on which they agree, and in which most of the believers in the Simple Pre-existence, unite with the bulk of those who reject the Pre-existence,—the doctrine of Final Restoration: and that if the believer in the Pre-existence,—adhering strictly and openly to the great principles of Unitarianism, (the Unrivalled Supremacy, Exclusive Worship, and Essential Mercy, of God even the Father,) joining with us in our Unitarian Fellowship Funds, uniting with us exclusively in our Worship, and sitting down with us at the Lord's Supper,—were disposed to associate with us, (without expecting that we should alter our practice in the introduction of books into the Catalogue, or in other means for the dissemination of the Simple Humanity of Christ in connexion with the

Proper Unity of God,) provided we would cease to lay down the avowal of the Simple Humanity as an essential requisite for membership, we ought not to keep him aloof from us. —Firmly and unhesitatingly believing the doctrine of Simple Humanity, advocating it on all occasions where a regard to still more important principles permits me, and satisfied that the current of conviction will eventually lead every Unitarian to the reception of it, I nevertheless believed, that in the *present* state of the Unitarian controversy, the interests of pure Christianity would be more effectually served, by generally relinquishing this as an *exclusive* separating principle; and that even with respect to this doctrine itself, the doubters, or disbelievers, would be more likely to come to us, if they fought with us under common banners. With these views, which as yet I have seen no reason to change, I wished, as the measure had been brought forwards, that it should be subjected to a fair and ample discussion. When I reached Bath the evening before the meeting, I found that some of those who supported the alteration at the preceding meeting would not be present, and I could not learn that any arrangements had been made for bringing the matter regularly forwards. I believe those who wished the change, had done as I had myself, left the matter to its own course. I had myself had no communication with any of them with a view to it.—In these circumstances, I drew up the following resolutions, which, at the wish of Mr. Fawcett, whom alone I conversed with before the service commenced, I undertook to submit to the meeting.

“ That with a view to those believers in the Absolute Unity, Unrivalled Supremacy, Exclusive Worship, and Essential Unpurchased Love and Mercy, of God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hold the doctrine of the Simple Pre-existence of our Lord,—and to those who, though they cordially unite in these fundamental principles of Unitarianism, do not possess that decided conviction in the doctrine of the Simple Humanity, which would enable them to avow belief in it,—and also to those believers in the Simple Humanity, who, however important they estimate this doctrine, object to it as an *exclusive* test among persons who are united by the open avowal of doctrines which exclude all who

* I have somewhat recently heard, with great satisfaction, that he has publicly stated that his mind is no longer unsettled, but rests in the simple truth, that the Mediator between God and men was the MAN Christ Jesus.

consistently profess them from the fellowship and even the worship of other denominations of Christians,—that part of the Preamble of this Society which respects its fundamental principles, do stand as follows:

“That there is but One God, the Maker and Preserver of Heaven and of Earth and of all things therein, Jehovah, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our God and Father;—that Jehovah is One, in substance undivided, in glory unrivalled, supremely great, infinitely powerful, wise, and good, the Only Proper Object of Religious Worship, the Sole Original Source of every blessing both temporal and spiritual;—and that Jesus Christ was the most distinguished of the Messengers of His wisdom and mercy to the human race, authorized and empowered by Him to declare and execute the Gospel-scheme of salvation, or deliverance of mankind from sin and misery; but in every respect, and at every period, now and for ever, subordinate to and dependant upon Him, so that God may be all in all.*

“That by the proposed alteration in the Preamble, it is not intended to make any change whatever in the *practice* of the Society respecting its chief object, the distribution of books,—agreeably to which, the selection of books is regulated by what are regarded as the sentiments of the great bulk of its Members, while each individual is left to choose for himself what he pleases for his own employment, and is not regarded as responsible for the sentiments advocated or avowed in others.”

At the meeting for business, much time had been occupied, with considering various alterations proposed by the Committee in the Rules; and we came to the main point respecting the Preamble, too late to allow of that species of discussion which I had hoped for. Before the opportunity was afforded me of proposing the above resolutions, &c., the respected individual to whom, I presume, Mr. Belsham alludes, (as having, by his “good sense and solid arguments made a deep impression on all who heard him,”) in the commencement of his address, made a pointed declaration, which I conceive must have made a deeper impression than even his arguments, and which at least prevented the simple effect of these

from being ascertainable,—viz. that if the alteration was made, *several* (I think) of the oldest Members of the Society would withdraw from it. It is my earnest hope, that when any discussion on questions connected with the interests of Christian truth, occur among Unitarians, this mode of biassing a meeting may not be regarded as a precedent. If those Members were resolved to pursue such a measure, in case the disposition of the meeting favoured the alteration, perhaps (in the *present* case) it was desirable that their resolution should be made known before the final decision, but not at the beginning of a discussion.

When my resolutions were read, it seemed doubtful whether they would be seconded: but this was done by a Member from Bristol, with whom I had had no communication on the subject; and this (as far as I can recollect) was the case with respect to all the other Members present, except those in the Committee, at the meetings of which the subject had been brought forwards more than once.

In the course of my remarks to the general meeting, I adverted to the opinion, (which for the reasons already given I believe to be well-founded,) that, if they were otherwise disposed to join us, our Preamble would keep from us two distinguished advocates for Unitarian Christianity; and I conceived that this might be regarded as a specimen of its natural effect: I knew that it had had such an effect in other cases. It was stated in reply, that those individuals had for some time been Members of the *London* Unitarian Society; and this, the Parent Society, lays down, in more explicit yet more scriptural terms, the doctrine of the Simple Humanity as its exclusive basis. The principle on which mainly I advocated the change remained the same; but the practical desirableness of it was greatly lessened.

When as much had been said, on both sides, as the circumstances of the case allowed, understanding that the disposition of the meeting was against the change, and that it would be painful to some of those present to press a division, with the consent of the friend who had seconded my proposed reso-

* I perceive it would be easy to improve this declaration, but I have not felt myself at liberty to make any alteration in it.

lutions, *I withdrew them*. As far as the present prosperity of the Society is concerned, and the satisfaction of some of its most effective Members, I see no cause to regret the failure of the proposal.

And now I must offer a few remarks on some parts of Mr. Belsham's communication. I will take them as they occur. The letter itself has, without a doubt, been perused by all your readers, with the attention which every thing which comes from his pen receives among us; and I need not therefore quote at large.

(1) As far as I am concerned, (and I presume it was the case with others,) the question was not brought forwards "inadvertently," nor "under a mistaken notion of liberality." Had I been a Member of the W. U. S. at its commencement, I should have been one of those who conceived (as I still think) that the line of distinction was then necessary.—My opinion now is, that those who are excluded, by certain principles, from the worship and communion of every other Christian Church, and are united in worship and communion on those principles, and are alike strict in maintaining them, and alike *desirous of openly avowing and promoting them*, should make those principles the bond of union. And my conviction is, that by such a system, not only the great principles of Unitarianism would be most effectually promoted, but even those which most Unitarians decidedly believe to be scriptural truth respecting the person of Christ. It is not in my mind (I may venture to assert) the result of "latitudinarian principles," or concern for the *personal feelings* of those whom we exclude: however much I may be affected by these, I am not influenced by them: if I were, there are others to *outweigh* them on the other side.—As to *inadvertency*, after what I have said, let the reader judge. I know that in pursuing the course I did, I went on merely because I could not otherwise satisfy my own mind. Few could be aware of the painful feelings with which the previous discussions had been attended: and my own *wishes* were, that the subjects should have been dropped with the Annual Meeting. I knew nothing of the Report which a highly-valued friend sent you

of the proceedings; or I would have requested him simply to state, that the opinion of the Meeting was against the proposed alteration.

(2) Though *principle* should never be sacrificed, yet what is *unnecessarily offensive* to others should be avoided. The term *idolatrous* in the Preamble of the L. U. S., which was also adopted in that of the W. U. S., is to me extremely objectionable: if taken in the common acceptation it conveys a wrong idea; if not, it is at least useless. And it is my conviction, that such expressions have kept many more from Unitarianism, than they can possibly have brought to us. They needlessly arouse prejudice, more than they awaken inquiry.—Undoubtedly the noble band who "so strenuously insisted upon" "the retaining of this offensive expression" pursued that course which they thought principle required; and far be it from me to throw suspicion on their motives: but that it lost us the *public* (though I apprehend inconsistent) *avowal* of Unitarian sentiments and *co-operation* in the dissemination of them, by Jones, and Tyrwhitt, and "the whole body of Unitarians then existing in the University of Cambridge," must have operated greatly to produce the present blank with respect to Unitarian prospects in that University; and taken more generally, must have impeded the spread of our principles much more than the retaining of this offensive expression can have done good.

(3) In my judgment it is not a "trifling logomachy" in what way the term *Unitarian* shall be employed. Multitudes now glory in the name, with all its reproachful associations, and are getting nearer and nearer to us, the believers in the Simple Humanity, who, had it continued to be restricted to ourselves, would still have been at least on neutral ground, and unable to join with us (as they now do heart and hand) in the great and ennobling efforts which are making to disseminate our grand principles, and to participate in our cheering and encouraging prospects of their final triumph.

(4) The object of many of the books in the W. U. S. Catalogue, is, to promote the great principles of Unitarianism without entering into minor

distinctions, (such, for instance, as Mr. Gifford's *Elucidation*,) and those important practical consequences respecting the character and dealings of God which are affected but little by the doctrine of Simple Humanity. From these, a believer in the Pre-existence joining our Society, might make an ample selection for his own distribution.—Besides, many who held that doctrine, cheerfully distributed books in which the doctrine of the Simple Humanity is advocated, if they thought them suited effectually to promote the grand principles of Unitarianism: in like manner as many distribute the Improved Version who believe in the Miraculous Conception, and do not accord with some of the notes in other parts; and as many Unitarians distribute books of practical piety, even if here and there occur an expression in which they cannot unite; and as still more distribute Bibles and Testaments in the Authorized Version, though they are convinced that Solomon's Song is not a religious book and has no pretensions to divine authority, that the passage respecting the Three Heavenly Witnesses is a gross interpolation, and that in several other parts it does not exhibit the best representation even of the Received Text, and that this, in several places, departs from the *original* text.*

(5) If I understand the character of that upright, conscientious, and able individual, to whom the W. U. S. was mainly indebted for its existence, and who contributed so effectually and extensively to the prosperity of the Unitarian cause, especially in the West of England,—*he* would not have considered the adoption of the proposed change, as “conveying an oblique and unkind reflection on his memory:” Mr. Kenrick valued too much, and understood too well, the right of private judgment. But if otherwise, there is, for every individual, a straight line which must not be warped to personal feelings: and when such motives, appealing to some

of our best affections, are brought forwards to deter or lead away from the steady consistent adherence to it, the interests of duty, if not of truth, must suffer in proportion as they are effectual.

(6) It is reasonable to suppose that Mr. Belsham must be more acquainted than I can be, with the constitution of the different Unitarian Societies in this kingdom; but I have never heard of an instance in which the once adopted Preamble of any Society has been *altered*, in order to make it more comprehensive. Several have been formed upon the more comprehensive basis; and my opinion is, that as long as there is the *London Unitarian Society* as a central point of union for the believers in the Simple Humanity, (and long, with the exception of the word *idolatrous*, may it continue as it is, and go on and prosper,) by uniting with which, they may, in the most public manner such Associations enable them to do, declare their convictions in this important doctrine,—the various other Societies now bearing the name of Unitarian, would do well to connect with the fundamental principles of Unitarianism, nothing which should keep those from us, who in *spirit, zeal, and co-operation*, would willingly prove that they are not against us.

(7) Who, among the Ministers who for the last twelve years have preached before the W. U. S. at our annual meetings, have advocated the Simple Humanity, more plainly and decidedly than those who desired the proposed change? And though several of our best sermons of late have not particularly entered upon that doctrine, yet they have boldly and unequivocally opposed popular errors, and shewn that Unitarianism is, in truth, “the doctrine according to godliness!” If the proposed alteration in the Preamble had been made, (and even any unexpected change taken place in the *practice* of the Society,) the sermons of Mr. Fox, and Mr. John Kenrick, and even that of Mr. Kentish, for instance, might, with equal propriety have been delivered at our annual meetings. And for myself I plainly declare, that had I afterwards been to preach before the Society, while

* It must have been upon the same general principle, that the *London Unitarian Society*, some years ago, introduced Archdeacon Blackburne's *Works* into their Catalogue.

I laid the greatest stress on the doctrines which I hold most important, and in which all Unitarians are agreed, I should, without hesitation, have endeavoured to lead those who still differ from us, a little farther. Nor do I believe, from all I have observed of the dispositions and views of such persons, that if I preached with the simplicity of truth and in the tone of Christian charity, they would have at all objected to it. At any rate they could not reasonably calculate on our silence.*

(8) I have only farther to observe, that Mr. Belsham seems to me to consider the proposed alteration in the Preamble of the *Western Unitarian Society*, as affecting that of the *London*. They are perfectly distinct; have no controul over each other's concerns; and nothing farther to do with each other, than as united in the same great objects, having several Members in common, and sometimes co-operating in effecting the publication of works for distribution, and the *London Society* supplying the *Western* with books, much in the same manner as the *London* bookseller supplies his correspondent in the country. And I imagine there is the same kind of connexion, and no more, between the *London Society* and the various other Societies in different districts, for the promotion of Unitarian principles by the distribution of books.

I have now finished all I have to lay before your readers on this subject. If any of my valued friends, (differing from me on this point, while we unite with cordiality and full consent in so many others, and having the great interests of Christian truth alike at heart, though not always agreeing in the means of promoting them,) should think it necessary to make any strictures on what I have said, I pledge myself, as I have done on another subject, plainly to express

any change of opinion they may produce, or to acknowledge any error into which I may inadvertently have fallen.—If I maintain the silence I wish, I entreat that it may be considered as no mark of disrespect to them; but simply as an indication, that my sentiments remain unchanged, and that I perceive no advantage in prolonging the discussion.

LANT CARPENTER.

P. S. An illness which suspended all my usual occupations, has prevented my publishing my *Reply to Bishop Magee*, as I expected, about this time; but I hope to advertise it as being published in the same Number in which this Letter will, I trust, be sufficiently early to appear.—In the last paragraph of p. 618, on *Divine Influences*, I noticed *duly* for *only*, which I beg the reader to correct.

SIR, *December 14, 1819.*

IN a former Number of your Repository (p. 623) appeared a communication signed W. W., animadverting upon a recent controversy between two anatomical professors. As no person immediately interested in the reputation of the parties has come forward to notice his remarks, you will, I trust, admit a few observations from one who lays claim to no other character in connexion with this business than that of a spectator, known indeed to both the professors, but not the eulogist or the apologist of either. What induces me to trouble you, is the strange inaccuracy of the statements made by your Correspondent. From the freedom and severity of his censures, and the tone of authority, *quasi ex cathedra*, with which he pronounces his condemnation, a stranger would naturally infer that he was fully master of all the facts of the case; and that, after his verdict, your readers, simple and wise, had nothing to do but to sit down in the belief, that the two professors had “disgraced” themselves, by the “way not very honourable to them,” in which they had conducted and “terminated” their “dispute.” But your readers will, I doubt not, be surprised to learn, 1. That there was, “during the last winter,” no “controversy

* I have just observed that Mr. Fox's *Voice of Revelation*, delivered before the *London Unitarian Society*, and containing statements in favour of the Simple Humanity, was afterwards delivered before the *Eastern Unitarian Society*, founded, if I mistake not, on the broad basis.

afloat amongst the medical professors and students at St. Bartholomew Hospital," on the subject to which W. W. adverts, further than that subject might have formed a topic of conversation there, as it did at all the other hospitals:—2. That no lectures were delivered at that Hospital on the "Origin of the Vital Principle," and, consequently, that "the pupils of each lecturer" did not "enlist under the banners of their master" with any "acrimonious" or hostile spirit:—3. That Mr. Lawrence is not now, and never has been, a "lecturer" at Bartholomew Hospital, and, consequently, delivered no "Physiological Lectures" there, which your readers may consult:—4. That neither did Mr. Abernethy deliver any Physiological Lectures there, which are printed and open to public inspection: And 5, that the "governors of the charitable institution, to which both gentlemen are surgeons," did not, for any cause whatever, "suspend Mr. Lawrence from two of his appointments."

The plain history of the case which W. W. has so unaccountably mistaken and misrepresented, is briefly this: In the year 1814, Mr. Abernethy was appointed Professor of Anatomy and Surgery to the College of Surgeons, in Lincoln's Inn Fields. In the Lectures which, under this appointment, he delivered at the College, in that and the following years, he took occasion to state and vindicate "Mr. Hunter's opinions respecting life and diseases." The two Introductory Lectures of the first course, and a part of the Introductory Lecture of the second, he afterwards published. In 1816, Mr. Lawrence, who is one of the assistant surgeons of Bartholomew Hospital, was chosen to succeed Mr. Astley Cooper as the other Professor of Anatomy and Surgery to the College, and that year followed his predecessor in delivering a course of Lectures on Comparative Anatomy. In these lectures Mr. Lawrence controverted and ridiculed the Hunterian theory of life, which his brother lecturer had been advocating.

In the year following, Mr. Abernethy delivered a course of "Physiological Lectures, exhibiting a general view of Mr. Hunter's Physiology," &c., in which he supported the opinions he had before maintained, and expressed his disapprobation of the systems of the French Physiologists. These are the Lectures, I presume, to which your Correspondent means to refer your readers. Mr. Lawrence, the next year, (1818,) delivered another course, in which he again took up the subject, and stood forward as the champion of the French school. These are the lectures which gave so much public offence, and which he suppressed after their publication. Of these lectures the only public notice, as far as I know, taken by Mr. Abernethy, is contained in a temperate Postscript to his "Hunterian Oration," which was delivered in February last, and published shortly after.

In order to form a correct judgment of the merits of the controversy, it is necessary to peruse the whole of these publications, and to them I beg to refer your Correspondent himself. If after the perusal of them he should still think that the professors have "disgraced" themselves by the management and termination of it, he must be left to the enjoyment of his opinion.

One word on another part of his communication. Mr. Lawrence held the appointment of surgeon to Bridewell, and also to a certain institution for healing the maladies of the mind, lately removed from Moorfields to the neighbourhood of St. George's Fields. It is true, that the governors of the latter did take alarm at his metaphysical heresy, and, as if infected by the atmosphere they breathed, proceeded to suspend him from his office, judging, no doubt, that orthodoxy of opinion was essential to practical skill in the cure of the disorders immediately under their charge. To their judgment Mr. Lawrence sacrificed his book, and made his peace by its suppression.

* * * *

REVIEW.

"Still pleased to praise, yet not afraid to blame."—*FORG.*

ART. I.—A Course of Lectures on Subjects connected with the Corruption, Revival, and Future Influence of Genuine Christianity. By W. J. Fox. 8vo. pp. 324. [A Second Edition in 12mo. pp. 336.] Hunter and Eaton. 1819.

THESE Lectures were heard, we are informed, with marked attention by a crowded auditory, at whose unanimous request they have been published. The author defines controversial sermons (Pref. p. v.), "speeches to set people thinking," and judging of these before us by this rule, we must pronounce that the Lecturer has completely succeeded; for whether the reader agree in opinion with the Lecturer or differ from him, it seems to us impossible that his mind should not be excited by the specimens of dense thought, forcible argumentation, brilliant eloquence, and, we had almost said, sparkling wit, that are here displayed: and the effect must have been much more powerful upon the hearer of the Lectures.

To such as look in a sermon for the qualities of an essay or a dissertation, Mr. Fox's Lectures will appear too declamatory, and to such as think that the prejudices of the many ought to be conciliated and not alarmed, his tone will sometimes appear too decided, bold and startling; but the coldest critic must allow that the declamation (if such it be) is splendid, and the most timid theologian must acknowledge, if not admire, the honesty, manliness and Christian frankness which characterize every page.

The few extracts that the scope of our work permits us to make will testify the Lecturer's extent of knowledge, his facility of turning his great reading to account, his power of intellect, his clearness of judgment, and, above all, his richness of imagination; they may, perhaps, shew also hastiness of composition, abruptness of manner, familiarity, even to homeliness, of style, and, in some instances, the extension and accumulation of metaphors beyond the limits of good taste.

Lect. I. is "On Antichrist." In his description of this allegorical personage Mr. Fox agrees with Mr. Evanson, ["Letter to Hurd,"] considering the character typical not of any one particular church, but of all churches in which are found the following marks of apostacy: "dominion over conscience, alliance with the temporal authority, mystery, idolatrous worship, blasphemy, hypocrisy, deceit and affected austerity, and persecution." (P. 10.) He applies to Antichrist, thus expounded, the prophecies of Daniel, &c., which are usually interpreted by Protestants of the great Christian apostacy. We question, however, whether sufficient attention has yet been paid to the arguments of Grotius, who maintains that all the predictions in question related to persons and powers out of the Church. His reasoning is, we confess, to our minds unanswerable. (See his *Commentatio et Appendix de Antichristo*, Op. IV. 457, &c.)

Referring to "pious frauds," Mr. Fox says,

"While we gladly forget the gross trickeries by which, in dark ages, ignorance was gulled that it might be enslaved and plundered, we must be allowed to express regret that Protestants and Dissenters should yet retain some traces of this evil. How often, in the recollection of every one, has reputed heresy been assailed with calumnious and forged tales of blasphemies and sudden judgments, got up for the purpose of terrifying men from the use of their common sense on religious subjects! Truth disdains such arms: they are the weapons of Antichrist, and worthy only of the policy of the Inquisition, which, when its victims are led to the stake, clothes them with robes covered with painted devils. Happily, their use is almost abandoned by the more respectable of every party."—Pp. 19, 20.

The following reflections come in seasonably after the Lecturer's denunciation of prevailing corruption and apostacy:

"This view of our subject, though at first it may seem harsh, is really conducive to charity. It teaches that no one body of professing Christians is to be singled out,

and held up for odium, as peculiarly stained with the characteristics of the predicted apostacy; but that they are scattered, though in different proportions, over the whole of nominal Christendom. We turn from mutual accusation to inquiry after the portion of the evil which we may have shared, and endeavour to correct it. What Presbyterian does not blush at the stern hatred of his forefathers to Rome, as the only Antichrist? What Churchman should not be ashamed of such a paltry excuse for depriving his Catholic fellow-subject of civil rights? Our attention is drawn from men to systems; to religious tyranny, mystery, idolatry, fraud, persecution; they alone are held up to hatred, opposition, condemnation, and destruction.—May they perish, and for ever!"—P. 23.

The Hnd. Lect. is "On Church-of-Englandism," a compound term, more expressive than elegant, borrowed from Mr. Jeremy Bentham. The text at the head of this Lecture announces the preacher's design; Acts xix. 15: *Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye?* By an induction of particulars, the characteristics of Antichrist, above enumerated, are here pointed out as adhering to the Church of England. Of its constitution, the Lecturer says, in figurative language,

"It is a massy and imposing edifice, not modelled, indeed, with Grecian simplicity, but shooting up, like its own Gothic buildings, into towers and pinnacles of various dignity, all of aspiring form—though while their heads are in the clouds, their foundations press heavily upon the earth, and their shade throws gloom and chilliness around on monuments of death; and all is overtopped by the lofty spire of archiepiscopal eminence; where sometimes, to finish the resemblance, has been seen only a vane, veering to every breeze of political direction."—P. 44.

With great candour, Mr. Fox pronounces (p. 47) a warm eulogium on the Liturgy of our National Church. He allows, however, that much of it may have descended from a very early age of Christianity. He might, we think, have spoken more strongly. The real praise is due to the Roman Missal. "Those who first compiled, or since revised, the English Book of Common-Prayer," says Dr. Geddes,*

did little more than translate from the Latin Original. Let me add, that, wherever they abandon this Original, there is, if I mistake not, a want of dignity in their composition, that immediately betrays the innovation."

The conclusion of this Lecture is a description of the majesty of England, and an apostrophe to her, and is, perhaps, the finest specimen that can be extracted of the peculiarities of Mr. Fox's eloquence:

"To conclude: designing men, even in the present day, have dared to represent dissent from the Church as synonymous with disaffection to the State. It is a foul calumny. The sternest and sturdiest protest against the one, may coexist with the most enthusiastic devotion to the other. England was great and glorious while her religion was Popery. She then reared her head above the nations, outstripped them all in the career of improvement, and soared above them towards the heaven of liberty. The great charter of her freedom was then wrested from unwilling power: commerce and manufactures were raising her citizens, burgesses and merchants, to wealth and intelligence, and placing them side by side with her barons; while, from contending elements, arose the harmony of representative government. She was great while that change, called Reformation, was proceeding, or retarded, or subsiding into fixedness, through successive reigns. She then began to wave her flag of sovereignty over the sea; her laws were framed in wisdom; and her literature, splendid in genius, profound in learning, and mighty in originality, advanced with giant step. She was great at that tremendous period when the crown was trampled in the dust, a regal head fell on the scaffold, and Cromwell sat on an ungarnished throne. Episcopacy was not her religion then. The Church of England fled to the wilderness: the mitre was crushed under sectarian feet, and the crosier snapped asunder by unconsecrated hands: yet then she was great; not a nation but cringed for her friendship, and trembled at her frown. Was there persecution, oppression or insult, on the Continent,—she lifted her voice of thunder, and Europe's hills were moved; her mountains quaked and trembled to their foundations. And while Episcopacy has been Church-of-England-

better witness than King Edward the Sixth, who to the Cornish rebels confesses it was no other than the old mass-book done into English, all but some few words that were expunged."

* Modest Apology for Roman Catholics, p. 169. "For the matter contained in that book," says Milton, "we need no

ism, our country has been great and glorious still ;—yes, through vicissitude, great ; in adversity and disappointment, in privation and suffering, in all changes and chances, in arms and arts, in literature and benevolence. The monuments of her majesty reflect the glittering of every star of heaven ; and not a wind can blow that has not wafted from her shores some freight of charity. And she would be great, were this assuming sect lost in oblivion, with all its robes, and forms, and wealth, and creeds : still to her would the nations look, as to an elder sister of the earth, pre-eminent in wisdom, grace and majesty.

“ Yes ; England, independently of adventitious circumstances, or predominant sects, must be admired and loved by all who can rightly think and feel ; nor would the hand that might not object to pull down the clustering ivy from the oak, whose strength it wasted, and impaired its beauty, touch profanely one leaf of the hallowed tree. O my country ! land of my birth, my love, and my pride ; land of freedom and of glory ; land of bards and heroes, of statesmen, philosophers and patriots ; land of Alfred and of Sydney, of Hampden and Russel, of Newton, Locke and Milton ; may thy security, liberty, generosity, peace and pre-eminence, be eternal ! May thy children prize their birthright, and well guard and extend their privileges ! From the annals of thy renown, the deeds of thy worthies, the precious volumes of thy sages, may they imbibe the love of freedom, of virtue, of their country ! May the pure gospel be their portion ! Through every future age, may they arise, as of yore, the protectors of the oppressed, the terror of tyrants, the guardians of the rights and peace of nations, the champions of civil and religious liberty ; and may they be the possessors and diffusers of genuine Christianity to all countries, through all generations ! Amen ! ”—Pp. 49—51.

The subjects of Lect. III. are “ Religious Liberty and Nonconformity ; ” “ an appropriate transition from the mischiefs and miseries of the Antichristian apostacy, to the gospel in its native simplicity, power and blessedness. ”—P. 52.

A just distinction is made of the liberty of Christian Churches into external and internal, that which they claim of the civil power, and that which they allow to their own members. The latter, it is truly said, (p. 53,) even by sincere and eloquent advocates of the former, has been too often misunderstood, overlooked or violated.

The history of religious tyranny is traced, pp. 59—62, with the hand of a master.

In the following passage, the abstract argument for dissent is admirably stated :

“ We dissent because human legislators exceed their province when they pretend to fix the religion of the country. Society cannot exist without government. It is for the good of the whole that we should have laws, and that their administration and execution should not be left to individual zeal, but be the peculiar duty of persons appointed to that office. This requires the surrender of much natural right, of how much, human wisdom must decide : it may fairly include even life itself, which, when the good of the community requires, should be offered a willing and a patriotic sacrifice : but the rights of conscience are, from their very nature, inalienable. Man never did give them ; he never can give them. The right of believing where he sees evidence of truth, and of worshipping where he finds characteristics of divinity, as it cannot injure society, cannot belong to society. It is inherent in man, as a rational creature, and he cannot divest himself of it, till he can re-create himself, and become another being, and his own God. What, then, does a legislator mean, when he says, You shall believe this doctrine ; you shall worship that God ; you are born to this religion ; we decree that you shall be a Deist or a Christian, a Mahometan or a Pagan, a Catholic or a Protestant, and will punish your disobedience. And who gave you this right ? God ? Produce the commission, and work the confirming miracle. Man ? When and where ? None could do it for themselves, much less for others. But you have the power—true ; so had Herod, (who was devoured of worms,) when he slew James ; so had Nero, (who was assassinated,) when he martyred Paul ; so had Pilate, (who died in miserable exile,) when he sentenced Christ ; and so had others who died in splendour, but who wait in their graves the righteous judgment of God. You have the power—to do what ? To issue the decree ? And so you have to decree that robbery is religion, and persecution for the glory of God : so you have to decree that the sun shall shine by night, and the moon by day, and they will as soon obey your bidding as the mind and heart of man. But you can inflict the penalties : yes, and make martyrs of the firm, and hypocrites of the fearful—nothing more. No human authority has either the right or power to make any system the religion of any individual. We reverence human laws and governors up to this point ; but with our consciences,

our worship, and our God, they have no business. We cannot belong to the Church of England, because, however mildly exercised, she recognizes this claim of man to tell with authority his fellow-man what he shall believe, and whom and how he shall adore. Her Articles and Liturgy have been rightly described, by one of her own prelates, 'as a long act of parliament;' a decree of the senate deciding what we are to think of God, how we are to feel and speak in his presence, and by what to obtain his blessing! Did they appear to us absolutely true, and supremely excellent, we have never delegated, nor can we ever acknowledge, the authority of others to decide for us that they were so, and compel us to their belief and use." Pp. 64—66.

This is the unanswerable argument for Nonconformity with regard to political or national Churches. Of some of the more palpable reasons for dissent, the author says, perhaps with too much smartness,

"I have not patience to rake together the pettifogging absurdities, contradictions and superstitions about crosses, and rings, and kneeling, and bowing, and altars, and Easter, and such like things, which in rich abundance disfigure the practices of the Church, and to one educated a Dissenter make it a matter of some toil and study to drill himself, so as to execute, correctly, the manœuvres and evolutions of divine worship. If men think they can please God by getting up such exhibitions, let them try; but not impose them on others for Christianity."—P. 71.

Mr. Fox thus answers one of the popular arguments for a national establishment of religion:

"But religious instruction for the bulk of the people should be provided. Let it be by all means. Who instruct them now? Whose schools exclude half the population of the country—those of the Sectaries or of the Establishment? Who raise the character of the poor by discourses which they can understand and feel? What sort of instructors will they generally be, who owe their office, not to the people, but to patronage? What is the fact? Where dissent is tolerated, is not more knowledge diffused by voluntary exertion than by established institutions? We may read, in broad characters, the importance of liberty to religious light, in those countries where the genuine spirit and tendency of slavery is unmitigated by the corrective of even tolerated dissent. How deplorable is their condition! There the populace are uniformly sunk in the most abject

ignorance and superstition. There priests and people, blind leaders of the blind, sink together into the very barbarism of ignorance. There is the grave of intellect and of knowledge, of morals and of freedom."—Pp. 79, 80.

The Lecture concludes (pp. 85—87) with a truly Christian plea for charity, towards such as may hold an intolerant system.

Lect. IV. is "On Unitarianism." In the introduction, the "immense importance" of the doctrine of the Divine Unity is illustrated by an assemblage of metaphors, which reminds us of the style of an age long gone by.

"It is the soul of Judaism, the foundation of Christianity, the noblest discovery of reason, the glory of revelation, the centre of religious truth, the antidote of infidelity, the death blow of idolatry, the spring of Reformation, the guiding star of free inquiry, the companion of liberty, the parent of piety, the source of light in the mind and goodness in the heart, and the inheritor of supreme dominion over faith, to which it is directed by prophecy, and will be conducted by Providence, in all nations."—P. 88.

Mr. Fox very judiciously separates the private opinions of Unitarians from Unitarianism.

"The discussion of Unitarianism has been much embarrassed, and its cause injured, by its being mixed up with the private opinions of its friends. There is gross mistake, or wilful injustice, in reckoning whatever is held by certain Unitarians essential to Unitarianism itself. The humanity of Christ is not essential to Unitarianism. Although differing from most respectable authority, I have no hesitation in deeming such limitation most improper. It is inconsistent with the etymology and meaning of the term, and its historical use. Dr. Price was an Unitarian as well as Dr. Priestley; so is every worshipper of the Father only, whether he believe that Christ was created before all worlds, or first existed when born of Mary. Philosophical Necessity is no part of Unitarianism: to some Unitarians it seems the plain dictate of reason and Scripture, illustrative of the character of God and plans of Providence, a glory around the cross of faith, and a rock for the anchor of hope; but others think it inconsistent with the threatenings and promises of God, and the responsibility of man; and a similar diversity obtains among the speculative of other denominations. Materialism is no part of Unitarianism. Some of us believe that man is formed of one substance, others

of two: some that unconsciousness prevails from death to the resurrection; and others that the transition is immediate to bliss and glory, or to punishment, of the separated spirit. The denial of angels or devils is no part of Unitarianism: some believe in one, or the other, or in both."—Pp. 91, 92.

He then describes the doctrines in which Unitarians agree, amongst which is incorrectly placed that of "the ultimate restoration of all things," it being well known that many Unitarians believe in the final destruction of the impenitent.

There is great weight of argument in that part of the Lecture which considers Judaism as Unitarianism, and represents this principle of Judaism as adopted by Christianity; as also in that which treats of "certain general characteristics of Christianity given in Scripture, to which Unitarianism and Trinitarianism may be brought as tests." With equal ingenuity and judgment, the author points out "indications of danger and apostasy, noticed by the apostles in the primitive Church." He exposes himself, perhaps, to misrepresentation in his description of "different classes of Unitarians who are out of the pale of Christianity;" though the agreement of so many wise and good men in the doctrine of the Unity of God, surely proves, as he says, (p. 119,) either that it is "the plain dictate of right reason, preached by the heavens and the earth, where man will hear their voice; or that it is a fragment of some original revelation, passed down by tradition to all ages and countries, and selected by the wise and good from the mass of accompanying absurdity."

In Lecture V. Mr. Fox descants "On Creeds, Controversy, and the Influence of Religious Systems on Society," topics of large and undefined extent. They are treated in nearly the reverse order in which they are given in this title.

The remarks on the influence of religion and the effects of the different systems of it are peculiarly striking. As an instance of the boasted perfection of Creeds, it is observed, (p. 443,) that "in a collection of sixteen creeds of Protestant Churches, published at Geneva, 1612, there are only six (of which that of the Church of England

is not one) that speak of the providence of God, and *eleven take no notice of the resurrection of the dead.*" Amongst other proofs of the utility of controversy, Mr. Fox appeals to the *retreat* of the assumed orthodox from their own proper system.

"Had the Church of England and the Calvinistic Dissenters to frame their creeds, without precedent to guide them, the Thirty-nine Articles would not originate with the one, nor the Assembly's Confession with the other. The standard of orthodoxy is lower than it was; and it continues to sink: but if the party be right now, they have been wrong; if now they are strictly scriptural, they have been unscriptural, and they have to thank their opponents for driving or shaming them back into the right road. While individuals (in no small number) have completely renounced the system, the whole mass has slowly receded; the tide yet ebbs and flows at intervals; but the old mark is not reached at its height, and at its influx the old bank is left unwashed by the billows; for generations yet the fluctuations may continue, but all will finally settle at the point of truth."—Pp. 150, 151.

Mr. Fox discusses in Lect. VI. the interesting but difficult question of "War." His object is to shew that "War is a great, *but not insuperable*, obstacle to that general improvement in the state of man which Christianity tends and was designed to realize." And he represents war as "opposed to the well-being and progress of society by the misery it inflicts, the criminality it implies and the mischiefs it produces."

There is truth as well as imagination in the following description:

"It is the tendency of war to produce war, and thus to extend and multiply miseries. Treaties of peace seem little better than links to connect one war with another. They leave something ambiguous for future dissension, some germ of discord, which grows into a poison tree. Indeed, the professed object of hostility is seldom determined in favour of either party, by the peace. In the series of wars which have for ages desolated Europe, we may generally see one growing out of another. The various connexions and interests of nations serve to spread hostility when once commenced. This was particularly exemplified in the late contest, into which nation after nation was drawn or forced. The torrent of blood swelled, as it rolled on; still fresh sluices opened, till it spread and widened, and

seemed without fathom or bound. Like the Glacier, from the mountain's top, it rushed on, accumulating as it fell, and finding in one work of ruin materials to render the next more wide and dreadful. It stretched from the old world to the new, wrapping both continents in its flames, and covering the earth as with a fiery deluge of desolation."—Pp. 170, 171.

The Lecturer admits the right of resistance to aggression or tyranny, but this, he contends, is not war. "Defensive war is a solicism.—A license to attack is essential to war." Pp. 208, 209.

To encourage the hope of the ultimate abolition of war, the author says, "Two facts are cheering. 1. Peace now scarcely differs more from war, than modern warfare does from ancient.—2. The tendencies of society have been, and are, to limit war, and consequently to abolish it ultimately." Pp. 181 and 183.

The more common pretexts of war are examined, (pp. 184—187,) and as they come under review, they make us blush for human nature.

In conclusion, Christianity is represented as incompatible with war, and its universal diffusion and influence, guaranteed by prophecy, is argued upon as tantamount to the abolition of the nefarious practice.

An Appendix to this Lecture is devoted to the examination of Paley's Chapter on War in his Moral Philosophy, and here the author displays great acuteness. He is somewhat *heretical* on the subject of the "Jewish wars." "Their example," he says, (p. 199,) "justifies massacre, or it does not justify war." He adds, "The power that should attempt to repeat the frightful scenes of the conquest of Canaan, would soon be blotted out of the map of the world, by an universal combination of civilized states." True, but it may be asserted with equal justice, that the nation that should now practise the atrocities of which the Canaanites were guilty, would be justly treated as the enemy of all mankind. Their human sacrifices, not to mention other crimes, were more abominable than the slave-trade, against which there is now a confederacy of all Christian states. On this ground we rest, and we think safely, the defence of their destruction. In the final sentence of his paragraph

on this subject, the author dismisses the "objector" rather *cavalierly*: "If it be said that the Deity would not command what was morally wrong, the objector is referred to the command for Abraham to sacrifice his son; and if this does not satisfy him, he may, if he so please, consult Dr. Geddes." Let him consult Dr. Geddes, who treats the injunction to destroy the Canaanites as a patriotic fraud; but let him consult, on the other side, for the justification of his objection, Mr. Good's remarks upon this notion in his valuable Memoirs of the learned translator (8vo. 1803, pp. 368—473); the late Bishop of Landaff's Apology for the Bible, in reply to the "Age of Reason;" and Jameson's Dissertation, in an Appendix to his Exposition of the Pentateuch, Folio, pp. 775—779, which was esteemed satisfactory by the late Mr. Lindsey, and was, we believe at his instance, reprinted as one of the tracts of the Unitarian Society.

This Lecture has of necessity a political complexion; but though the author exercises in it his wonted mental courage, he has not laid himself open to *any other animadversion than that of the critic*. We write this after Lord Castlereagh's new Bills have been proposed to Parliament.

Mr. Fox praises an historical character, not often the subject of eulogy:

"What a fine contrast to Yorkists, Lancasterians, Stuarts, Bourbons, and all the rest who 'wade through slaughter to a throne,' was Richard Cromwell! He was advised to take off a seditious leader, and secure his father's elevation for himself. 'No,' said he, 'I will not purchase authority at the price of one man's blood.'"—P. 185.

The VIIth and last Lecture is "On Human Perfectibility." All that the author means by this is "a state of very high improvement, of knowledge, liberty, peace, virtue and felicity, to which man will be, in the latter days, conducted by Christianity." And the expectation of this is undoubtedly justified by reason and Scripture. Mr. Fox separates from his theory the notion of "*organic* perfectibility, the triumph of mind over matter," which was entertained by the system-builders, who, a few years ago, maintained "Human Perfectibility;" but we

question whether he allows sufficient weight to the influence of *disease* and *death* in keeping down man, as an individual, to the level on which he has hitherto stood. Still, who would check those hopes of a better age, which tend to realize themselves, and to advance, at the same time, the virtue and the happiness of mankind? Cold must his heart be who cannot, in some of the better moments of existence, give himself up to the influence of the Lecturer's glowing anticipations of "millennial glories."

As a whole, we think this Lecture inferior to the preceding; but its defects are more than compensated in the *Notes*, in which the author briefly discusses the theory of *Malthus* with a degree of ability that leads us to wish that he would take up that subject in a separate publication, and give a popular refutation of the new hypothesis; in so far, at least, as it may be thought to present an obstacle to the best Christian hopes, and to countenance war and the degradation and oppression of the mass of the human race.

This volume has, we learn, and as we should have expected, excited public attention, in an extraordinary degree, to the Course of Lectures which Mr. Fox is now delivering; and every friend to Christian truth must rejoice in knowing that multitudes are receiving assistance in their religious inquiries from so able and enlightened a champion of "the faith once delivered to the saints."

ART. II.—A new Version of some of the Epistles of St. Paul, &c.

(Concluded from p. 699.)

IT remains that we speak more particularly concerning the merits of this volume.

Philalethes is much to be commended for making an accurate text the basis of his version. We have already perceived that, with a few trifling variations, he follows the readings of the best critical edition of the Christian Scriptures. The principal instances of his departure from it, besides those we have previously enumerated, are Coloss. ii. 13, iii. 12, 15, iv. 13; 1 Thess. ii. 15, iii. 2, iv. 13; 2 Thess. i. 10, ii. 2; 1 Tim. i. 4, vi. 4; 2 Tim. ii. 19, iv. 1; James

ii. 13, 24, iii. 12, * iv. 2, 13, v. 9. In a single case we have found him substituting conjecture for a reading supported by unimpeachable authority.† Yet he modestly speaks of himself as having *adopted* the alleged emendation. We may refer to Wetstein, (in loc.,) whose inner margin presents this note, "ὁ κατεχων το κατεχον. P. Junius, R. Valesius." It should be added that the Syr. Transl. has the neuter participle.

Of the claims of *Philalethes* to the merit of faithfulness and perspicuity, our readers will in some measure judge from the extracts laid before them: these have purposely been numerous; and if there be any individual who, on such a subject, condemns the desire of attaining the nicest accuracy, let him know that his censure is egregiously misplaced. To possess as exact a version as possible of the records of the revealed will of Almighty God, must be an object of vast importance: the translator of these writings then should be as scrupulously attentive to every part of his undertaking as though he were weighing grains of precious metals for the young and inexperienced. Although the doctrines of the gospel do not depend on the refinements of verbal criticism, yet the evidences, the character, and, in many cases, the sense, of the books of Scripture, cannot without this criticism be justly ascertained. Let no man conceive that his mind is comprehensive and profound only because it is incorrect. He who suffers himself to be ignorant of minute circumstances and particular facts, will never be master of general principles: his pretensions are refuted both by the reason of the thing and the history of literature and science. Superficial and conceited, he in vain aspires to the character of a philosopher and scholar. There is an admirable remark of Dr. S. Clarke's,‡ which cannot be too deeply inscribed on every student's memory: "Levia quidem hæc, et parvi fortè, si per se spectentur, momenti. Sed ex elementis constant, ex principiis oriuntur, omnia: Et ex judicii consue-

* The beginning of this verse is not translated *interrogatively* by *Philalethes*.

† 2 Thess. ii. 7.

‡ Præfat. ad Homer. *Iliad*.

tudine in rebus minutis adhibitâ, pendet sæpissimè etiam in maximis vera atque accurata Scientia." Never, perhaps, was any observation more completely or more beautifully illustrated in its author; this great man being equally distinguished by enlarged views and indefatigable researches, by various and extensive learning and by a sound, acute, discriminating judgment—in a word, by superior correctness and superior vigour of understanding.

From the maxims that we have quoted, *Philaethes* will not withhold his approbation. We believe him to be "a scholar, and a ripe and good one:" and therefore he is a friend to precision and accuracy in biblical criticism. As his performance bears indisputable marks of care, so, for the most part, he has conveyed the meaning of the original authors with fidelity and clearness. That his version is frequently paraphrastical, it has been impossible for us not to notice and lament. His tendency to become a commentator he chiefly evinces by his liberal use of *italics*, and by his clothing in a modern dress some characteristic and metaphorical expressions: and, though for both these practices he may plead the authority of a few very eminent names, we cannot but be of opinion that he is here opposed as well by the majority of able divines as by the rules of solid reasoning and criticism.

In favour of a literal version of the Scriptures, Archbishop Newcome and Dr. Symonds have argued with such excellent sense that we need not apologise for copying their language:

"A translation of the Bible," said the late Primate of Ireland, "should express every word in the original by a literal, verbal, or close rendering, where the English idiom admits of it.

"For thus the translator shows how he reads the original: and not only the matter of the Scriptures, but their peculiar language and manner, will be faithfully represented. The Sacred Writings are of singular importance; they are the rule of our faith and practice: and therefore it is requisite that the reader unskilled in Hebrew, Chaldee, and Greek, should always be enabled, as far as the nature of the English language allows, to argue with equal justness from a

translation as scholars do from the original text."*

"The examples of those upon whose judgments we may safely rely, as well as many conclusions arising from the nature of the thing itself," led the late Professor of Modern History at Cambridge "decisively to affirm, that a version of the Bible should be as literal as the difference of language will permit." In support of this position, he adds,

"Though it should be allowed, merely for the sake of argument, that a loose translation may be of sufficient authority in determining matters of faith and practice, yet still it would be liable to an insuperable objection: I mean, the impossibility of furnishing the reader with a just idea of the Original."†

To the principle of these reasonings *Philaethes* does not refuse his assent; for he professes to have made his translation "as literal as, according to his judgment, the idioms of the respective languages would allow." The general rules of translation, indeed, are the same in respect of all languages: by a classical scholar of the highest rank,‡ those rules are virtually stated in the description which he gives of his own labours: "illud inter alia dedi operam, ut, quantum ejus per utriusque linguæ rationes liceret, non discederem a singulorum verborum significatione, nec ab ordine verborum, et figura dictionis; sed ipsum quoque genus dicendi, eumque, quem charactera vocant, exprimerem: quod illis præcipue locis difficultatem habuit, ubi corruptum sermonem ridendo imitatur, et imitando ridiculum facit auctor.—Ubi plane nihil difficultatis erat in Græcis, minus singulorum rationem verborum habuimus.—Voluimus ergo interpretationem nostram Lucianæ orationi, quantum ejus consequi potuimus, esse simillimam."

In a version of the Sacred Writings an adherence to these maxims is more than usually essential. The grand point at issue between *Philaethes* and

* Histor. View, &c. p. 256.

† Observ., &c. the Four Gospels, p. 112.

‡ J. M. Gesner, Epist. ad J. F. Reitz. (Lucian. Ripont.)

ourselves, remains therefore to be considered: does his translation conform to the rules that have just been proposed and illustrated? We cheerfully acknowledge that his deviations from them are far less numerous and striking than those which some of his predecessors have exhibited. In 1727 "An Essay for a new translation of the Bible" was published, which should rather have been styled, "An Essay towards an *exposition* of the Scriptures;"* the author having almost uniformly confounded the provinces of the translator and the commentator. Versions of the N. T., which are extremely offensive to the eye of piety and taste, have proceeded from men who appear to have studied in this school. *Philalethes*, however, is a translator of a different spirit and a higher order—not undeserving, indeed, of being compared with the very respectable writers by whose aid we have endeavoured sometimes to justify and sometimes to impugn his renderings. He must pardon us if we think that he would more nearly have resembled the ablest of them had he been less inclined to the use of *paraphrase*.

It is commonly, perhaps, we might say, universally, admitted that *italics* occur too often in the R. V. In the following passages of the translation before us we deem them unnecessary and inexpedient: 1 Thess. ii. 7, 19, iv. 2, 14, 16, v. 1; 2 Thess. iii. 12; Col. i. 6, 9, 27, ii. 13, 21, 22, iii. 21, 24, iv. 4, 6, 11; 1 Tim. i. 1, 4, 6, 7, ii. 2, v. 1, vi. 4, 5, 10, 18, 21; 2 Tim. ii. 1, 4, 24, iii. 5, iv. 8. These are the principal examples of a habit which ought, we presume, to be very cautiously indulged.

Let it next be considered, whether the figurative expressions which present themselves in the Christian Scriptures should be lost sight of in an English version, and "the sense" be given "rather than the words"? We do not mean to intimate that this is the frequent practice of *Philalethes*: still, however, we wish that the instances of it which we shall now point out had not taken place. Why, we

would ask, in Col. iii. 6, does he render the phrase, *τας υις της απειδειας* "the disobedient," instead of "the children of disobedience," as in the R. V.? This translation may be met with, it is true, in Castalio and in the F. Genev. Vers.; but we object to it upon principle. As a *comment* it is unexceptionable: yet *Philalethes* does not profess to appear before the world in the character of an *Annotator*. Is the English reader furnished in this case with "a just idea of the original"? Are "the peculiar language and manner" of Paul "faithfully represented"? Can any man unacquainted with "the original text" argue with *justness* from *Philalethes'* translation? Has such an individual an advantage, in any degree, "equal" to that of *scholars*? The same questions, we conceive, may fairly be put with reference to our author's version of Col. iii. 12—"merciful dispositions" [*σπλαγχνα οικτιρμου*]: in R. V., "bowels of mercy." Here again we must pronounce that *Philalethes* has judged rightly as a *Commentator*, but erroneously as a *Translator*. The expression is, no doubt, a Hebraism, Gen. xliii. 30, &c. &c. And can it be undesirable that the reader not skilled in the oriental dialects have an opportunity of familiarizing himself with peculiarities of this class? Will he not be thus "enabled" to discern with greater clearness the phraseology of Scripture, and to reason from it with more effect? Another of *Philalethes'* renderings now calls for our animadversion, Col. iv. 6, "Let your discourse be always graceful, and seasoned with wisdom:" in R. V., "with salt" [*αλατι*]: in which passage our author has destroyed the integrity of the beautiful figure employed by the apostle. Once more; we have seen that, in 1 Thess. iv. 13, *Philalethes* substitutes the words, "the dead," for "those who are asleep" [*κεκοιμημενων*]: and we find him rendering a clause in 2 Tim. i. 16, as follows: "he hath not been ashamed of my bonds," [*την αλυσιν μου ουκ επησχυνθη*]. In the latter example, the use of the general term and of the plural number is particularly to be lamented. Wakefield is correct and emphatic, "this chain of mine." Lardner, too, (Works, l. 232,) has made it highly probable that Paul alludes to the specific mode

* See a notice of this work which was not *original*, in *Geddes' Prospectus*, &c. pp. 85, 86.

of his being kept in custody, agreeably to the Roman custom.

When the language of Scripture is in any measure divested of its native simplicity, its venerable character, we are apprehensive that many readers will distrust the translator, who substitutes for such idioms and figures the current expressions of a polite and learned age. This suspicion and want of confidence, indeed, may not always be just, and certainly would not be so in the present instance; but perhaps it is easier to obviate than to remove these feelings. We have great pleasure in observing that the version under our review, although frequently paraphrastic, is in general concise, and that the style of it is pure and easy. A few exceptions, occasioned by the introduction of words that are too refined, and somewhat exotic, must, nevertheless, be noticed; of this description appear the following: *operateth, reanimated, annulling, impending, intoxicated, operative, parricides, refractory, duplicity, domestic, verbal, inaccessible, attested, implacable, depraved, continent, corrode, pregnant, verified*. These terms, we know, are now admitted into the English language, and find a place in the pages of some of the best of our modern writers. Should we be asked, why we would banish such expressions from a version of the Scriptures, we reply, "domestic words are preferable to exotic ones, when both are equally used, and both express the same idea;" and the R. V. "should be imitated in every circumstance which produces simplicity, not only because a simple style has exquisite charms for every reader of taste, but also because it is accommodated to ordinary capacities." *

Translators of the Bible, however, are sometimes chargeable with the use of homely and vulgar terms. Examples of this sort may be found in the R. V.: scarcely any are fur-

nished by PHILALETHES; and our readers must determine whether he has offended against propriety and taste in the following clause (2 Tim. iv. 3): "to have their sense of hearing tickled" [*κνηθομενοι την ακοην*]: in the R. V. it is, "having itching ears"—in Wakefield, "to sooth their ears," which is not sufficiently literal. We acknowledge the great difficulty of translating such expressions. Nor shall we accuse *Philaethes* of meanness of language; though we doubt whether the rendering in the English Bible be not preferable.

We shall now copy a few passages of his version:

"Representing the invisible God, he [Jesus Christ] is the first-born of the whole creation; for in reference to him were formed all in heaven and upon earth, visible and invisible, whether occupying the highest stations or subordinate in dignity; all were made by him and for him, and he is before all, and through him they all subsist. He also is the head of that body the church, and he is the chief, the first-born from the dead, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence. For it hath pleased God that in him all that is complete should abide, and that by him all should be reconciled to Himself; all, whether upon earth or in heaven, by him who hath made peace by his death on the cross." Col. i. 15—21.

Our next quotation is from the practical part of the same epistle (iii. 18, iv. 2):

"Wives, be submissive to your husbands, as becometh those in union with the Lord. Husbands, love your wives, and be not harsh towards them. Children, be always obedient to your parents, for this is pleasing to the Lord. Fathers, vex not your children by undue severity, lest they be discouraged. Servants, always obey those who in temporal concerns are your masters, not with eye-service, as seeking the favour of men, but in sincerity of heart as fearing God; and whatever ye do, perform it heartily, as to the Lord rather than to men, knowing that from the Lord ye are to receive the reward of a heavenly inheritance, for ye serve the Lord Christ. But he that doth wrong shall receive according to the wrong which he hath done, and there is no respect of persons. Masters, give to your servants that which is just and equal, knowing that ye also have a master in heaven."

The following extract from the Epistle to Titus (ii. 11—15) may not be unacceptable:

* Newcome's Hist. View, &c. pp. 294, 295. It is much to be deplored that, of late years, some foreign words, which violate the analogy of our language, without adding to its elegance, have been introduced among better company than they deserve. The verb "to advocate," v. g. is imported from America. See the Pref. to Ramsay's Hist. of the Am. Rev.

“ — the saving grace of God hath appeared to all men, teaching us to renounce impiety and worldly desires, and to live soberly, and uprightly, and piously, in this present state; looking for the happy object of our hope, even the manifestation of the glory of the great God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify for himself a peculiar people, zealous in good works.

We finish our transcripts with a few verses from the Epistle of James (iii. 1—6):

“ My brethren, let not many of you become teachers, considering that we shall undergo a more strict judgment. For in many things we all offend. If any one offend not in word, he is a perfect man, able also to bridle the whole body. Behold we put bits into the mouths of horses, that they may obey us, and we turn their whole frame. Behold also how the ships, though they be so large, and agitated by violent winds, are turned with a very small helm, in whatever direction the steersman pleaseth. Thus the tongue is a little member, and may boast of great things. Behold how large a quantity of materials a small fire kindleth!”

Here we take our leave of *Philalethes*, whom, however, we shall be happy to meet again in the walks of scriptural and theological literature: opportunities for this purpose he will perhaps afford us by a revision and new edition of his present version, and by a translation of some others of the apostolic epistles. We entreat him to believe that our remarks on his labours are offered in the spirit of unfeigned good-will and candour, and under the deepest sense of our own imperfections and fallibility. Declining any thing like altercation with so respectable a writer, we shall gladly receive instruction from his pen. His notes, although properly few, are, in general, very pertinent and judicious, and may serve to shew what are some of his opinions concerning points of religious doctrine and discipline; while his translation indicates his acquaintance with the classical authors of antiquity. We think that his characteristic excellence is *perspicuity*; his prevailing error, *a taste for paraphrase*.

May we be permitted again to express our conviction, that no version of the Scriptures for popular use is likely to be effected unless by the

combined labours of many scholars? Of the translations executed in our native tongue by any single individual, Newcome's retains most of the simple style of the R. V., and is so far the best; and it was therefore with good reason that the Editors of the I. V. took the learned Primate's as the basis of their valuable work.

ART. III.—*The Peculiar Doctrines of the Gospel: a Sermon preached at the Chapel in Parliament Court, Artillery Lane, London, on Wednesday, June the 2nd, 1819, before the Friends and Supporters of the Unitarian Fund.* By James Yates, M. A. M. G. S., one of the Ministers of the New Meeting Birmingham. 12mo. pp. 32. Hunter and Eaton.

THE Introduction to this sermon will shew that it is peculiarly worthy of perusal and consideration:

Nothing is more common among those of our fellow-christians, who are called Orthodox, than to speak of their opinions as the *Peculiar Doctrines of the Gospel*. By this expression they evidently intend to convey the idea, that those opinions are not to be found in any other system of religious belief, and that in the communication of them to mankind the chief and distinguishing value of Christianity consists. Nevertheless we find it repeatedly asserted by the more learned of the orthodox writers, that indubitable traces of these opinions are to be found in the tenets and practices of many heathen nations, and that, although now altered and corrupted in various ways, they appear to have been received from time immemorial over every quarter of the globe.

“ Upon the conquest of America in the 16th century, the Roman Catholic missionaries, who laboured during a great part of their lives to convert the natives of that vast and newly discovered territory, found that the most essential parts of their system, such as the adoration of Three in One, the Incarnation of the Second Person in the Divine Trinity, and his expiatory sacrifice, were already admitted; and they considered the surprising fact of the reception of these sublime mysteries among tribes so barbarous and so remote, as a splendid omen of success.* That the

* “ ‘ That which is difficult in our law to believe,’ says D’Acosta, ‘ has been made easy among the Indians, because the Devil had made them comprehend even the self-same things, which he had stolen

some doctrines have been very generally believed among the nations of the *Eastern* world, is asserted with equal confidence, and by a numerous train of esteemed and popular authors. The late Dr. Claudius Buchanan in particular, whose authority respecting facts of this nature stands in the highest repute, and whose information was received a few years since with an avidity and admiration rarely paralleled, states that the ideas of a Tri-une God, and of the Incarnation and Atonement of the Second Person, are current throughout almost the whole of Asia.* What a glaring inconsistency is it, to call these the '*Peculiar Doctrines of Christianity*,' and yet to attempt the confirmation of them by citing the long-established convictions of innumerable heathen nations!"—Pp. 5—7.

After a few further remarks upon the prevalence of these ideas among the Heathens, tending to shew that, even if they *belong to Christianity*, still they are not *confined to Christianity*, Mr. Yates proceeds to state some important principles which are not only maintained by Christians of every denomination to be parts of *their* system, but which never formed a part of *any other* system, and which, therefore, have a strict and indisputable claim to be regarded as PECULIARITIES of the gospel. These are the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Dead; the doctrine that the Love of God is the First and Greatest Commandment; and the injunction of Universal Philanthropy. On these topics the preacher dwells with much seriousness and judgment. He fully establishes his point, and concludes with an animated and powerful appeal to his auditory on behalf of pure Christianity, and of those institutions which guard and promote it. For its excellence as a composition, and for the comparative novelty and, at the

same time, the eminent importance of the subject, the sermon deserves to be widely circulated by means of Unitarian missionaries and Book Societies.

ART. IV.—*Letters from Lexington and the Illinois, containing a Brief Account of the English Settlement in the Latter Territory, and a Refutation of the Misrepresentations of Mr. Cobbett.* By Richard Flower. 8vo. pp. 32. 1s. 1819.

MR. RICHARD FLOWER is an old correspondent of ours, and is well known to many of our readers. He is one of the late Illinois settlers, and his account of the settlement is interesting from his intelligence and probity.

"On a tract of land from the Little Wabash to the Bonpar on the Great Wabash, about seventeen miles in width, and four to six from north to south, there were but a few hunters' cabins, a year and a half since, and now there are about sixty English families, containing nearly four hundred souls; and one hundred and fifty American, containing about seven hundred souls." P. 24. Already a capital is rising, named Albion. A market-house is built, and an inn and a place of worship are building, the latter intended also for a library. Of the land, Mr. Flower, who is a practical agriculturist, speaks in terms of high praise, as he does also of the climate. Indeed, his picture of the country altogether is very inviting, and will, we apprehend, tempt many an industrious family to follow his steps.

The neighbouring capital of Lexington is, as Mr. Flower says, p. 10, "a phenomenon in the history of the world. Twenty-five years since, it was trodden only by the foot of the savage; now it contains about three thousand inhabitants." It has "a college, at which are already one hundred and forty students." Tea-parties, balls, routs, an Athenæum and a Museum, have taken the place of log cabins and Indian hunts. But slavery is forcibly denounced by this writer as the opprobrium of Kentucky.

The American character generally has made a favourable impression upon Mr. Flower's mind. He speaks with feelings natural to an English Protestant Dissenter of the exemption

from our evangelical law, as their manner of confession, their adoration of Three in One, and such like; the which, against the will of the enemy, have holpen for the easy receiving of the truth."

* See also the History of California, by Venegas, Vol. I. pp. 88, 92, English Translation; and the History of America, by Dr. Robertson, who cites additional authorities, although, as we might have expected from an heterodox philosopher, he is himself very sceptical upon the subject. Book iv. § 7."

"Star in the East, 7th Edition, 1810."

of the United States from the burden of a National Church-Establishment; but he describes with candour the American Church-of-England clergy:

“The Episcopalian clergy in this country have an enjoyment seldom known in England, that is, being chosen by the people, and supported according to their respective merits; and it is my duty to add, that Episcopalians, as well as the ministers of most other sects, are in general ‘labourers worthy of their hire,’ virtuous

in their conduct, exemplary in their deportment, exhibiting Christianity in their every-day conduct and intercourse with mankind, and enjoying the esteem of their congregations. There are none of those divines in the busy hive of America, which you know by the name of *dignified clergy*, partaking of the largest revenues, and doing the least possible service,—conduct which one would think must make their heart shudder at the thought of a judgment day!”—Pp. 7, 8.

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC.

RELIGIOUS.

Unitarian Quarterly Meeting of Ministers in South Wales.

On the 30th of September last the Unitarian Quarterly Meeting of Ministers was held at Pant-y-defaid, Cardiganshire, whereat J. James, of Gelli-Onnen, preached from Rev. vii. 14; Mr. John Evans, of Carmarthen, preached the preceding evening at Capel-y-Groes, from Col. i. 15; and also Mr. Thomas Evans, of Aberdare, Glamorganshire, from Eph. vi. 13.

The Quarterly Meeting is intended for the open and public discussion of subjects connected with the Christian religion, as well as for preaching: and believing that religious conversation and debates, when properly conducted, are calculated, in an eminent degree, to promote inquiry after truth, and consequently to discover it; to propagate the truths which may have been discovered, and advance the best interests of man; many of those who were zealous supporters of the meetings, always regretted, that two, three, or four long sermons should leave so little time for public conference, even if the patience of the congregation were inexhaustible, and their attention not to be wearied. The advocates of one sermon only at one time were not displeased to observe at Pant-y-defaid, on the 30th, at a very full meeting, a very large majority voting, with uplifted hands, for their proposed alteration, in order that more time might be devoted to the subsequent discussion. The service commenced at ten o'clock, and immediately after it was concluded, Mr. J. Thomas, minister of the place, was unanimously voted to the chair, and the conference begun by the introduction of the subject which had been partly discussed at the summer meeting at Llandyfaen, and is to be considered at each meeting till it shall have been discussed in every meeting-house in the circle, viz. What are the best Rules to be observed in the Chris-

tian Church? Though the debate was prolonged till between three and four o'clock, the meeting-house was almost full to the last, and very few, comparatively speaking, left the place till the Chairman quitted the chair; and all seemed to be very attentive throughout. The next meeting to be held at Merthyr, December 30, Mr. J. Davies, Capel-y-Groes, to preach.

J. JAMES.

October 15, 1819.

Liverpool Unitarian Fellowship Fund Society.

At a Meeting of the Committee of the Liverpool Unitarian Fellowship Fund Society, held in the vestry of the Unitarian Chapel, Renshaw Street, on Sunday, November 14, 1819, it was unanimously resolved,

“That feeling a deep and lively interest in the cause of Unitarianism at Madras, we have witnessed, with great pleasure, the resolutions of the Fellowship Funds of Loughborough and Mount Sorrel, of Exeter and Sheffield; and are ready and willing to co-operate with them and the other Fellowship Fund Societies already established in the kingdom, for the purpose of carrying into effect the important objects suggested in the second letter of William Roberts to the Unitarian Society.”

GEORGE HARRIS, Secretary.

The Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Christian Association.

At a General Meeting of the Unitarian Christians of Lancashire and Cheshire, held in the Unitarian Chapel, Renshaw Street, on Tuesday, October 19th, 1819; Ottiwell Wood, Esq., in the Chair, it was unanimously resolved to establish a General Association of the Unitarian Christians of Lancashire and Cheshire, and the following preamble and rules were adopted.

Preamble.

Unitarian Christians believe the doctrines they profess, to be the perfection of reason, and the glory of revelation; they conceive their views of divine truth to be honourable to the Deity and ennobling to man; they know that their direct tendency is to inspire the purest reverence of God, and the most lively aspirations after holiness; they feel them to be cheering in the hour of prosperity, and consolatory in the moment of adversity; that they elevate the mind above the vicissitudes of life, and fill the heart with peaceful hope on the approach of death.

It is their sincere and solemn conviction that many doctrines maintained by other denominations of Christians, if pursued into all their consequences, would produce effects totally opposite to those professed by the Unitarian Christian. They indeed rejoice in the conviction, that in numerous instances such effects are not produced. They love the piety of many of their brethren and applaud their zeal. But they are convinced that that zeal would burn with a purer flame, and that piety glow with a more divine ardour, were they with earnestness and feeling to embrace those views of divine truth which the Unitarian maintains. Unitarian Christians therefore cannot but think and feel, that if they are generous and benevolent and virtuous, it is their imperative duty to display this pure system of truth and righteousness before the eyes of their fellow-christians, in its genuine and native light.

These are the reasons which have led to the formation of *The Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Christian Association*. Its objects are to promote the honour of God and the happiness of man. Its means of producing these great and good effects, those sanctioned by the Anointed of the Most High; the sending persons to and fro that knowledge may be increased; and its justification (if any should be deemed necessary) the solemn and expressive language of that great Being, who declared, "No man when he hath lighted a candle, putteth it in a secret place, neither under a bushel, but on a candlestick, that they which come in may see the light."

Rules.

1. That it is a most desirable object to form and maintain a regular correspondence with the different religious societies in Lancashire and Cheshire, which are united on the common principles of the strict unity of God, and of his universal love to his creatures.

2. That no means appear to be better adapted to accomplish that object, than the institution of a General Association of those religious societies, to be held alternately at the places in which such societies exist, and maintaining a correspondence

with each other through the medium of a committee.

3. That such an Association is calculated not only to unite the societies themselves in a spirit of friendship most worthy and illustrative of the Christian name, but will also tend to check the progress of infidelity, and will likewise afford an excellent opportunity to explain to the public the real principles avowed by Unitarian Christians; to expose the misrepresentations which are circulated respecting them, and to remove the unjust imputations too frequently cast upon them by many of their fellow-christians.

4. That a General Association of the Unitarian Christians of Lancashire and Cheshire be therefore established, to be denominated "*The Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Christian Association*."

5. That the objects of this institution are, 1. To promote and keep up an intercourse and correspondence between the different religious societies in Lancashire and Cheshire, which are united upon the common principles of the strict unity of God, and of his universal love to his creatures. 2. To co-operate with the (*London*) *Unitarian Fund*, in promoting the principles of Unitarian Christianity by means of popular preaching; by the employment of permanent missionaries in the two counties; by forming districts for preaching around the populous towns; by promoting the interchange of ministers; by supplying those congregations which are destitute of ministers; and by the distribution of tracts in those places to which the missionaries are sent.

6. That this Association shall be supported by donations from the congregational Fellowship Funds, and by individual subscriptions.

7. That with a view to carry into effect the objects of the Association, the different Fellowship Funds in the two counties are requested to transmit to it a sum of money annually, according to their respective resources, to be placed at the disposal of the Association.

8. That every member of any Fellowship Fund connected with the Association, shall be considered a member of this Association, and his presence shall entitle him to vote.

9. That in every town and village in Lancashire and Cheshire where there are any Unitarians, the friends be requested, if they have not previously done so, to form themselves into societies, to be denominated, "*The Unitarian Fellowship Association Fund*."

10. That the Secretaries of the respective Fellowship Funds be requested with the advice and confirmation of the members, before whom their reports must be previously read, to send an annual account of

FOREIGN.

FRANCE.

A CONSIDERABLE emotion has been excited in France by a tumult occasioned at BREST, by the appearance of a company of Catholic missionaries. [The character of these missionaries is given p. 701.] The mob is said to have risen upon them, and to have used them very harshly. Irreligious cries are also said to have proceeded from the populace. The people of Brest are hence accused in the Paris papers of impiety. It is reported, as a further instance of their profaneness, that when Mademoiselle Georges appeared at the Theatre of that town, all covered and blazing with diamonds, some persons began to sing the *Adoremus*, and this being ended, the canticle of *Sur cet autel, ah ! que vois je paroître !*

A Paris correspondent of ours says in a letter of the 8th instant, "The Jesuits are busy here and throughout France. There have been some tumults at BREST, in consequence of the intolerant barbarism of the missionaries. Their friends are as a cipher against millions; but there is no miserable intrigue that is not at work for them.—LLORENTI has been deprived of his privilege of saying mass at his parish church, because of his books on the *Inquisition* and the *Concordat*."

The Abbé GREGOIRE continues to excite public attention. He has been prevented from taking his seat in the Chamber of Deputies. But he will not voluntarily betray his constituents. Before the decision for his exclusion, he addressed to them an interesting letter (*Lettre aux Electeurs du Département de l'Isère*) breathing the pure spirit of liberty and the gospel. He says he goes to take his seat beside the veteran of freedom, (La Fayette,) who has so gloriously defended it in both worlds. The following passage we translate as a specimen of this Election-Address:—

"*Religious Hatred*.—This expression, taken literally, is an absurdity; for it connects ideas which are incapable of connexion. That hatred which murdered Catholics in Ireland, and Protestants in the South of France, and which, beyond the Rhine, is now persecuting the children of Israel, would seek in vain its justification in the gospel; would attempt in vain to render the gospel the accomplice of those crimes on which its malediction falls. Religion has no other arms than truth to convince the mind, and charity to subdue the heart: we are deceived if, in-

stead of contemplating religion in her own form, we are resolved to view her through the habits and conduct of some of her ministers."—Pp. 10, 11.

A new periodical publication has appeared at Paris, entitled *Annales Protestantes: A Miscellany specially devoted to the Defence of the Reformed Religion. By a Society of Protestants and of Men of Letters*. The first Number, (for October, 1819,) has been sent to us, and we are happy to recommend this specimen of the work, on account both of its talents and spirit. The deluge of the French Revolution is succeeded by a freshness and sweetness which are grateful to the heart. The French have paid the price of liberty and know its value.

GERMANY.

A novelty appeared last year at Dessau, a Selection (in 8vo.) of *Sermons for Israelites* (Auswahl mehrerer predigten, &c.), by G. SALOMON. These Jewish Sermons, preached at Dessau, are on the following subjects: Concord, Causes of Unbelief, Reflections upon the new Year, Characters that distinguish the People of Israel, Vanity of earthly Good, Trust in Divine Providence.

HANOVER.

The Prince Regent of this kingdom "in consequence of the resolutions passed by the German Diet," has issued an ordinance subjecting the press to a rigorous censorship. How uniform is this hatred of princes, and especially German princes, to the press! There would, we fear, be sedition in the answer to the question, why they hate it.

HOLLAND.

M. VAN DER PALM, professor of oriental literature in the University of Leyden, and minister of a congregation there, well known by his volumes of excellent sermons and his translation of *Isaiah*, has announced a *New Dutch Version of the Bible*, and in less than six months has received more than two thousand subscriptions. The *First Part* is published and is well received. It consists of 276 pp. 4to. and contains the five Books of Moses. The Version is accompanied by short notes. M. Van der Palm adopts the hypothesis that Moses used in the composition of the Pentateuch, and especially of the book of Genesis, ancient original memoirs, preserved by songs or some other means in the patriarchal families.