

THE  
**Monthly Repository.**

No. CLXXXII.]

FEBRUARY, 1821.

[Vol. XVI.]

*Biographical Sketch of J. S. Semler.*

A FRIEND, whose contributions to your valuable Miscellany prove his own acquaintance with the best authors in the department of biblical criticism, has suggested to me, that, having furnished to the Monthly Repository some years back a biographical sketch of Michaëlis, [Vol. VI. 1 and 65,] I might perhaps gratify some of your readers, by giving a similar account of Semler, the *lumen alterum* of German theology in the eighteenth century. I would willingly have resigned to him the office of making Semler known to the English theological student, on the ground that he was as well acquainted as myself with the sources whence his biography must be drawn, and much more conversant with those studies in which Semler excelled. As, however, I have not been able to prevail on him by these arguments, I have sent you the subjoined sketch for insertion in the Repository. My principal, though by no means my only guide, has been an article in the *Allgemeine Bibliothek der Biblischen Litteratur* of Eichhorn, Vol. V. Part I. pp. 1—202.

K.

JOHN SOLOMON SEMLER was born on the 18th of December, 1725, at Saalfeld, in Thuringia. His father was a clergyman in this little town, but, though enjoying the dignity of Arch-deacon, his “couch of preferment” was a much humbler one than that of his brethren who bear the same title in our English hierarchy. His son learnt from him, however, if not the art of acquiring wealth, one still more valuable to a member of a profession which, above all others, should be independent of the favour of the world, —the art of dispensing with wealth, by moderate expectations and simplicity of habits. He is said to have owed much to his mother, who instilled into him sound principles of conduct, and a real regard for religion, while she carefully guarded him from the influence of that pietism which then prevailed as much in Germany, as similar ex-

cesses and perversions of the religious principle do in this country, under the names of Methodism and Evangelical Religion. The Duke of Saalfeld himself was strongly tinctured with pietism; and, after his mother’s death, Semler was persuaded by his father and elder brother, both of whom were already converted, to attend the rector of the school in his religious exercises, or *Hours of the Heart*, as they were called. The consequence was such as might have been foreseen: Semler, who did nothing in moderation, lost all his former cheerfulness, became a prey to the most distressing fears about his own salvation, and was seen perpetually weeping and on his knees, and, the new birth having succeeded in due time to the previous stages of his disorder, was invited to court along with some of his school-fellows, to give proof of it before the Duke in extemporary prayer. The literary part of Semler’s education was not neglected during this period of his life; but being left to himself too much in the choice of books, he read without discrimination and patient attention, and never acquired the power of arranging his own ideas with method, and developing them with accuracy.

In 1742, he was removed to the Orphan-House in Halle, and became a student at the University. The same religious influences to which he had been exposed at Saalfeld, continued for a time to operate here. The founder of the Orphan-House, August Hermann Franke, though one of the most benevolent of men, had a kind of Moravian mysticism in his piety, and this spirit continued to prevail among the directors of the institution after his death. At the time of which we are speaking, John Anastasius Freylinghausen, son-in-law of Franke, presided over it; and his Manual, though honoured by the approbation of the late Queen, and translated into English at her command, will sufficiently explain what is meant by pietism. Those

into whose hands Semler fell, harassed him with anxieties about his religious state, represented study as useless, and even sinful, and embittered the innocent enjoyments of his life. Accident, however, threw in his way a number of the classical authors whom he had never before had an opportunity of reading; his ardour for study, which had languished while he was under the influence of pietism, broke forth afresh; he became acquainted with Baumgarten, and acquired a taste for theological literature; and both these circumstances aided the re-action which Semler's native disposition made against the oppressive gloom and terror in which it had been kept. In his subsequent life, the religious experience of his youth seems to have had no unfavourable effect upon him. Indeed, it appears rather to have produced the effect which the rigour of a Calvinistic education sometimes has on those who have afterwards had strength of mind sufficient to shake off Calvinistic dogmas, preserving in them through life a strong sensibility to religious impressions. Baumgarten, to whom Semler attached himself more particularly on going to the University, was the most celebrated theologian in Germany, and deserves grateful mention, as the instructor both of Michaëlis and of Semler, and as having prepared the way for the great revolution which, in different spheres, and sometimes with hostile purposes, they jointly accomplished. Nothing could be more wretched than the state of theology in Germany at the close of the 17th century. The lectures read in the Universities were upon polemical and dogmatical theology; but biblical exegesis and ecclesiastical history were quite neglected.

Franke, whom I have before mentioned, at that time a teacher in Leipzig, was one of the first who raised his voice against this unprofitable mode of study: but as the other party saw nothing in the Bible but proofs of doctrines, so he and his friends regarded it only as a collection of practical precepts, and neither of them felt the necessity for that historical, philological and exegetical knowledge, without which the application of scripture, either to moral or doctrinal uses, may be only a perversion of its real sense. As opposite extremes of error, how-

ever, sometimes point out the middle path of truth, Franke and his party were not useless to rational theology: they had the further merit of drawing on themselves so strongly the hatred of the teachers of the old school, that some of them were expelled from Leipzig, and the University of Halle founded for their reception (1694) by the Prussian government. Here from the first, as might be expected in a newly-founded University, a more liberal spirit prevailed, and till Göttingen arose, of still more recent date, Halle led the way in the diffusion of rational theology. This of course must be understood comparatively: Baumgarten himself, who had been Professor at Halle from 1734, was far from being an accomplished theological scholar; he had an extensive acquaintance with both civil and ecclesiastical history, and made use of the latter to throw light upon the doctrines of scripture; but he neither possessed nor valued philological and critical knowledge. The greatest benefit, perhaps, which Michaëlis and Semler derived from him was, that he made them acquainted with the works of English theologians. Accustomed as we have long been to look to the Germans as our masters in theology, few perhaps are aware that they were once our scholars. We feel an honest pride in recording, that the *English Presbyterian Dissenters* gave to the Germans the first idea of a rational interpretation of those parts of scripture which are most wrested to the support of orthodoxy, and that Michaëlis and Semler were the disciples of Benson, Peirce and Hallett. The altered state of things in our time is easily explained. It was not so much extensive philological knowledge which had led these excellent men to a better system of interpretation, as the necessity of defending revelation against the Deists, (whose influence in compelling the advocates of Christianity to distinguish between what was and what was not defensible, has not perhaps been sufficiently attended to,) joined to that freedom of thought and investigation which is the heritage of Dissenters, but which can only be enjoyed by stealth in an establishment. They studied the Bible assiduously, made it its own interpreter, and deduced from it, thus explained, doctrines in conformity with reason and

sound philosophy. These qualifications sufficed to place them as critics and translators of scripture, far above those whom Germany had hitherto revered as oracles ; in these qualifications their descendants among the Presbyterian Dissenters have never been deficient ; but to pursue the study of theology, as a branch of literature, with that minuteness with which the Germans have, since the middle of the 18th century, cultivated every department of it, would have required more leisure and more wealth than falls to their lot. To be pursued with such results, theology must be studied, as the Germans study it, as an end not as a means. Some few, it is to be hoped, we shall always preserve among us, to whom no department of theological literature will be strange ; and, we trust, that no one will interpret what has been said, as an excuse for neglecting to furnish himself with as much literary knowledge, for the office of a minister, as his circumstances will allow. We have been endeavouring to account for a fact which cannot be denied, and which we have heard remarked in Germany itself ; the solution which has been given appears simple, and not dishonourable to those to whose present state it applies. Our establishment, connected with so many splendid institutions of learning, and offering to its members so many situations into which neither cares of subsistence nor calls of professional duty intrude, might indeed have done for the theological literature of England what the Dissenters could not do ; but the feeling of shame or danger arising from ignorance must be strong indeed, before it can overcome the *vis inertiae* of an establishment so wealthy and aristocratic as ours.

Baumgarten possessed an excellent library, in which Semler, whom he had taken into his house, and to whom he continued through life strongly attached, was enabled to indulge that thirst for various and desultory reading, which we have already observed that he brought with him from Saalfeld. History, however, his patron's favourite study, became also his ; Baumgarten employed him on the translation of the English Universal History in which he had engaged, and he contributed materials to other historical works in which the literati of Halle were occu-

pled. He also projected some classical works ; one of these, which he began in the second half-year of his academical career, was a consolidation of all the Greek lexicographers, Hesychius, Suidas, the Etymologicon Magnum, &c. into one. It is hardly necessary to say, that he never proceeded, even to the end of Alpha, with this gigantic undertaking. In the years 1747-8, while yet a student at the University, he published a letter to Heumann, upon his Emendations of Livy ; an Essay on the Coincidences of Legends and Romances ; a Specimen of Corrections in the German Edition of Bayle ; a Translation of the Isis and Osiris of Plutarch ; a Dissertation on the Egyptian Dynasties according to Manetho, Eratosthenes and Syncellus ; besides a number of articles in the Transactions of Literary Societies in Germany. Baumgarten, proud of the genius of his favourite pupil, took every method to make him known, and before he had finished his academical course he was regarded as a young man of the highest promise, and one whom a distinguished station awaited. But the inspection of the works which he published at this period will shew, what might have been expected from the nature of his studies, that he had never given himself time to master completely any one of the numerous topics on which he wrote. His free and ardent mind made him on every subject a vigorous and independent thinker ; he touched nothing on which he did not throw some light, but the fitful and unsteady gleam never remained long enough on any one object to shew it in all its parts. He had not hitherto received that decided bias to any particular pursuit, which leads to the concentration of all the mental powers upon it : and even his theological studies, though he had devoted himself to this profession, appear from his earliest works to have been still very imperfect. His Disputation for his Degree on leaving the University, was a defence of the genuineness of the readings in some passages of the received text of the Greek Testament, attacked by Whiston either in his Sacred History or his Translation. He sent him this Dissertation, and Whiston, then in his 83d year, replied with great mildness, and excused the errors which he pointed out to Semler,



on the ground of the infant state of biblical criticism in Germany. His countrymen, and especially Baumgarten, a bigoted defender of the integrity of the received text, applauded him to the skies; Semler was not deceived by their flattery, but lived to make an ample atonement to the manes of Whiston, by defending his opinions on much better grounds than Whiston himself had alleged in their support.

On leaving the University in 1749, he settled at Coburg, where he undertook the editorship of a newspaper, and excited so much attention by the spirited manner in which he conducted it, that he was appointed to draw up a memorial respecting the disputes between the Duke of Wirtemberg and his vassals before the Diet at Ratisbon. The chief benefit which he derived from his year's residence at Coburg was, that he became acquainted with his future wife, a woman of great firmness of mind and calmness of temper, endowed with that sound judgment upon matters of real life, and that spirit of order and economy, to which Semler was an utter stranger. Accompanied by her, he removed in 1751 to Altdorff, as Professor of History and Poetry, and spent there one year, which seems to have passed in the purest domestic happiness, in the pursuit of the studies in which he most delighted, and in harmony with his colleagues, to whom he was not yet become an object of jealousy. His removal to Halle in 1752, as Professor of Theology, made him acquainted with a different state of things. He was here placed, it is true, by the side of his friend and patron, Baumgarten, who lived till 1757; but all the rest of the theological faculty was decidedly hostile to him, and embittered his life by intrigues and cabals, which might have operated still more unfavourably upon his peace, but for the prudence of his wife. Even Baumgarten's influence was unfavourable in some respects to the development of Semler's mind: he was one of those who, having departed a little from prevailing opinions, are as jealous of those who go further as if they themselves had been standards of orthodoxy; he had early discovered a taint of heretical liberality in Semler's turn of thinking, and watched him as rigidly as if it had been

a spot of leprosy: so that during Baumgarten's life-time he was compelled to keep those juster views to himself, which had opened upon him almost from the time when the duties of his professorship led him to make theology his chief study. He was deficient too, in the first years of this period, in theological acquirements, which assiduous application was necessary to supply; and, from the united influence of these causes, it was not till about 1760, that he assumed that rank as a theologian which he continued to hold during 20 years. On Baumgarten's death, in 1757, he was made Director of the Theological Seminary, an institution existing in many of the Protestant Universities of Germany, and designed to assist and guide the theological student in his preparation for the ministry, by placing him more under the immediate superintendence of his teacher, than the loose connexion between professors and students would otherwise allow. A short time only was now necessary to acquire for Semler a degree of reputation which brought theological students from all parts to Halle. Every year he continued to publish works full of novel and interesting ideas: his language and elocution, as a lecturer, were, like his writings, full of unpolished strength and irregular animation; but from these very qualities, perhaps, he succeeded better in making his hearers think, and awakening the love of truth and thirst for knowledge in their minds, than he could have done by a more finished style and delivery. Hence his auditory was always crowded with students, among whom he diffused a love of theological learning, and a spirit of fearless investigation of scripture and of Christian antiquities. The theological chairs in the principal Universities and other institutions of education in Germany were filled by his pupils, or by those who adopted his principles; and as the spirit of the times co-operated with his endeavours, the diffusion of his doctrines was wide and rapid. Among his pupils, it is only necessary to mention GRIESBACH, to prove how deeply we are indebted to him for those more correct opinions respecting the text of the New Testament, which have placed the scriptural argument for the Unity of God upon an immoveable



basis. We shall speak more fully hereafter respecting the different works of Semler; at present it is sufficient to have remarked their general tendency and effect. Although he indulged in violent language as a writer, he was disposed to live peaceably with his colleagues; but in his intercourse with the great, with some of whom he was necessarily brought into contact, from the dependence of German universities on their respective governments, he was not sufficiently smooth and complying, and he suffered a very mortifying insult from the Prussian Minister von Zedlitz, who, in 1779, took from him the office of Director of the Theological Seminary, although he had administered its funds in an unexceptionable manner. This and some similar circumstances appear to have produced for a time disgust for the studies to which he had till now devoted himself, and to have led him to study natural philosophy, and especially chemistry. In uniting a taste for these pursuits with those which were more strictly professional, he resembled our own Priestley; but the parallel is confined to this single circumstance. While Priestley enlarged the boundaries of science by his curious discoveries, Semler wasted his time in researches after the elixir of life and the philosopher's stone. Lest the reader should consider this as a proof of insanity or dotage, or at least begin to doubt all that has been said of Semler's vigour of mind and extent of knowledge, we must entreat him to remember that a tendency to mysticism is a part of the national character of the Germans, among whom, at this moment, animal magnetism is taught by professors in universities, and annals of its wonders are regularly published.

The respect which Semler had long enjoyed among his contemporaries was lost towards the close of life, not so much in consequence of these extravagancies as of his supposed abandonment of those principles of religious liberty which he had not only defended in his former life, but practically availed himself of them, by renouncing opinions supported by the state and the belief of the majority. This charge was founded upon the part which he took in opposing those who exercised the liberty of going still further than himself in calling received opinions in

question, and abandoned orthodoxy or even Christianity altogether. Semler not only wrote against them, as against Bahrdt and the author of the *Wolfenbüttel Fragments*, but treated them as men pernicious to the state, whose works deserved to be suppressed by its authority; and when charged with inconsistency and with having himself been the greatest innovator in theology of his age, sheltered himself in a distinction between private and public religion. He distinguished, indeed, in his work on this subject, (1786,) a three-fold variety of religion: *historical* religion simply takes the relation of the life and doctrine of Jesus in the literal sense, without any application to the moral condition of the individual: *civil* or *established* religion consists in the doctrinal propositions which the church has adopted, incorporated in its creeds and confessions, and, for the preservation of unity, tranquillity and order, has enjoined to be believed and taught: *moral* religion, finally, is that development and adaptation to his condition and necessities which an individual makes of the doctrines which he derives from the New Testament, and its effects are seen in the sentiments and conduct. The great mass of Christians must content itself with historical belief and the explanation of it which the church has given, and thus do the best it can for its own spiritual welfare: those of more comprehension, on the contrary, he would have receive religion in the peculiar form best adapted to their own minds, and fashion and apply it according to their own necessities, the established religion being merely the vehicle to convey this higher and more refined species to those who are capable of it. In this way he hoped to reconcile that diversity of opinion on religious subjects which is essential to freedom of conscience, with the unity of teaching and profession which is implied in the idea of an established church.

It may be easily conceived, that this scheme of Semler's met with the fate which attends attempts to reconcile irreconcilable things: the orthodox gave him no thanks for an adherence which was formal and insincere; the heterodox condemned him for timid duplicity. It was alleged with truth, that our Lord and his disciples, instead

of setting up Christianity in opposition to the doctrines which they found established, might have taken them as articles of peace, and, conforming as good subjects to the religion of the state, have employed as much or as little of it as they pleased for the purpose of *moral religion*; that the Reformers had done wrong to quit the Church of Rome, and Protestants should return without delay to the fold from which they ought never to have broken out. The assertion that creeds and confessions were not meant to be imposed in their strict and literal meaning, and might be fairly signed and recited simply as an outward sign of adherence to the church which adopted them, was refuted, it was said, by the whole conduct of the councils and synods which imposed them, who evidently meant to exclude every shade of opinion except their own, and either made the language of their symbols more precise, as soon as they found that they were not sufficiently so to prevent all variety of belief, or took more violent measures to get rid of those who did not embrace them in their most strict and literal sense. In short, all those arguments which are familiar to our readers on the subject of subscription, were successfully urged against Semler's scheme, and his antagonists were not sparing of reflections upon his motives. Naturally vehement, conscious of no selfish motive, and unable to bear the loss of that respect which he had hitherto enjoyed, he replied with equal bitterness, and defended his own principles the more pertinaciously, in proportion as he was involved by them in inconsistencies and contradictions. His defence of the Religious Edict of the King of Prussia, in 1788, raised the animosity of the party against whom it was directed to the highest pitch, and the few remaining years of his life were embittered by the virulent attacks which they made upon his character. During the reign of Frederic the Great, full liberty had been enjoyed in the Prussian dominions to write freely on all subjects but the King and his administration, and the progress of heresy or scepticism, it may be supposed, gave the philosopher of Sans Souci very little uneasiness. His successor, Frederic William II., however, thought differently, and issued the Edict above-men-

tioned, occasioned principally by the writings of Bahrdt, whose "Confession of Faith" was an attack upon revelation. Semler, as might have been expected, approved and defended the Edict, which was generally condemned as an infringement of religious liberty.

It is a good rule in morals, as well as in criticism, to interpret doubtful passages by those which are plain. We cannot bring ourselves to join in the charges which have been advanced against Semler, when we remember how long and zealously he had laboured in defence of liberal principles. The exertions of his former life could scarcely have any other motive than a sincere attachment to these principles: his apparent renunciation of them may be explained by his finding himself entangled in a dilemma which ever has embarrassed, and ever will embarrass, those who endeavour to reconcile religious freedom with an establishment of religion and, what is essential to it, a confession and articles. We will not call Paley's chapter on Subscription "a shuffling chapter," but it is certainly a very unsatisfactory one, and we have never yet seen any similar attempt which was not equally so. The question respecting the desirableness of an establishment, is, indeed, not decided by its necessarily imposing some restriction upon the religious freedom of its members. We can conceive of, though we do not expect speedily to see realized, an establishment in which this restriction should be so small as to be compensated by the other advantages which an endowed church possesses; but, without some sacrifice of the right of private judgment, we see not how such a thing can exist. A Dissenter may be entitled to say to Semler, You should have left the Church, whose confessions, in the obvious sense of their language, no longer contained your belief, and not have endeavoured, by subtle distinctions and evasive statements, to excuse what simple honesty condemns. But his accusers in Germany had no right to use this language, as they departed still more widely than he from the Church of which they professed themselves members, and the only other difference between them was, that he made an indifferent justification of himself and

they none. Eichhorn, who, in the Memoir to which I have referred, has exposed the false reasoning of Semler with great clearness and energy, subjoins, [p. 176,] “It is very true, no state can allow its subjects, by doubts and opposition, to make those principles fluctuating and uncertain on which the peace and virtue of mankind rest. No care can be superfluous to protect practical religion from every possible danger, and to promote ignorance on many points in those classes to whom it is beneficial, and to whom to be enlightened on these points would be injurious. But it has no right to force ignorance on those classes to whom illumination is necessary, and to whose peace it is indispensable. We take the sword from the child that he may not wound himself; we restore it to the man that he may use it for his defence, and we train up the child that he may learn to use it when his time comes. And thus it is the duty of a nation to provide instruction for every class of its citizens, and so make them constantly susceptible of higher degrees of illumination, but never to subjugate the mind by oppressive decrees.” Metaphors seldom run on all-fours; and we fear that if governments are to decide who among their subjects are arrived at an age to be safely trusted with edge-tools, it will be only in some of those German principalities, whose extent has been so pleasantly described by Mr. Canning, that ministers of state will have leisure for such an investigation. Most of them, we believe, would think it a shorter and better way to allow no sword to be forged but at a royal manufactory, nor sold but by a special licence. We are very sure that Eichhorn did not mean to include professors in the universities among those for whom too much illumination is not good; yet the governments of Germany have shewn of late that they by no means rejoice in the light which some of them emit. The professors of Göttingen are too prudent to make it necessary for the Hanoverian government to teach them their duty to the state by violent means; but some of their neighbours appear to be less discreet. One of the measures which the Congress of Carlsbad devised for the tranquillity of Germany was to establish a commissioner of government in every university, who should especially

watch over the conduct of the professors. Their first care was of course to be, that no democratic doctrines should be taught; but theological heresies were also to be carefully watched. The following is an extract from the instructions to the commissioner at the University of Heidelberg, dated Dec. 2, 1819. After a preamble, professing that nothing which follows is designed to check the progress of scientific knowledge and real illumination, it goes on, “The superintendence of public instruction shall consist not only in inspection of the manuals and compendia, according to which the Lectures are avowedly delivered, but the commissioner may satisfy himself, in other ways, that the professor does not in his oral instructions depart from what he has traced in his manual, and infringe upon the principles which have been laid down. If he should find that this is done, he is to admonish the professor of his misconduct, and if he does not alter it, he is to report him to the Minister of the Interior; that he may be deposed for contumacy. This rigid superintendence is to be exercised particularly over the departments of theology, philosophy and history, and the commissioner is especially to take care, that the *noxious spirit of innovation be banished from the Exegesis of the Scriptures, which must be founded upon the inviolability of the established doctrine*, and limits be set to mysticism; that philosophy do not presume to enter into the province of what is positively taught and enjoined by divine authority, nor inspire a pernicious scepticism by inquiries into subjects which lie beyond its province and its reach—a scepticism which philosophy is unable to tranquillize, and for which it can give no compensation.” We doubt exceedingly whether the ingenious works which have placed Eichhorn at the head of the present race of theological scholars in Germany, would be found upon examination to respect the *inviolability of established doctrines*; we fear that his Exegesis might appear to the higher powers to be animated by a noxious spirit of innovation; and would he not think it hard to be compelled to suppress his own opinions out of deference to the ignorant prejudices of a commissioner or a minister of the interior? And yet if the government should think, as some



of his hearers certainly have done, that his doubts make those principles uncertain, on which the peace and virtue of mankind rest, on his own shewing they are bound to interfere.

We have made these remarks in order to mitigate, if not wholly to remove, the censure which has been so unsparingly bestowed on Semler for his theory of the three religions, and his willingness to see civil power employed in protecting that which is established. When we see how many excellent men have continued in an establishment which they did not approve; how many Blackburnes and Paleys there have been for one Robertson or Lindsey, we cannot harshly condemn their conduct. In the case of Semler, there is no *proof* that he had renounced the principal doctrines of the Lutheran confession; he himself declared that he had done no more than to reject the common arguments in their support; and as Griesbach remained a Trinitarian, after expunging from the New Testament every passage on which the shadow of an argument for the Trinity could be maintained, so may it have been with Semler. To his own Master he must stand or fall. He died on the 14th of March, 1791, of the consequences of an obstinate obstruction of the bowels, foreseeing his death for a considerable time, and contemplating it with calmness, resignation and hope. His friend F. A. Wolf, the celebrated Editor of Homer, published an account of the interviews and conversations which he had with him in the days which preceded his dissolution. The passions which caused him to be so harshly judged, died away when he was no more; and, at this distance of time, few who review his life will probably refuse to add the praise of integrity to that of extensive learning and vigorous originality of thought.

[To be concluded in the next Number.]

---

*The Character of Christian in Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress.*

(By the late Rev. T. HOWE.)

Letter II.

SIR,

Bridport.

**H**AVING in a previous number of your Repository (pp. 16—18) endeavoured to vindicate the character of Christian in the Pilgrim's Progress, from the charges brought

against it by Mr. Dunlop, in his History of Fiction, I now send you some observations on this ingenious and popular allegory.

In order duly to appreciate the Pilgrim's Progress, and to be able to account for the vulgarisms and other faults apparent in this production, it is proper for the reader to know something of the circumstances of the life of the author, and of the peculiar disadvantages under which he laboured. JOHN BUNYAN was born in Elstow, in Bedfordshire, Anno Dom. 1628, and at ten years of age was distinguished as the most profane swearer in the place. His father was a tinker, and brought up his son to the same humble employment. He had no other education than being taught to read and write. When about seventeen, he served as a soldier in the Parliament's army. Though a notoriously depraved and vicious character, he was not so thoroughly hardened in sin but he occasionally felt the terrors of an accusing conscience. He was affrighted by supposed portentous dreams and visions, warning him of his danger, and threatening him with punishment for his evil practices. These effects of a disturbed imagination, together with other concurrent circumstances, were so graciously overruled by Divine Providence, as to lead him to serious thought, pious resolutions, and eventually to a thorough reformation and holy life. His conversion he always ascribed to the immediate and supernatural operation of the Holy Spirit. On his becoming religious, he adopted the system of Calvinism as then professed by the Particular Baptists, to whom he joined himself, and, after some time of trial, became a preacher among them. After the restoration of that unprincipled persecutor and ungrateful violator of sacred promises, Charles II<sup>nd</sup>, Mr. Bunyan was tried on an indictment, at Bedford Quarter Sessions, for his Nonconformity. He was charged with "having devilishly and perniciously abstained from coming to Church to hear divine service, and with being a common upholder of several unlawful meetings and conventicles, to the great disturbance and distraction of the good subjects of this kingdom, contrary to the laws of our Sovereign Lord the King." [Toulmin's Historical View, p. 335.]

The accused did not hesitate boldly to avow and vindicate his principles of Nonconformity, for which, without the examination of any witnesses, he was sentenced to be re-committed to Bedford jail, and if he did not *recant* at the end of three months, to be banished the realm. No threats, however, or punishment could induce him to violate the dictates of his conscience; and though the sentence of banishment was not executed, this noble confessor was kept in prison for twelve years, enduring various evils and deprivations with Christian patience. The circumstances I have stated will account for the general complexion of the Pilgrim's Progress, written by a person converted, as he supposed by *supernatural* agency, from a course of sin to holiness, and no doubt suggested many of the scenes therein described.

Mr. Dunlop remarks, that "the sentiments of Christian are narrow and illiberal." In this I think him more just and accurate than in the delineation of his character. Christian on various occasions advances his religious opinions, which are those of Mr. Bunyan himself. The doctrines of original sin, the necessity of supernatural regeneration, the immediate revelation of the Saviour to the soul of the believer by the Father, the being clothed in the spotless robe of the righteousness of Christ, who is God, and relying on his personal obedience to the law, in doing and suffering for us what that required at our hands, were deemed by him to be the essential articles of the gospel. He had, indeed, no candour for any person who maintained different sentiments, as appears from his conversation with Ignorance. What little affinity, however, has this system with the moral instructions contained in our Lord's admirable Sermon on the Mount! It is indeed irreconcilable with Christian's own account of the necessity of personal righteousness for acceptance with his Judge in the day of general retribution: "The soul of religion is the practical part. 'Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their afflictions, and to keep himself unspotted from the world.' This, Talkative is not aware of; he thinks that *hearing* and *saying* will make a good Christian, and thus he deceiveth his own soul. Hearing is

but as the sowing of the seed; talking is not sufficient to prove that fruit is indeed in the heart and life; and let us assure ourselves that at the day of doom, men shall be judged according to their *fruits*. It will not be said then, Did you *believe*? but, Were you *doers* or *talkers* only? And accordingly shall they be judged. The end of the world is compared to our *harvest*, and you know men at harvest regard nothing but *fruit*. Not that any thing can be accepted that is not of faith; but I speak this to shew you how insignificant the profession of Talkative will be at that day." I wish every part of the Pilgrim's Progress corresponded with these just and important observations.

There is one considerable defect in this Allegory, which is, I think, as pernicious in its tendency as it is erroneous in principle. Morality is represented only as a village, and, that pilgrims may not pass through it, the author has placed it a mile out of the way which leads to Mount Zion; and poor Christian for his attempt to go to it, to consult with Mr. Legality, was in very imminent danger of being burnt by flashes of fire from a neighbouring hill. This, together with the severe reproof given him by Evangelist for his rashness, exhibits morality in a point of view to be dreaded and avoided, rather than sought for and highly valued. How much better would it comport with the genuine system of Christianity, if Morality were made the King's High-way to Mount Zion, and every deviation from it strictly forbidden!

That all persons after having entered on the Christian pilgrimage should be obliged to pass through the Slough of Despond in their way to the heavenly city, is presenting a needless discouragement from the undertaking, and not warranted by divine revelation. That many sincere converts from darkness to light, from a course of sin to the service of God and the practice of holiness, are occasionally apt to despond of divine mercy and acceptance, is true, but this should be stated as their infirmity, against which the genuine principles of religion, and the gracious promises of the gospel, tend to preserve them, to animate their steps, to cheer their hearts, and to brighten their prospects. The contest

of Christian with Apollyon in the Valley of Humiliation, and the dismal scenes he was called to pass through in the Valley of the Shadow of Death, beset with infernal fiends suggesting horrid blasphemies, are more calculated to promote *superstition* than genuine piety, and to oppress the minds of people with those terrific apprehensions of evil and malignant spirits, which, in proportion as they prevail, diminish confidence in the paternal goodness and protection of the Father of mercies, and which often prove fatal to the human intellect. In this respect, indeed, the Pilgrim's Progress and Milton's Paradise Lost (I say it with the strongest conviction of the unparalleled beauties of this sublime poem) have been more injurious than any two books besides in the English language, and the former to a greater extent than the latter, being more generally read and better suited to common capacities.

To counteract such pernicious effects, it is desirable that a new edition of the Pilgrim's Progress should be published, *revised* and *corrected*. To make it calculated to enlighten the mind with useful, religious knowledge, and to communicate important moral instructions suited to all classes of the community, requires a sound judgment with respect to the requisite omissions and alterations. As for the author's *rhymes*, they cannot be too soon consigned to utter oblivion. Whether others should be substituted in their stead, must depend on the taste and poetic genius of the editor. Some of the conversations which are introduced, need to be either wholly omitted, or made to convey very different sentiments.

Let no one who has ability and leisure for the task decline it from an apprehension that it would be deemed unworthy of his talents and pursuits to engage in so humble an undertaking as that of preparing for the press an edition of Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress on the plan above proposed. It might not add any splendour to his literary reputation, but, what is more valuable, it would merit the thanks of all the friends of pure religion for its *utility*. It cannot be expected that it would meet with the approbation of the advocates for Calvinistic divinity. They would probably censure the under-

taking as an undue liberty with the sentiments contained in the work, to make such material alterations. If these, however, be announced in the title-page, it is no act of injustice to the author; it can mislead no one, and is sanctioned by a very prevalent custom. My valuable friend who has for some years past resided at Sidmouth, and whose bodily infirmities, I am sorry to hear, disable him from pursuing his ministerial labours, but whose continued vigour of intellect is evinced by the third volume of his excellent Family Sermons which he has just published, will, I trust, excuse me for saying, that no one can be better qualified than himself for rendering this ingenious and popular allegory subservient to the noble cause which he, as an Unitarian Christian, is well known to have near at heart.

T. HOWE.

### Christianity not Naturalism.

(Concluded from p. 21.)

THE stigmatizing prayer as "a charm," is an attempt to take us by surprise; it is mere sophistry. The "exposing ourselves to impressions" as a means of virtue, may with equal reason be termed magic. Prayer is the result of a certain disposition of the mind or change of the heart, pleasing to the Deity, because required by him as the condition of his favour. We may hence discern a reason why the Deity is accessible to prayer. But as prayer is the expression of a mind peculiarly disposed, it is not the cause of that disposition, but its effect: and as the approbation of the Deity is extended to the motive influencing prayer, and not to the prayer abstractedly from the motive, prayer in itself cannot be the cause of his extending that approbation. Prayer, therefore, cannot be a charm. In fact, a charm implies a verbal spell, similar to the Popish ternary invocation, by which it is meant to express the *emperichoresis* of the Trinity:

Jesu, Jesu, Jesu,  
Jesu, Jesu, Jesu,  
Jesu, Jesu, Jesu,  
Miserate nos.

Can it be pretended that the prayer of "the spirit and the understanding" has any affinity with this?



The dilemma proposed, that "if God immediately disposes mankind to good, he also immediately disposes them to evil," is irrelevant to the sort of divine influence which is the subject in dispute. It is not supposed that God arbitrarily disposes the mind by irresistible grace to follow what is good: it cannot, therefore, be inferred that he arbitrarily directs the mind to follow what is evil. If God dispenses aid to those who seek it, there is implied a predisposition to goodness: if God dispose to evil, it is where the heart is wilfully prone to evil; and this is illustrated in 2 Thess. ii. 11, 12, and Rom. i. 24.

It is contended, that from God's immediate communications, knowledge cannot be excluded; because Christ says, "Every man that has *learned* of the Father cometh unto me:" "He will guide you into all *truth*:" "He will *teach* you all things." Now the question properly is, whether *doctrinal* truth is here intended? For this was the sort of truth which it was doubted that God imparted to men, since the ceasing of the gift of his miraculous energy or spirit—a doubt which is founded on the absence of all authority that he does so, and which derives strength from the great improbability that he should interfere to direct the natural understanding of men, when his written word, transmitted from the hands of prophets and apostles, and the traditions of Christ's primitive church, are within their reach. The diversity of doctrine, in those who equally pretend to divine aid, is of itself a demonstration that doctrinal truth is not communicated: but if we can produce no *proof* of the communication of spiritual influences, independent of illumination on points of doctrine, no one can demonstrate their non-existence.

The argument of the writer respecting "supernatural periods," might here be retorted upon him; for if it be allowed that the truth spoken of was *doctrine*, it might be said that the teachings of mysterious knowledge were imparted in the apostolic age; but it does not follow that they are imparted still. The application of these texts, however, is a mere trifling with words. The divine truth here mentioned had nothing to do with the metaphysical nature of God, or any question about

the person of Christ, which alone would be to the writer's purpose, and in connexion with the subject in hand; for these questions had not then been originated. No disciple of Jesus had any doubt of the unipersonal nature of Jehovah, or of his self-originating mercy, or of the humanity of Jesus, who was "called the Son of God." What the Jews had to learn, was that disposition of heart which would bring them to acknowledge Jesus of Nazareth as the Christ; and the knowledge of all things, to which the apostles were to be guided by the Spirit, related to the designs of the gospel dispensation. *Knowledge, truth and wisdom* are, moreover, equivalent, in scripture language, to a religious spirit, or a knowledge of the will of God, as is evident from that fine chapter, Prov. ii. To confound this with accurate theological doctrine, in the modern sense of orthodoxy, is to quibble with sounds.

As the writer is apprehensive that the example of Christ in the garden (Luke xxii. 41) may have misled people into this foolish application to the "God of all hope and consolation," he shews an anxiety to invalidate this piece of gospel history, as if there were no other occasions on which Jesus betook himself to prayer. He seems, however, to do him justice, perfectly indifferent whether the passage be spurious or Christ amenable to censure. The question has been mooted, very unnecessarily, to say the least of it, whether Jesus were clear from human sin, in circumstances which did not respect his ministry? Now, as sin implies a wilful or conscious breach of some known commandment of God, it would be rather difficult to conceive how Jesus could yield to sin (whether little or great, in human computation, is indifferent, for, as respects the pure and perfect God, "he that keepeth the whole law, yet offends in one point, is guilty of all") and could, at the same time, be "the beloved Son of God in whom he was well pleased." It was reserved, however, for the present writer to impute sin to Jesus in the very office of his Messiahship. I shall pass over the curious proof of the spuriousness of this whole relation from the impugned authenticity of the 42nd and 43rd verses, which do *not* include the circumstances to which his

remarks apply, and are merely *episodic*, containing the appearance of the consoling angel and the sweat of blood (a phenomenon, we may observe, likely to excite suspicion, but which is by no means unprecedented: see Theol. Repos. VI. 347): nor shall I attempt any answer to the questions, How the facts came to be known? Whether Jesus himself reported what he had said? Whether the Holy Spirit revealed it afterwards, &c.? Cavils of a similar nature may be brought to bear on a variety of particulars in these ancient narrations, and thus the whole gospel history may be pulled to pieces. What we have to ask is, what credit is due to the text, and what is the authority of the writer? And if the old copies sanction the one in its general integrity, and the early churches acknowledged the other, we ought to be satisfied that there is sufficient ground for the fact, though we may not be enabled to ascertain precisely in what manner it was made known to the evangelist. But this prayer, it seems, is very "unworthy of Christ." If this writer believe Christ to be God, or a secondary God, he may consistently think the supplication of Christ unworthy of him; but if Jesus were properly a man, as Peter and Paul affirmed, and as the Jews expected their Messiah would be, this is merely finding fault with his possessing the infirmities of our common nature; for as to his knowledge of his high destination, and his intimate participation of the counsels of the Eternal, it is well observed by the writer in the *Theological Repository*, that "in a highly-agitated state of mind, the thing might for a moment appear in a different light: our Lord well knew that the appointments of God, even when expressed in the most absolute terms, are not always so intended. We have more instances than one of similar orders and appointments, by which nothing was meant but the trial of a person's faith. This was the case when Abraham was ordered to offer up his beloved son Isaac." This objection has therefore only force in respect to those who believe Christ to be a person in a plural godhead, or a superangelic, pre-existent spirit, the necessary instrument of the Deity's communications. Your readers cannot fail to remark, that, like some other

attempts which have lately been made through the medium of the *Repository*, the suspicion which it is endeavoured to cast upon this affecting incident, deprives the Unitarian of an important proof of the simple humanity of the Messiah.

We are told that he "wished to avoid pain;" that "his pain was incomparably less than that which thousands of his followers have willingly endured in his cause, with motives infinitely inferior to his;" and we are asked, "What conceivable ties could Jesus have had to this world which could have made life so exceedingly desirable to him?" Now it is merely begging the question (passing by the miserably poor and paltry view taken by the writer of the sufferings of Jesus) to say that Jesus wished to avoid *pain*, or that what he wished to obtain was longer life. His motives are degraded in order to favour the writer's positions: and as to the incomparably greater *pain* of the martyrs, (unless we are to understand the corporeal pain of burning or flaying or boiling in hot oil,) how can he be so sure that any martyr suffered mentally in the degree that Jesus suffered? As no one was ever so emphatically the only-begotten or well-beloved of God, so none could have felt so sensibly the temporary suspension of God's upholding aid; and as no one was ever "in the bosom of the Father" in the same sense as Jesus was, no one could have had so clear a foresight of the precise amount of his sufferings; no one could therefore have exhibited so perfect an instance of entire self-annihilation and devotion to God. "Father! if THOU BE WILLING, remove this cup from me; nevertheless, NOT *my* will, but THINE be done." Ver. 42. From this passage the writer most logically infers, that "he did, in this one instance, for some time seek *his own* will, and *not* the will of him who sent him"!

The truth is, that the nature of this agony of Christ has totally escaped the writer's discernment: he has not even once guessed at what must be sufficiently plain to those who have accurate views of the design of Christ's ministry as personally affecting himself, namely, the fact that this agony was a *trial*: "a horror of great darkness fell upon him." He was to be

"made perfect by *suffering*," and not, as this writer seems to imagine would have been more consistent with his dignity, by opportunities for the display of an impassive superiority to the sense of pain. Had there been no sense of suffering, it is obvious there would have been no merit. Had Jesus acted like an incarnate deity or sub-deity, it is obvious he would have been no pattern for our imitation, and would have had no claim upon our sympathy. Had his sense of the apparent desertion of his God and Father been less, the resignation to his will would have lost proportionately in merit. The writer, in short, insists that to evince perfect dignity of virtue, it would have been necessary for Christ to resign himself to his Father's will, under a Stoical insensibility to the sufferings that awaited him; that in proportion as he felt his sufferings, his patience under them was less exemplary, and his magnanimity in meeting them more doubtful and imperfect. This is in entire consistency with the logic, that he who prays with submission to the will of God, is all the time seeking *his own*!

If, however, this be so, there is an end of the imitation of Christ altogether: if, instead of being "tempted as we are, yet without sin," he sinned *just* to a certain point, and "just so far" is not an object for our imitation, he is not an object for our imitation at all. The apostles must have been mistaken when they described him as "knowing no sin:" and the just appreciation of his character must have been reserved for the later sect of philosophizing Christians, to whom the age is indebted for a projected alliance between *Deism* and *Christianity*.

CORNÉLIUS.

SIR, November 9, 1820.

**I**N common with many other persons who respect the talents of Mr. Belsham, I read with some surprise, during last summer, his *Three Sermons on the Patronage of Christianity by the Civil Power*; in which he exhibits a view of the subject very opposite to that which is commonly supposed to be entertained by the great bulk of Protestant Dissenters. The fairness and precision with which he states the arguments of his opponents, and the general candour displayed

throughout the work, cannot but command admiration. I must confess, however, I was much struck with the poverty of his reasoning, and could not but call to mind an anecdote of Jeremy Taylor, who, in his "*Liberty of Prophesying*," is supposed to have stated the case of his adversaries in so powerful a manner as to overturn the force of his own reasoning. My present remarks, however, will refer principally to Mr. Belsham's paper in the last Number of the "*Repository*." [XV. 575—578.]

No one who is acquainted with the cool, deliberate mind of Mr. Belsham, as portrayed in his writings, or with his acuteness in conducting an argument, can imagine for a moment to impose upon him by rhetorical flourishes, hard words or inconclusive reasoning. If he is to be assailed by the rude arts of controversy, as he seems to anticipate, it will not be by the present writer.

When a man of learning and talent advances an opinion upon any subject, even if it be ever so novel and repulsive, provided he does it in a gentlemanly manner, he is entitled to a candid hearing. But if the subject be hackneyed, and one upon which the wise and good confessedly differ, there is still farther ground for consideration and forbearance. If Mr. Belsham, after mature deliberation, considers that Christianity has ever gained, or is likely to gain, any good by the patronage of the civil power, he has unquestionably a right so to think, without incurring the displeasure or ill-will of any person upon that account. I think he is mistaken, and in the exercise of this judgment must put in my claim to the same indulgence that I have granted to him, or that we should both of us be disposed to concede to his Grace of Canterbury.

The question of civil establishments of religion has never, perhaps, been so ably argued, with a view to their support, as by that prince of dogmatists Bishop Warburton. If you grant him his premises, I do not see with what propriety you can withstand the force of his conclusions. When the civil magistrate is once let in, who is to set bounds to his authority? What are the prescribed rules which say to him, "Hitherto shalt thou go, but no farther"?



There are but two ways, as I conceive, of reasoning this subject. Ecclesiastical establishments must be defended on the score either of truth or of utility. If the former, the civil magistrate is converted at once into a teacher of Christianity; he is made the infallible expounder of the divine law, and the immediate vice-gerent of the Supreme Being upon the earth. In short, he approximates very near to the condition of the Roman pontiff, or the grand Lama of Thibet. But if truth is to be the basis of any particular religion before it is recommended and enforced by the civil magistrate, he can have no pretensions to deviate from the laws and regulations of its Founder, who must be best acquainted with both its nature and requirements. These can only be learnt by having recourse to his own testimony, or to that of agents immediately commissioned and authorized by him.

Christians, I know, differ widely in the degree of authority which they attach to the writings of the New Testament. But every Christian, I presume, and Mr. Belsham amongst the rest, professes to derive his religion from thence. He builds upon no other authority, and any deviation from, or addition to, what was taught and practised by Jesus Christ and his apostles, must be considered so far a departure from their religion. I need not tell Mr. Belsham that there is not the shadow of an authority in the New Testament for investing the civil magistrate with the protection of Christianity, or for decorating him with the swelling title of "Defender of the Faith." The Jewish Church, indeed, was essentially involved with the state, it made an integral part of it, its worship was symbolical, and it was clothed, in the emphatical language of the apostle, with "the beggarly elements of the world." Now, if I understand any thing of the design of Christianity, it was to destroy this system altogether, and to substitute for the gross and unworthy views which then prevailed respecting the Divine nature and government, a worship of a more refined and intellectual nature. The Jewish religion was a system of worldly polity; but Jesus Christ says, "My kingdom is not of this world," a declaration which, notwithstanding the ingenuity that has been exercised to

explain it away, must ever remain a significant token of genuine Christianity, and effectually prevent it from being amalgamated with the policy of princes, or the institutions of civil society.

Much unnecessary heat has been diffused by different contending parties in order to prove the superior practical efficacy of this or that particular system. It is quite natural that every man should consider his own religion the best, and that he should be desirous of recommending it to others; but charity, if not an enlightened understanding, should check the beginnings of hatred and resentment, and repress that imagined superiority which is seldom wanting in established Christians. The essential principles of human conduct belong, in fact, to every system, and these alone are legitimate objects of legislation. The more sublime and refined parts of religion, such as relate to the nature and being of a God, to the mode in which he is to be worshiped, to the nature of the soul, and the expectations of man in a future state, are subjects not cognizable to human laws, and can never be ingrafted on them without injury. The overfondness that has been always shewn for legislating in these matters, instead of being serviceable to mankind, as Mr. Belsham supposes, has, I doubt not, been of essential injury in impeding the progress of knowledge, and in paralyzing the best feelings of our nature.

Mr. Belsham observes, that "if Christianity had been oppressed in Europe, as it was in Asia and Africa, which it probably would if it had not been established, it cannot be doubted that the Christian religion would have been reduced to the same miserable state in which it now exists in those extensive continents." Of this I have great doubts. Christianity was never in a more flourishing state than before it was polluted by the embraces of the Roman emperors. The history of our own country, and of all Europe, certifies that sects are most prosperous when under the rod of oppression. Look at the Nonconformists, for instance. Besides, it by no means follows that Christianity would have been always persecuted, if it had not been established. Such was not its fate always under the Roman emperors,

by some of whom it was protected. Mr. Belsham's deduction is untenable upon another account. Knowledge and virtue thrive best upon the soil of liberty. But the Eastern governments are mere tyrannies; whilst those of Europe, profiting by the light of science, commerce and the arts, have been gradually ameliorated, always keeping pace with the progress of information amongst the people. During the middle ages, established Christians in Europe were neither wiser nor better than their Eastern neighbours. Indeed, these, for a time, had decidedly the advantage. It appears to me, therefore, that the speculative parts of Christianity would have shared pretty much the same fate as the doctrines of philosophy; still bearing in mind, that, as governments became civilized, they would necessarily conform their laws as much as possible to the maxims of Christian morality.

If the fundamental principles of morality be eternal and immutable, and applicable equally to all sects and nations; if the peculiarities of the Christian system be addressed to the understanding of man as a reasonable and accountable agent, and, moreover, if the writings of the New Testament be supposed to contain a genuine and complete view of the religion of Jesus, the aid of the magistrate is not required either to recommend or enforce its acceptance, or to mould it to the shifting manners of society. Nay, more, the whole genius and spirit of the system expressly forbid it. Its institutions are none of them political; they depend neither upon the smiles nor frowns of princes, and may be observed as effectually in the secluded cottage, as in the palace or the gorgeous temple.

When the chief magistrate undertakes to drill a whole nation to a particular creed or mode of worship, there are a thousand chances to one against his making a proper selection. If he patronizes error, his influence and authority, to say nothing of penal sanctions, go far to extend the mischief; and the jealousy shewn by all governments in removing old landmarks, points out the danger of its descending to successive generations. But supposing this champion for religion to profess a great zeal for Christianity, and to say that he will establish the

religion of Jesus; how is he to go about it? If he takes the New Testament for his guide, he will find a paucity of materials to work with. Nothing can be farther removed from the pomps and vanities of the world; yet, without these, what is an establishment good for? The humility and self-denial, the zeal and devotedness, the patience and suffering practised by the apostles, and preached by their successors, would cut but a sorry figure in courts and senates. Yet, the least departure from the simplicity of the gospel, the annexation of worldly interests, or substitution of other objects than those held out by Christ and his apostles, is so far a deviation from genuine Christianity. The state may incorporate with its other institutions the profession of Christianity; it may establish the belief and practice of it with penal sanctions or without them, and if the latter, it does only half its work as the guardian of truth; it may fabricate a machinery of greater or less extent in order to give effect to its publication; but the religion so adopted and promulgated, let it go by what name it will, is merely the religion of that particular state—not the religion of Jesus Christ.

It is the opinion of Mr. Belsham, "that even admitting that the Christian religion could stand without any external support, and could make its way in defiance of all opposition, yet if its progress could be in any degree accelerated by a judicious interference of the civil power, so great is its excellence, and so beneficial its effects in every form of civil society, that it would be the indispensable duty of the civil power to afford every reasonable aid and encouragement to its advancement in the world." Should the position here laid down be granted, still much difference of opinion would exist, as Mr. Belsham acknowledges, upon the degree of "aid" that would be "reasonable;" but when the door is once open to let in the magistrate, he alone will be the judge in this matter. Suppose him to be an Evangelical or an Unitarian Christian; in either case, he will give the aid and encouragement which he considers best adapted to advance the interests of the creed he espouses. For, it would be absurd to suppose that the civil magistrate, if he is made the guardian of religious wor-

ship, will not bend his power to the support of his own particular views of it; and this he cannot do in his magisterial capacity without adopting some sort of machinery to connect it with the state, which, as I observed before, is not the Christianity of the New Testament, but something superadded to it.

When Mr. Belsham speaks of "indispensable duty," if he means any thing more by it than that it is incumbent upon every person in his individual capacity to forward the interests of truth generally, without the assumption of authority, he must shew his warrant for it. Before the civil magistrate assumes the prerogative of prescribing or patronizing, which is pretty much the same thing, a particular creed or form of worship, he is bound to prove in the clearest manner the three following things: "First, that the Deity has himself propounded a direct pattern; secondly, that the mode he recommends is agreeable to that pattern; and, thirdly, that he is expressly delegated to be its advocate and guardian." It will be clearly seen that upon the proof of these must depend not only his individual right, but the authority of the worship he establishes. Whatever excellencies may attach to it, short of this, must leave the subject to be discussed upon other grounds, and resolve it into a mere question of expediency.

Bishop Warburton well knew how vulnerable he would render himself by resting his argument on the solid basis of truth, by an appeal to the New Testament; he, therefore, defends his establishment, with its creeds, tests and penal sanctions, on the ground of their utility. "The true end" (says he) "for which religion is established is, not to provide for the true faith, but for civil utility." Mr. Belsham's establishment provides as little for the propagation of truth as that of the bishop. He is for extending civil patronage to Christians at large without distinction; and he knows full well that error and absurdity abound amongst them in as great a degree as amongst people of other religions. His system is charitable, and he must be acquitted of intentionally recommending so unjust a thing as *favouritism*. Herein, however, he deceives himself. Suppose Mr. Belsham and a party of his

friends to be taken into favour by the chief magistrate, so as to possess all the influence which he would give to the civil power in ecclesiastical matters. How would he and they act in such circumstances? Would they give any encouragement to Trinitarianism or Calvinism? On the contrary, would they not lend their power and patronage to an opposite creed, under the notion of its being the best and purest form of Christianity? Reverse the case, and give all the power and patronage to persons of the Evangelical class, and they certainly have quite as fair a claim to them as the other. They would use them differently to be sure, but the result would be the same. No one can pretend to affirm that the sects not favoured at court would not be damaged in their civil rights. If you have an establishment, and give to it immunities, it is absurd to think of excluding a system of favouritism.

But relinquishing truth for the basis of an establishment, Mr. Belsham appears disposed to reason it on the ground of expediency. In this he agrees with the champion for establishments before quoted. Their principle is the same; the only difference between them being, to adopt his own language, upon the question of *plus* and *minus*. To debate the question upon this ground would be occupying too wide a field for your pages, nor would it tend to any useful purpose. The notion of expediency is as diversified as the human intellect, and that, as the education, connexions, pursuits and employments of individuals. If the civil magistrate is to be let in as the patron of Christianity upon such equivocal and indefinite pretences, he will be the sole judge in the matter. Expediency will bend to his pleasure and convenience, and religion be made subservient to state purposes.

I differ from Mr. Belsham in his statement of the true principle of Protestant Dissent. Time was, and that but little more than a century ago, when his principle was entertained with horror, as opening the flood-gates to all manner of errors; and even in the present day, I believe by far the greater number of persons who attend Dissenting places of worship, would be alarmed at the idea of granting a licence to any one to maintain, and certainly to publish, what they consider



pestilent heresies. In truth, the subject is but little attended to excepting as a matter of feeling; to study it in connexion with the philosophy of mind, or the nature of civil government, falls to the lot of comparatively a few. It may be observed, however, in reply to Mr. Belsham, that some of the ablest writers who have appeared against the Church of England during the last half century, have attacked the principle of ecclesiastical establishments; and, I believe, it will be found that nearly the whole of those persons who maintain the right of private judgment in its most unlimited sense, have adopted sentiments adverse to the incorporation of religion with the state.

It appears to me that Mr. Belsham bears rather hard upon those Dissenters who participate in the parliamentary grants; for, whatever may have been their origin, they are now neither given nor received for any state-purpose. Their object is purely eleemosynary; and, although I do not stand forward as their advocate, yet I really see no reason why Dissenters should forego any advantages they can obtain with a good conscience under the present system, merely because they think that a better might be substituted in its stead. As little do I blame Mr. Belsham, with his views, for wishing to see the ministers of religion occasionally lifting "their mitred heads in courts and parliaments." The transition from an established church to a courtly clergy is both easy and natural; and if one sect is to be allowed to fill the seats of parliament with so much dead lumber, I see no reason why other sects should not be accommodated in a similar manner. But the principle itself is altogether pernicious: it is highly detrimental to civil liberty; it operates as a clog to reformation, and can only be regarded as an absurd relic of other times, when the ecclesiastical aristocracy claimed the privilege of intermeddling with the affairs of the state.

Upon the whole, I cannot agree with Mr. Belsham, that Christianity either *claims* or *requires* the protection and patronage of the civil power. Such a supposition might be fairly urged as *prima facie* evidence against the divinity of the system itself; for, if it is the offspring of Deity, it may surely be supposed to come better supported

and recommended than by civil pains and penalties, or the meretricious arts of the politician. The motives that draw people together into civil communities have nothing to do with religion, and the laws that are to bind them relate wholly to their civil conduct. It is true, that most nations have artfully contrived to mix them up together, but for the basest purposes. Although a zeal for religion has been the pretence, the real motive has been to strengthen the hands of the civil power. It is not to be concealed that a large class of persons imagine Christianity to be the basis of civil society, and they shudder for the fate of both were they parted asunder. This notion, however, is the effect rather of habit and feeling than of correct views of either. They rest on considerations perfectly distinct, as might easily be made appear to a calm and judicious inquirer. Matters of faith and of religious worship have really no more necessary connexion with the well-being of society than any particular theory relating to life, matter or motion, or the system of the universe. I do not mean to deny that they may not be made to have a powerful influence; for experience certainly proves that they have. Mr. Belsham well knows the effect upon society of an extensive belief in hereditary depravity, and that the moral demeanour of the great mass is supposed to be upheld by the fear of spending an eternity in hell-torments. Now, whether the theological opinions that influence mankind be true or false, it is not my present business to inquire; all I contend for is, that it is not the province of the magistrate to teach them, either himself or by his deputy.

Let no one tremble for the fate of Christianity when dissevered from the state. It has obtained too firm a hold upon society to be easily lost. The purest motives that now influence mankind to believe and to teach it will still remain in full force, and it involves considerations too interesting and important to be neglected or forgotten. Finally, if it come from heaven, its Author is fully able to protect it; and we may rest assured that he will no more suffer it to fail, than the air we breathe or the food that nourishes our animal existence. I must apologize for trespassing so long upon the pa-

tience of your readers, and commit the subject to their impartial judgment.

W. W.

SIR,

Clapham.

**I** THINK the following extract from one of South's Sermons, entitled "The Doctrine of the Trinity asserted," may be worthy the attention of some of your readers, as shewing how many of most orthodox repute, and deeming themselves most sound in the Trinitarian faith, have in truth not a bit of the Trinity in their creed, but are as very Unitarian heretics as Socinus or Dr. Priestley. I need hardly remind your readers, that a notable controversy once arose between Dr. South and Dr. Sherlock, on the true and right mode of conceiving of the Trinity, and that finally Dr. South's explication of it received the approbation of the University of Oxford, in convocation assembled. So that it is not to be considered as the opinion merely of an individual Doctor, but as the last corrected edition of orthodoxy from the highest authority. The passage is as follows :

"But that we may a little aid and help out our apprehensions in conceiving of this great mystery, let us endeavour to see whether upon the grounds and notions of reason, we can frame to ourselves any thing that may carry in it some shadow and resemblance, at least, of one single, undivided nature's casting itself into three subsistences without receding from its own unity. And for this purpose we may represent to ourselves an infinite rational Mind, which, considered under the first and original perfection of *being* or *existence* may be called the *Father*, inasmuch as the perfection of existence is the first, and productive of all others. Secondly, in the same Infinite Mind, may be considered the perfection of understanding, as being the first great perfection that issues from the perfection of existence, and so may be called the *Son*, who is also called  $\delta \text{ Λόγος}$ , the Word, as being the first emanation of that Infinite Mind. And then, thirdly, when that Infinite Mind, by its *understanding* reflects upon its own essential perfections, there cannot but ensue *an act of volition and complacency in those perfections*, arising from such an intellectual reflection upon them, which may be called the *Holy Ghost*, who, therefore, is said to proceed both from the Father and the Son, because there must be not only existence but also understanding before there can

be love and volition. Here then we see that one and the same mind is both being, understanding and willing, and yet we can neither say that being is understanding, nor that understanding is willing."

I shall not stay to point out the self-blazoning folly of this choice scheme, though it is certainly liable to more than one *reductio ad absurdum*. An obvious consequence from it, if it means any thing, is, that the Father, in himself, is destitute of both will and understanding, the Son of existence, and the Holy Ghost of both existence and understanding. Yet let it be remembered, the advocates of the Trinity, if they disrelish this, have only the alternative of the opposite doctrine maintained by the more honest Sherlock, that is, that the three persons are to be regarded as three distinct minds. But this again has the misfortune of not being distinguishable from the doctrine of three Gods: as the University of Oxford perceived, and therefore pronounced it heretical. The Unitarian believes that God has both existence and understanding and will, and thus, wafting aside the smoke of unintelligible words, he believes precisely as much of the Trinity as South and his party: while, at the same time, believing that God is but one undivided mind, he avoids the Paganism of Sherlock. In arguing with Trinitarians I believe it would be expedient to bring them, if possible, to avow one of these alternatives before we proceed further.

If, Sir, you deem what I have written worthy of insertion in your Repository, you will oblige

PHILOGRAPHUS.

Dr. J. Jones on the Introductory Chapters of Matthew and Luke.

**I** HOPE I shall not encroach too much on the Editor or the readers of the Repository, if, together with the remarks which I intend on Lucian and other enemies of the gospel in ancient times, I make some strictures on the introductory chapters in Matthew and Luke, beginning with Griesbach's reasoning for the genuineness of those chapters. No argument, it is said, can be deduced against these chapters from Mark's silence, because, forsooth, many other things are omitted by him. To this it may be replied, first, The object of the miracles of

Christ is to prove his divine authority, his mission from God to preach the gospel. A few of these miracles, well defined and well attested, would be sufficient to prove this object, to establish his claim as a teacher from heaven; and Mark would have proved nothing more than he has actually proved, had he minutely recorded every thing said or done by his divine Master; but the end of his miraculous birth was to prove not his *divine mission* but his *divine nature*—to prove that, as he was born in a supernatural manner, he must have been a supernatural being. This peculiar object of the miraculous birth ascribed to Jesus, rendered it imperative on every one of his biographers, to record it as essential to the gospel; and nothing could have induced any one of them to omit it, but either a total ignorance of the story, or a conviction that it was not true. Secondly, The four Gospels being now combined into one volume, a person who peruses the narrative in Matthew, is not apt to be struck with the absence of it in Mark. But this is a prejudice which Griesbach, and such men as the correspondent N, instead of taking the lead in misleading modern readers, should be the first in dissipating. Mark wrote his Gospel in consequence of the establishment of a Christian church at Rome, who wanted an authentic document respecting Christ, and who, by the omission of that Evangelist, were left in ignorance of his supernatural birth, and consequently of the doctrines of his divinity grounded upon it: and this, we may be assured, no historian of our Lord would have done. Mark, therefore, was either a total stranger to the story of the miraculous birth of Jesus, or being acquainted with it he considered it as a fiction unworthy of notice. Thirdly, the fact was first taught by men who aimed at setting aside the Gospel, by assimilating it with Heathenism a few years after the resurrection of Christ, and that in the very spot where Mark first published his Gospel. This Evangelist was therefore fully aware of its existence and circulation; and he took care in the introduction and conduct of his Gospel to set it aside as a falsehood. His Gospel opens thus: "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of

God, (as it is written in the prophets, behold, I send my Messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way in thy presence,) *was* a voice crying in the wilderness," &c. Here the Evangelist says positively and unequivocally, that the good news respecting the Son of God originated with John the Baptist, no intimation being given of him till he was pointed out by his forerunner: thus inculcating on his readers that the story of his birth, with all its wonders, had no foundation in truth. It is essential to the story of our Lord's miraculous birth, that his mother should have been acquainted with his destination as the Messiah; and to shew that she did not know this, Mark represents her as thinking her son *mad* for pursuing a conduct which implied that he considered himself in that light. Mark iii. 21.

I have said that the object of the supernatural birth of Christ was to prove his divine nature; accordingly the first teachers of this *cunningly-devised fable*, as Peter calls it, consistently enough supposed that Jesus had a supernatural power when he was a *child*, and represented him as actually having wrought many miracles in his infancy. Now Mark was called upon by his peculiar situation to set aside these things as false, by stating some well-attested facts that proved them so. Such facts he does state in chap. vi. 2, 3. Here he holds forth his divine Master as a common mechanic, and not only the people of Nazareth, but his own relations, as utterly perplexed as to the source of his divine power. Had Jesus been supernaturally born, and thus proved that he was a superior being, his early title would have been very different from that of a carpenter, and the people of Nazareth would have been at no loss as to the source of his supernatural power. And Mark brings forward the circumstance that he was a carpenter, and the astonishment of those who knew him from his birth, as a complete refutation of the miraculous birth ascribed to him. I shall continue these remarks: and I hope that N, to whom the Repository is so much indebted, will take the trouble to set me right, if I be found mistaken in any of my positions.

J. JONES.



*Mr. Cogan's Summary of the Evidences of Christianity.*

(Concluded from p. 3.)

**B**UT it may be objected, that, allowing the validity of the testimony, and admitting likewise the credibility of the facts, the New-Testament history cannot be received by the philosophical inquirer, since, if the facts there recorded had really taken place, different consequences must have followed, and all Judea and the Roman empire must have been immediately converted to the Christian faith. This objection it seems, does not deny that the truth of the gospel-history is a sufficient cause of the revolution which was effected by Christianity, but simply affirms, that the progress of this revolution must have been more rapid had the facts been real. But as the sufficiency of the cause to which the Christian ascribes the origin and diffusion of Christianity is by the very objection acknowledged, those reasonings must be very clear and forcible which will oblige him to reject it. But that the objection is by no means decisive will appear from the following observations. Few *comparatively* could have been eye-witnesses of the miracles in question. Prejudices of *the strongest kind* against Christianity existed among both Jews and Gentiles. Now that these prejudices will not account for the slow and partial progress of Christianity, allowing it to have been as slow and as partial as any unbeliever will maintain it to have been, can never be proved, unless it can be demonstrated that *no* prejudice can resist the credible report of miracles. But on what *data* this demonstration is to proceed, it will be difficult to say. The mind is certainly indisposed to receive any fact in proportion as it is averse to the conclusion which is to be admitted upon the belief of the fact; and with *certain* prejudices, and in certain circumstances, it is probable that no evidence of testimony would be attended to. Paine, I think, somewhere says, that he would not have believed the resurrection of Jesus without ocular and manual demonstration; and yet he too urges the unbelief of the Jews, as a proof that the event never took place. It may here be farther observed, that they

who were not converted to Christianity in the earlier ages of the Christian history, must have remained unbelievers, either because their prejudices did not allow them to pay any proper attention to the subject, or because they knew the falsehood of the pretended miracles on which Christianity depends. If the latter alternative be adopted, how comes it to pass that it should not appear upon the *slightest evidence*, that the truth of these miracles had ever been disproved? If these observations do not remove the objection, it may be asked, How can the belief of those who did receive Christianity be accounted for, upon supposition that the facts on which it professes to depend, are false? It may perhaps be replied, that this fact may be explained by the natural credulity of the human mind, and that love of the marvellous, which has shewn itself in every age and nation. But will not the force of prejudice, equally natural to the human mind, just as well account for the non-conversion of the remainder who were not converted?

I now proceed to the consideration of the fourth method by which the evidences of the Christian religion may be opposed; by proving that the truth of the facts contained in the gospel-history, was not the real cause of the existence and progress of Christianity. And here it must be observed, that if the evidence in favour of this history has not been already invalidated, the contrary evidence must be very clear and convincing before it can with justice be rejected. Nothing, in fact, will avail but evidence, which shall be clearer and more authentic than can be produced in favour of the history, the credit of which is to be subverted. When the Christian is asked, how the great revolution which was effected by Christianity is to be accounted for, he immediately replies, by the evidence of the facts on which it professes to rest; and he produces a history of these facts, which he maintains to be attended with all the requisite marks of genuineness and truth; and if the unbeliever, without *previously* subverting the credit of this history, attempts to prove its falsehood, by unfolding the origin and explaining the progress of Christianity, it is ob-

vious that this attempt must be made on the evidence of the clearest and most decisive testimony ; and that the causes to which the rise and establishment of Christianity shall be thus ascribed, must have no connexion, even of the remotest kind, with the truth of the controverted facts. But it may now be proper to consider the causes to which the unbeliever, in the absence of historical testimony which might set aside the Christian records, must ascribe the origin and progress of Christianity ; and these must be the following, imposture and credulity. On this *hypothesis* it may be observed, that it is gratuitous, and erected in opposition to historical testimony ; and that the exigence of the case does not require it. Moreover, the operation which is assigned to imposture and credulity by the unbeliever, can never be proved to be conformable to analogy ; though it might reasonably be expected that an hypothesis which should be assumed for no other purpose than to avoid admitting what contradicts analogy, should possess the advantage of being itself analogous to the ordinary course of events, and free from the difficulty which it was invented to avoid. But was it ever heard of since the world began, that an imposture, *appealing to public facts*, produced a total change in the religious associations of a large community ? And with respect to what imposture *can* effect, we must be allowed to judge by what it *has* effected. Upon the whole, the difference between the argument of the Christian and the hypothesis of the Unbeliever stands as follows : The Christian attributes the rise, progress and establishment of Christianity, to a cause which indeed contradicts analogy, but which is affirmed upon proper evidence to have existed. The Unbeliever erects, in opposition, an hypothesis *not* supported by testimony, and which can never be proved to be more conformable to analogy than the very facts which it is invented to overthrow. Upon a review of the whole it must surely be concluded, that if Christianity is an imposture, it was the most happy in its contrivance, the most dexterous in its management, and the most magnificent in its effects that ever wrought upon the credulity of mankind.

But before I quit the subject, it will be right to notice one or two objections to Christianity drawn not from a defect of testimony, or the incredibility of the facts, but from circumstances connected with this religion, and conclusions to be admitted by those who receive it. Of this kind are the following : The partial diffusion of this religion supposed to be divine ; the incapacity of mankind in general to judge of its evidence, and the little good which has followed its promulgation.

Before I consider these objections separately, I shall premise an observation which will apply to them all, and which does not appear to have been sufficiently attended to ; which is this : that as the legitimate and proper method of attack is now relinquished, and objections urged against Christianity which do not, strictly speaking, apply to it as a question of history, those principles must be clear and certain from which these objections are derived. For in *no case* can this method of opposing historical evidence be properly employed, except the axioms which are thus brought in opposition to the testimony, are of such a nature that to reject them would be to bid defiance to the plainest conclusions of the human mind. Let the objections above-mentioned be now separately considered. It is then said, that a religion which really proceeded from God, could never have been limited to a small number of the human race, but must, like the benevolence of its Author, have been extended to them all. To this it may be replied, that a gradation of privilege is the favourite law of nature, and that moral advantages are, *in fact*, allotted to mankind in very different degrees ; so that the objection, if it has any force, must be urged not against Christianity, but against the whole œconomy of the Divine government.

But it is farther affirmed, that the generality of mankind are not qualified to determine upon the evidences of the Christian religion, and that it cannot be supposed that a religion should proceed from God, of which the proof should not be equally clear and intelligible to all. This objection, like the preceding, has the misfortune to contradict a general principle of the Divine

administration. It is a fact, that the lower classes of mankind, who have not leisure and ability to inquire into the evidence of important truth, depend for information upon those superior classes who possess the opportunities which are denied to them. And whatever had been the evidence of the Christian religion, multitudes in the lowest station of society must have still remained incompetent judges of its truth, unless a perpetual miracle had been wrought to remedy the inconvenience. But it may be further observed, that the most ignorant, as well as the best informed of men, are capable of feeling the practical influence of Christianity, which is far more important than deciding upon its evidence.

But we are now to encounter an objection apparently more formidable and alarming, that Christianity has been the cause of great and public evils, and that it is altogether problematical whether it has done more good or harm to the cause which it professes to promote—that of virtue and happiness. Admitting the objection for a moment in all its force, it may be replied, that the evil which has resulted from Christianity has been purely adventitious, and that it is some argument of its excellence if it has done any good at all, amidst the general perversion of its principles, and the enormous load of absurdity with which it has been encumbered. And it will be allowed by judicious inquirers, that Christianity is now better understood than it has been for many ages, and that by the aid of learning and criticism its genuine principles have been unfolded, and their unadulterated excellence displayed; so that it must be admitted to be probable, that the evil complained of will be gradually diminished; and should the time arrive when Christianity shall be professed in its primitive purity, consisting simply of the doctrines of a perfect Deity, an overruling Providence, a future retribution, and the immortality of man,\* it is

difficult to see what evil could arise, directly or indirectly, from such a religion. Indeed, if this is not religion, there is no such thing. And if these doctrines are admitted at all, it is difficult to conceive that their influence should be more injurious in consequence of their being received upon the evidence of fact. It may farther be remarked in reply to the objection before us,

---

this doctrine? This has been affirmed (but I must be excused if I add that it has been *only* affirmed) by men whose talents and character demand respect. Did nature fully disclose this doctrine to the wise men of antiquity? Let the learned Valckenaer answer the question: *Quidquid optimi philosophorum, Socrates et Cicero, de immortalitate animæ loquuntur, meræ tantum sunt fluctuationes. Christiani demum de hoc dogmate certo fuerunt persuasi. Hinc æstimari poterit, adds this great man, quam exiguam vim habuerint eximia Gentilium præcepta ethica, quippe hanc ferme vitam tantum spectantia.* Does nature by the constitution of the human mind, and the phenomena of the moral world, suggest the hope of a life to come? This hope Christianity is designed and admirably calculated to confirm. And, after having reflected upon the subject much and seriously through the greater part of my life, I venture to give my decided opinion, that, unless the doctrine of future existence can be proved to be *false or incredible*, the Christian religion, supported as it is by the strongest direct and presumptive evidence, cannot rationally be rejected. That the subject is not without its difficulties, I do not wish to dissemble. It seems, indeed, to be the general fate of moral truths, that when they appear to be satisfactorily established, some difficulty should remain which may form the ground of objection. This observation applies (as, I think, Bishop Watson has also remarked) even to that truth which of all truths seems to rest on the surest foundation, the being of a God. And it will sometimes happen, that an objection which has but little weight when contrasted with the evidence to which it is opposed, will be more intelligible to general apprehension than the answer, and will supply a topic of plausible declamation to those who find it easier to declaim than to reason. But in all cases the preponderance of evidence ought to be allowed to turn the scale. Have unbelievers, in general, appeared solicitous to hold the balance with an impartial hand?

---

\* On the doctrine of a future life, which is the great discovery of the gospel, I have one or two queries to propose: Does the evidence of nature disprove the doctrine? This will not, I think, be pretended. Does nature clearly reveal



that before it can be urged with effect against Christianity, two difficult questions must be decided. First, As evil must be supposed to attend every thing which passes through the hands of such an imperfect creature as man, what balance of good may reasonably be expected from a divine revelation? Secondly, What is the precise balance between the good which has resulted from Christianity and the evil to which it has incidentally given rise?

I submit these reflections to your readers, trusting that they are just in the main, and that they may be of some service to the impartial inquirer in enabling him to decide upon the evidences of a religion which has been justly characterized as the best gift of God to man.

E. COGAN.

Chichester,

January 4, 1821.

SIR,  
OF all the magnificent institutions for charitable purposes which grace our country, not one appears to me of more importance than is that for the Relief of the Widows and Orphans of Dissenting Ministers. Without wishing improperly to magnify the office of a Dissenting Minister, it may fairly be asserted, that, with very few exceptions, it is, in a worldly point of view, one of considerable sacrifice. The talents devoted to a critical understanding of the Scriptures, and the time occupied in discharging the various duties of their profession, would, in any other occupation, yield an infinitely greater advantage. The individuals who engage in this pursuit, relinquish many worldly emoluments; but not only so, their families are involved in their determination. Ministers have not only to bear the "proud man's contumely," including that of some of their clerical brethren of the Establishment, under which the testimony of conscience may be supposed to be an adequate support, but they have no opportunity for providing for their families, and must frequently be assured of leaving them at their death in circumstances of deep distress. Often must their affection, when they reflect on this result of their labours, cause them a severe pang; it might be expected to be sufficient to unman them, and to unfit them for their

varied duty. A Society which is intended in its efforts to ease this excruciating feeling, has high claims on the benevolent heart, considered merely as such, but Protestant Dissenters seem almost bound in duty to support it. The widows and orphans of those who have died in their service, have strong appeals to make to their justice, as well as to their Christian philanthropy, for preservation and support.

I was not aware till the summer of 1817, that the Society about which I am writing was deficient in funds. I found this to be the case from a letter which Mr. Ray, of Sudbury, read to a meeting of gentlemen at Stowmarket, assembled to support a county Society with somewhat similar views. This Society I should have joined had I not left the county of Suffolk, since which I considered that the funds of the London Society must have improved, as I have had no personal application made to me, as a minister, to interest myself in their augmentation. Now this appears, Sir, to me to be the proper mode for the managers of the London Society to adopt. Let them send circulars, containing an account of their funds and claims, to every minister, and I should hope, for the honour and Christian feeling of Protestant Dissenters, such an appeal would not be made in vain. Assuming that the statement in your last number, from the pen of the late excellent Mr. Howe, [XV. 722—725,] is correct, that in 1815 there were 124 congregational collections, and but 12 in 1820, the appeal to the generosity and justice of our body, which I am recommending, cannot, I imagine, have been made; and, without having so done, I must confess, had I belonged to that Society, I should have somewhat blamed the managers for selling their landed property to meet their claims; this, I think, should have been their *dernier* resource. Not being aware of their great wants, I have not hitherto supported this Institution, but I shall be happy to aid it henceforth to the best of my power, and with this feeling beg to throw out the hint of the propriety of appealing to the great body of Dissenters on the subject.

J. FULLAGAR.

*An Inquiry respecting Private Property, and the Authority and Perpetuity of the Apostolic Institution of a Community of Goods.*

“As it must be extremely difficult to establish such wise regulations where private property takes place, it may justly be doubted whether property must not be excluded out of the most perfect government.”—WALLACE, *Various Prospects of Mankind*, &c.

“A scheme of government may be imagined that shall, by annihilating property and reducing mankind to their natural equality, remove most of the causes of contention and wickedness.”—Dr. Price’s *Four Dissertations on Providence*, 1777, p. 138 (*Note*).

HOWEVER opposed to the opinions now generally prevalent, I confess I cannot wonder that from the first promulgation of Christianity there have at various times been found many amongst its most sincere disciples who considered its spirit and tendency to be directly opposed to the acquirement of personal riches, or the system of private property. The example of Jesus Christ, in conjunction with a multitude of precepts and maxims repeated from time to time during the whole course of his ministry, pointing out the evils which result from the pursuit of riches, and the vices and failings of the rich,—the humble rank of the persons whom he chose as his first disciples, \*—and the numerous precepts which they have left us, agreeing with those of their Master,—may well account for the prevalence of the opinion among the first Christians, that the system of private property was incompatible with the prevalence of the gospel. And when we find how continually the Christian Scriptures inveigh against the pursuit of wealth, and the temper and conduct of its votaries, and how constantly and repeatedly the first teachers of Christianity dwell upon this subject, we might rather wonder at the little attention it excites among professors of Christianity in the present

day, than that their predecessors should neither have overlooked nor explained away a doctrine so prominent in the Christian code.

Christ came to preach the gospel to the poor. “Blessed be ye poor,” said he, “for yours is the kingdom of God. But woe unto you that are rich; for ye have received your consolation.”\* The benediction, as recorded by another Evangelist, is upon *the poor in spirit*; probably meaning those who are not given to the pursuit of riches. In the parable of the sower, “He that receiveth seed among thorns, is he that heareth the word; and the care of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the word, and he becometh unfruitful.” After the rich young man, *who had kept the commandments*, (and whose wealth, therefore, had neither been ill acquired nor ill employed,) had gone away sorrowful when directed, if he would be perfect, to give up his great possessions, “Jesus looked round, and saith to his disciples, How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!—It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.” The question, “Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him?” shews that his doctrine was not at all acceptable among those who are called the *higher orders*. Nicodemus, indeed, went to converse with him, but it was by night. When Christ said, “Ye cannot serve God and Mammon,” the Pharisees, who had the common notions of the importance and prerogatives\* of property, derided him, which may be thought much more natural for them, than for Christians to talk so much as they do of standing up for Religion and Property, which seem indeed to be but other words for God and

\* Luke vi. 20, 24.

† ——— Omnis enim res,  
Virtus, fama, decus, divina humana-  
que, pulchris  
Divitiis parent; quas qui construxerit,  
ille  
Clarus erit, fortis, justus:—Sapi-  
ensne?—Etiam, et rex,  
Et quidquid volet.

Hor. Sat. Lib. ii. 3.

\* Judas, the only one who proved unworthy, was corrupted through the love of money.

Mammon. The parable of Dives \* and Lazarus then followed, the tendency of which is sufficiently manifest. When one wanted to refer a dispute about an inheritance to Christ, he refused to have any thing to do with the matter; —desires the man to take heed and beware of covetousness; as a man's life consisted not in the abundance of the things which he possessed; and then relates the parable of the rich man who would have pulled down his barns and built greater, and whose golden dreams of "much goods laid up for many years,"† were awfully interrupted by the approach of death. He also bore his testimony against the pursuits of traffic in a remarkable manner when "he cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money changers,"‡ as having made the house of prayer into a den of thieves. And by the story of the widow's mite, he teaches that the possession of wealth is not necessary for the exercise of charity.

The concomitants of wealth—pride,§ domination, and the claims of rank, were equally the subjects of our Lord's reprobation. When there was a strife for pre-eminence among his disciples, he says, "Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them, and their great ones exercise authority upon them; but ye shall not be so: he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger, and he that is chief as he that doth serve."||—"He that is least among you all, the same shall be great."¶ "Be ye not called rabbi; for one is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren."\*\* To which may be added the sentiment conveyed by his washing the feet of his disciples, and many precepts of similar tendency.

The reprobation of the pursuit of riches, and the frequent animadversions on the evil consequences of inequality

of rank and condition, which are such prominent features in the teaching of our Saviour, might well be expected to produce a strong effect upon the minds of his disciples. Accordingly, we find that after his ascension, as soon as a considerable number were converted, they at once commenced the plan of a Community of Goods. This shews what was the first impression on their minds: and the miraculous punishment of Ananias and Sapphira may lead us to conclude that it was sanctioned by Heaven. If it should be objected that this plan of life, not having continued in the church, must have been found on trial to be impracticable, it may be replied, that this departure affords no better argument against the primitive practice, than is presented by any other corruption of Christianity against its genuine doctrines; and we shall find on further inquiry, that in fact it has uninterruptedly continued to the present time as an apostolic institution in the Christian Church, and, though much disfigured and corrupted, yet perhaps not more so than the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

The general tenor of the apostolic writings is quite as remarkable upon this subject as that of the gospels. There are several passages which seem to relate to the community of property in the church. Paul writes to the Corinthians, "For I mean not that other men be eased and ye burdened: but by an equality, that your abundance may be a supply for their want; that their abundance may also be a supply for your want: that there may be an equality: as it is written, He that had gathered much had nothing over; and he that had gathered little had no lack."\* With respect to the acquiring of property,† he thus writes to Timo-

\* 2 Cor. viii. 13—16.

† Richard Baxter says, "There are few texts of Scripture more abused than that of the apostle, '*He that provideth not for his own, and specially those of his family, hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.*' This is made a pretence for gathering up portions, and providing a full estate for posterity, when the apostle speaketh only against them that did cast their poor kindred and family on the church, to be maintained out of the common stock, when they were able to do it themselves." "His following words shew

\* Dives is exactly what is called in the phrase of the *mammonarchical* faction, "*a respectable person.*"

† Luke xii. 19. ‡ Matt. xxi. 12.

§ Every one that is proud in heart is an abomination unto the Lord. Prov. xvi. 5.

|| Mark x. 42—44. ¶ Luke ix. 48.

\*\* Matt. xxiii. 8.



thy : "They that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts which drown men in destruction and perdition. For *the love of money* is the ROOT of ALL EVIL ; which, while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows."\* And the Epistle of James, the brother of our Lord, contains some strong declarations of his sentiments respecting wealth and rank : "Let the brother of low degree rejoice in that he is exalted ; but the rich in that he is made low."† Again, "My brethren, have not the faith of our Lord with respect of persons ; for if there come into your assembly a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment, and ye have respect to him that weareth the gay clothing, and say unto him, Sit thou here in a good place, and say to the poor, Stand thou there, or sit here under my footstool ; are ye not then partial in yourselves, and are become judges of evil thoughts ? Hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised ?—But ye have despised the poor.—Do not rich men oppress you, and draw you before the judgment seats ? Do not they blaspheme that worthy name by the which ye are called ? If ye fulfil the royal law according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, ye do well ; but if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin."‡ And in another chapter he utters these severe denunciations against the rich : "Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you. Your riches § are corrupted, and

your garments are moth-eaten. Your gold and silver is cankered, and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh as it were fire. Ye have heaped treasure together for the last days. Behold, the hire of the labourers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth : ye have lived in pleasure on the earth, and been wanton ; ye have nourished your hearts as in a day of slaughter ; ye have condemned and killed the just, and he doth not resist you."\*

Such were the notions with respect to riches in the Christian Church at its first commencement. The acquisition and possession of property, which it is now the practice to speak of as alone entitling a man to consideration or to the enjoyment of political rights, was then considered as almost a disqualification for the kingdom of righteousness and peace.

The apostolic institution of a Community of Goods appears to be related in a manner so distinct and marked that it seems almost impossible to avoid the conclusion, that it was either itself a divine suggestion, or at least considered by the apostles and the first converts as a necessary consequence of the doctrines that had been revealed to them. Immediately after the account of the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles, and the conversion of the 3000 on the day of Pentecost, we read that "they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship :—and many wonders and signs were done by the apostles. And all that believed *were together, and had all things common*, and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men as every man had need."† Again, in the 4th chapter, an allusion to this rejection of the system of private property in the infant church, forms a part of one of the most important passages of its history : "And when they had prayed, the place was shaken where they were assembled together : and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they spake the word of

---

that it is present provision, and not future portions, that the apostle speaketh of," &c. : "You are bound to do the best you can to educate your children, &c., but not to leave them rich."—Gildas Salvianus, p. 238.

\* 1 Tim. vi. 9, 10.

† James i. 9, 10. ‡ Ibid. ii. 1—9.

§ ——— root of all disquietnesse ;

First got with guile, and then preserv'd with dread,

And after spent with pride and lavishnesse,

Leaving behind them griefe and heavinesse :

Infinite mischiefs of them do arize ;

---

Strife and debate, bloodshed and bitterness ;

Outrageous wrong and hellish covetize.

Faerie Queene, B. ii. Ch. 7.

\* James v. 1—6. † Acts ii. 42—45.

God with boldness. And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul, *neither said any of them that aught of the things which he possessed was his own, but they had all things common.* And with great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus; and great grace was upon them all. Neither was there any among them that lacked; for as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the apostles' feet; and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need.\* Though, therefore, it be now the practice altogether to pass over in silence this part of the Christian institute, without condescending even to comment upon it, or to attempt explaining it away, or only to make it the subject of a jest, the authority for it seems to be as clear as that of any of those institutions, or supposed institutions, of Christianity which are the subject of so much discussion.

The account given in the 6th chapter of the Acts of the first appointment of Deacons, plainly shews us that the plan of a Community of Goods had been continued in the Church of Jerusalem for seven years, (according to the chronology of some interpreters,) and was then matured and confirmed by the election of Stephen and six others, by the general body, at the instance of the twelve apostles, for the express purpose of having the care of the common stock. This was recommended because some complained, (ver. 1,) that they "were overlooked in the daily ministration;" "*of alms,*" adds the Improved Version, but surely without any sanction of the original or of the context. The ministration was not *of alms*, but of the common goods, as Tyndall justly remarks in his note on the passage, "that is, not indifferently looked upon in the dayly distrybutyng of the commune goodes." "Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples together and said, It is not meet that we should leave the word of God and serve at the tables: wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men which we may appoint to this needful business." Newcome renders

the passage, "minister to the tables *of the poor,*" but the words in italic are also interpolated without authority, and, like the others, are inconsistent with the narrative, and calculated to mislead, by preventing the reader from perceiving in this passage an important incident in the history of the apostolic community of goods, of which the office of deacon,\* however it is now changed from its original design, stands as a memorial.

In contending that the subsequent relapse of the professors of Christianity into the system of Private Property ought not to afford any presumption of mistake with regard to this subject on the part of its first teachers, I do not at all mean to admit that this apostolic institution of a community of goods and the renunciation of riches, were early or suddenly lost sight of in the church; the history of its continuance and gradual perversion and decay, is probably to be traced in the history of those Religious Orders and communities whose members alone were considered as living in complete conformity with Christian principles, and which were established upon the plan of having all things in common. †

---

\* St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, (xii. 7,) probably refers to the duties of deacons in the management of the common property of churches: *εἴτε διακονίαν, ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ*—also ver. 8, *ὁ μεταδίδους ἐν ἀπλότῃτι*.—See Taylor and Schleusner.

† In the middle of the fourth century St. Anthony permitted a numerous body of men to live in a community with him, and lead under his direction a life of piety and manual labour.—Butler's Memoirs respecting the English Catholics. Anthony had given up a large estate on his conversion, in obedience to the precept of Christ, "Go, sell that thou hast, and give to the poor."

St. Jerome (On the Christian Ecclesiastical Writers, *verb.* Philo) says of Philo, "He hath praised the Christians, reporting them to be not only there (in Alexandria) but in many countries, and calling their dwelling-places monasteries. Whereby it is apparent that the church of believers in Christ at the first was such as monks endeavour to be now, *that nothing in property is any man's own, none is rich among them, none poor, their patrimony is distributed to the needy,*" &c.

---

\* Acts iv. 31—35.

One error into which some of the early Christians fell, was the supposing that, in order to comply with the renunciation of riches, which their religion required, it was necessary to renounce the enjoyments and conveniences of social life, which it was no doubt the design of the apostolic ordinance not to withhold, but to diffuse among all. Instead of "being together and having all things common," these ascetics lived alone and *had nothing*. \* The prevalence of persecution may, however, have concurred with this misapprehension in causing the adoption of the *eremitical* life. But it is in the history of *conventual* or *cœnobitic* life that we must seek for the relics of the Christian system with regard to possessions. The author of the *Histoire des Ordres Monastiques*, informs us, that many of the fathers and popes, two of the councils and a great number of writers have agreed in referring monastic institutions † to the apostles, and to the above-mentioned primitive practice of the Church of Jerusalem.

The history of the Essenes may throw considerable light upon our subject. In the learned work just mentioned we find some account of an interesting controversy which took place at the beginning of the last century relative to this sect, in which the illustrious Benedictine Dom Bernard de Montfaucon, in some observations appended to his translation of Philo *De Vitâ Contemplativâ*, maintained, in accordance with Eusebius and Jerome and the greater number of Catholic writers, that the Essenes were Christians, but dissented from the opinion that to them the origin of monastic institutions was to be attributed, as they had wives, and did not observe the rules of any order. His anonymous opponent denied that they were Christians, as

being highly commended by Philo, whom he considers as a Jew, and as all that could be learnt respecting them savoured of Judaism, and was opposed to Christianity (meaning, no doubt, Catholic or orthodox Christianity); but at the same time maintained, that if they were Christians, they must be allowed to have been monks, living according to a rule of their own, much more ancient than any now known. The truth, however, probably escaped both these disputants, who, in the unadulterated doctrine and practice of these early believers, could not recognize either primitive Cœnobitism or genuine Christianity.

A question much connected with this inquiry, viz. whether Philo was not himself a Christian, has lately, upon other grounds, occupied the learned pen of Dr. John Jones, who quotes from the works of that writer the following accounts of the Essenes :

"These are called Esseans, a name (though not in my opinion formed by strict analogy) corresponding in Greek to the term *holy*. For they have attained the highest *holiness* in the worship of God; and that not by sacrificing animals, but by cultivating purity of heart : they live principally in villages, and avoid the towns; being sensible that as disease is generated by corruption, so an indelible impression is produced in the soul by the contagion of society. Some of these men cultivate the ground; others pursue the arts of peace, and such employments as are beneficial to themselves without injury to their neighbours : they seek neither to hoard silver nor gold, nor to inherit ample estates in order to gratify prodigality and avarice, but are content with the mere necessities of life : they are the only people who, though destitute of money and possessions,—and that more from choice than the untowardness of fortune,—felicitate themselves as rich; deeming riches to consist not in amplitude of possession, but, as is really the case, in frugality and contentment. Among them no one can be found who manufactures darts, arrows, swords, corselets, shields, or any other weapon used in war; nor even such instruments as are easily perverted to evil purposes in times of peace. They decline trade, commerce, and navigation altogether, as incentives to covetousness and usury; nor have they any slaves among them, but all are free, and all in their turn administer to others. They condemn the owners of slaves as tyrants, who violate the principles of justice and equality,

---

\* Jesus Christ was no ascetic, and was reproached on that account by the Pharisees.

† "Cassien aiant prétendu que les Cœnobites sont plus ancien que les Anachorètes, qu'ils ont commencé avant St. Paul Ermite et St. Antoine; et mesme qu'ils ont toujours esté dans l'Eglise depuis les Apostres, M. de Tillemont veut qu'il justifie cette prétention."—Tom. I. Diss. Prélim. p. 19.



and impiously transgress the dictates of nature, which like a common parent has begotten and educated all men alike, and made them brethren not in name only but in sincerity and truth: but avarice conspiring against nature burst her bonds, having produced alienation for affinity, and hatred in the room of friendship.

"They evince their attachment to virtue, by their freedom from avarice, from ambition, from sensual pleasure; by their temperance and patience, by their frugality, simplicity, and contentment; by their humility, their regard to the laws, and other similar virtues. Their love to man is evinced by their benignity, their equity, and their liberality; of which it is not improper to give a short account, though no language can adequately describe it.

"In the first place, there exists among them no house, however private, which is not open to the reception of all the rest; and not only the members of the same society assemble under the same domestic roof, but even strangers of the same persuasion have free admission to join them. *There is but one treasure, whence all derive subsistence*; and not only their provision but their clothes are common property. Such mode of living under the same roof, and of dieting at the same table, cannot, in fact, be proved to have been adopted by any other description of men. And no wonder; since even the daily labourer keeps not for his own use the produce of his toil, but imparts it to the common stock, and thus furnishes each member with a right to use for himself the profits earned by others.

"The sick are not despised or neglected because they are no longer capable of useful labour; but they live in ease and affluence, receiving from the treasury whatever their disorder or their exigencies require. The aged, too, among them are loved, revered, and attended as parents by affectionate children; and a thousand heads and hearts prop their tottering years with comforts of every kind. Such are the champions of virtue which philosophy, without the parade of Grecian oratory, produces, proposing, as the end of their institutions, the performance of those laudable actions which destroy slavery and render freedom invincible." \*

---

\* A Series of Important Facts demonstrating the Truth of the Christian Religion, by J. Jones, LL.D. 1820, pp. 40—43.

Does not this account lead us to suppose that the Essenes preserved in its purity the mode of life instituted by the apostles? Many learned Protestant writers, with the illustrious exception, however, of Vossius and some others, have denied the Essenes to be Christians, being loth to ascribe so high an antiquity to monastic institutions. Perhaps the truth is, that these institutions are but relics of the Coenobitic institute, which was indeed founded by the apostles, but grossly perverted by the prevalence of asceticism, celibacy, \* and superstition, but especially by its restriction to a privileged order, instead of being adopted by all Christians, and by the ample endowments which the religious orders received after the church began its adulterous connexion with the state, in consequence of which they became † the greatest monopolizers of landed property, living an indolent life upon the fruits of other men's labour. ‡

That this, however, was never contemplated by the founders of what are called the religious orders, but that it was intended the monks should live upon a plan of joint labour and common property, we may learn from many of their Rules. § The Rule of

---

\* Forbidding marriage is one of the corruptions of the apostate church expressly predicted by Paul.

† Ridley, Civil Law, 261.

‡ This deviation from the original design of their foundation drew upon them the severe reprehension of the Friars, who, however, in the mode which they adopted of complying with the requirement of voluntary poverty, fell into an error of a different kind, by confounding it with a mendicant life. Parker, Holden, &c. Carmelite and Black Friars, and Milverton, provincial of the Carmelites, were imprisoned in the 15th century for preaching against the pride of prelates and the riches of the clergy. To the last, the friars had no other real estates in England than the sites of their convents.

§ Passages extracted from the Rule of St. Benedict.

Respecting Community of Goods.

— "neque aliquid habere proprium. — Omniaque omnibus sint communia, ut scriptum est, nec quisquam suum esse aliquid dicat, aut præsumat. Quod si quisquam hoc nequissimo vitio deprehensus fuerit," &c.—Regula Sancti Bene-

St. Benedict, cap. xlviii. *concerning daily manual labour*, prescribes the proportions of time to be employed in labour, in study, and in devotion; and adds, "But if poverty or local causes require them to labour by themselves in harvest-work, &c., let them not think it a grievance, for *then are they truly monks, if they live by the labour of their own hands*, as did also our fathers and the apostles:" and, greatly as they departed from the design of their institution, the monastic orders may nevertheless furnish valuable proofs of the success with which the affairs of communities may be ma-

---

dicti, Cap. xxiii. "*Si quid debeant Monachi proprium habere.*"

"Sicut scriptum est: *Dividebatur singulis, prout cuique opus erat*, ubi non dicimus, ut personarum, quod absit, acceptio sit, sed infirmitatum consideratio. Ubi qui minus indiget agat Deo gratias, et non contristetur. Qui vero plus indiget humilietur pro infirmitate, et non extollatur pro misericordia: et ita omnia membra erunt in pace."—Ibid. Cap. xxiv. "*Si omnes æqualiter debeant necessaria accipere.*"

Respecting Labour.

— "*Quod si labor forte factus fuerit major*, in arbitrio Abbatis erit aliquid augere, remota præ omnibus crapula: ut nunquam subrepat Monacho indigeries: quia nihil sic contrarium est omni Christiano, quomodo crapula, sicut ait Dominus noster: '*Videte ne graventur corda vestra in crapula et ebrietate.*'"—Ibid. Cap. xxxix. "*De Mensura Ciborum.*"

"Quod si aut loci necessitas, vel labor, aut ardor æstatis amplius poposcerit," &c. —Ibid. Cap. xl. "*De Mensura Potûs.*"

— "*Si labores agrorum non habent Monachi — si opera in agris habuerint*—." Ibid. Cap. xli.; see also xlv.

"Certis temporibus occupari debent fratres in labore manuum; certis horis in lectione divinâ. [Then follows a division of their time.] Si autem necessitas loci, aut paupertas exegerit ut ad fruges colligendas per se occupentur, non contristentur: quia *tunc vere monachi sunt*, si labore manuum suarum vivunt: sicut et Patres nostri et Apostoli. Omnia tamen mensurate fiant, propter pusillanimes."—Ibid. Cap. xlviii. "*De Opere Manuum quotidiano.*"

"Fratres qui omnino longe sunt in labore, et non possunt occurrere hora competenti ad Oratorium,—agant ibidem opus Dei ubi operantur, cum tremore

naged,\* and how literature, science and the arts may thrive without any stimulus of private emolument. Let it also be remembered, that while in the middle ages the care of the poor, and of education, and the duties of hospitality, devolved principally upon them, they were eminently successful in agriculture, drainage and embankment, architecture, and various works of public utility.†

Disgust at the corruption of the monks might well create in the minds of the first favourers of the Reformation an aversion to Cœnobitism or conventual life, which scarcely retained any traces of its first design: although, having continued in the church from the institute of the apostles in a constant succession, its perversions were no better reason for rejecting it as a Christian ordinance, than those of the mass for rejecting the Lord's Supper. The religious revolution in this country, indeed, was mainly assisted by the division of the spoils of the Church among its partisans, which seems to have given rise to a system of public robbery and embezzlement of endowments that has continued to the present time. And under this head may also be ranked the conversion of the common lands into private property, by inclosure bills, to which may be justly applied the words of holy writ: "Woe unto them that decree unrighteous decrees, and that write grievousness which they have prescribed; to turn aside the needy from judgment, and to take away the right from the poor of my people.—Hear this, O ye that swallow up the needy, even to make the poor of the land to fail. Woe unto them that join house to house, *that lay field to field, till there is no place; that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth!* What

---

divino flectentes genua."—Ibid. Cap. l. "*De Fratribus qui longe ab Oratorio laborant.*"

\* The great accumulation of their wealth is to be attributed to the advantageous plan of a community, more than to any other cause.

† "In the monastic institutions, in my opinion, was found a great power for the mechanism of politic benevolence."—Burke's Reflections on the Revolution in France.

mean ye that beat my people to pieces,  
and grind the faces of the poor?" \*

Some, however, of the more disinterested forerunners of the Reformation, seem to have held the opinion that private property was inconsistent with Christianity,† especially the venerable Wicliffe and Ball, but some of their adherents fell into the error (not to be wondered at in that age) of attempting to establish their opinions by

\* "The country gentleman from his  
neighbour's hand  
Forceth th' inheritance, joyne's land  
to land,  
And (most insatiate) seekes under  
his rent  
'To bring the world's most spacious  
continent;  
'The fawning citizen (whose love's  
bought dearest)  
Deceives his brother when the sun  
shines clearest,  
Gets, borrowes, breakes, lets in,  
and stops out light,  
And lives a knave to leave his son  
a knight."

Browne's Pastorals.

See also Goldsmith's Deserted Village, and the passage in Sir Thomas More's Utopia, lib. i. from which the following description is taken: "Ergo ut unus helluo inexplibilis ac dira pestis patriæ, continuatis agris, aliquot millia jugerum uno circundet septo, ejiciuntur coloni quidam, suis etiam, aut circumscripti fraude, aut vi oppressi exuuntur, aut fatigati injuriis, adiguntur ad venditionem. Itaque quoquo pacto emigrant miseri, viri, mulieres, mariti, uxores, orbi, viduæ, parentes cum parvis liberis, et numerosa magis quam divite familia, ut multis opus habet manibus res rustica: emigrant inquam, e notis atque assuetis laribus, nec inveniunt quo se recipiant, suppellectilem omnem haud magno vendibilem, etiam si manere possit emptorem, quum extrudi necesse est, minimo vendunt: id quum brevi errando insumpserint, quid restat aliud denique quam uti furentur, et pendeant *juste scilicet*, aut vagentur atque mendicent: quamquam tum quoque velut errone conjiciuntur in carcerem," &c. This tragedy has recently been revived in the county of Sutherland.

† Forthi cristene men scholde been in  
commun riche, no covetise to hym  
selve.

Piers Plouhman, passus vii.

force.\* Whether there may have been any others among the Reformed that have not lost sight of the apostolic institute, I have scarcely been able to inquire.† The constitutions, indeed, of the Moravians, ‡ the Shakers, and the

\* This highly culpable disposition is also imputed to the Spenceans, whose object appears to be the re-establishment of the feudal tenures, upon a modified system.

† Bock mentions, among the early Unitarians, Gregorius Pauli, and Daniel Zwicker, as advocates for a Community of Goods. There is an interesting, though rather tart, correspondence on the subject between Zwicker and Ruarus, in which it does not appear to have occurred to the former, when his antagonist urged the want of permanence of the institute of the Jerusalem Church, that it had been continued to his own time in the monasteries.

‡ The picture of a Loan Farm, occupied by a Vee-boor, (a Cape of Good Hope land-holder or country gentleman,) and the same portion of land supporting a Moravian community of Hottentots at Gnadenthal, affords an interesting and striking contrast. It is taken from Mr. Latrobe's account of Gnadenthal. "Little do I wonder at the rapture with which this place is spoken of by travellers, who, after traversing a dreary uncultivated country, find themselves transported into a situation, by nature the most barren and wild, but now rendered fruitful and inviting by the persevering diligence and energy of a few plain, pious, sensible, and judicious men, who came hither, not seeking their own profit, but that of the most despised of nations; and while they directed their hearers' hearts to the dwellings of bliss and glory above, taught them those things which have made even their earthly dwelling a kind of paradise, and changed filth and misery into comfort and peace."

"Nearly 1300 Hottentots now inhabit this village, which was once a perfect wilderness, or, which amounts pretty much to the same thing, a loan farm, held by a single Dutch boor. It consists of 256 cottages and huts, containing 1276 inhabitants. Every cottage has a garden, from the state of which the disposition of the owner is pretty well known. The *loan farms* are tracts of about 5000 acres granted in perpetual leasehold, on payment of 5*l.* per annum, or a farthing an acre, and are occupied by the Vee-boors.

"The whole establishment of a Vee-



Society of Harmony in America are more or less founded on this principle : but though all the ancient churches paid homage to the Christian proscription of private property, it is to be feared that in the Reformed Churches a worldly, money-getting spirit is very much the characteristic of those who consider themselves as the godly.

Among the causes that have prevented the general adoption of the primitive suggestion of a Community of Goods, may be reckoned the want of any practicable plan to carry it into effect, and of a sufficient extension and preponderance of the genuine spirit of Christianity to make it lasting. This, however, need not excite our surprise, as it appears to have been the plan of Providence that Christianity should produce its effects gradually, and in co-operation with the efforts of human reason and the improvement of knowledge ; leaving room for the exertions of mankind to carry into effect its divine suggestions. And for any successful attempt to rid society of the evils of the system of private property, we must look, not as some have done to a return to a state of nature, but to a progress in refinement and civilization. The necessary arrangements can only take rise from increased knowledge of human nature and of the art of governing. The system of private

---

boor presents a scene of filth and discomfort. His house has neither tree, shrub, nor a blade of grass near it.—The interior is as slovenly as its exterior accompaniments." (A most forbidding description follows.) " Yet this man is probably the owner of 6000 head of cattle and 5000 sheep.—He lords it over the kraal of Hottentots with the power of a feudal chief.—He neither ploughs nor plants vineyards ; his habits are slovenly, and he neglects the decencies of life.—If he carries enough butter, soap, ostrich feathers, and skins, to purchase in return a little coffee, brandy, and gunpowder, the purpose of journey and his life is answered."

Quarterly Review, Vol. XXII. p. 227.

The late attempts of emigrants to settle in the deserts of America and the Cape appear to fail miserably from having been made on the system of individual property. A community is the only plan for speedily converting the wilderness into an abode of social happiness.

property belongs rather to the savage\* than the civilized state ; or is, at least, but the first step towards civilization. To appropriate to himself all that he can, is the instinct of the savage : to prevent the contentions to which this propensity would give rise was the origin of laws, so that it may perhaps be more truly said that law is the creature of property, than that property is the creature of law. No doubt the institution of Private Property has been a great stimulus to improvements in the progress of man from a barbarous to a civilized state : but it by no means follows, that when a certain degree of civilization has been attained, he may not gradually lay aside this system ; the existing stock of knowledge now enabling him to adopt a more perfect one.

I see no reason to adopt the opinion of those who think that if Christianity were universal, and had its due influence on the minds of all men, it would wholly supersede the necessity of civil government, and produce such a state of things that there would be no need either for laws or magistrates. As long as men, as social beings, are dependent on each other, and capable of deriving good or ill from mutual intercourse and assistance ; so long it would seem necessary that some system should exist by which this intercourse may be regulated, and by its improvement made to produce the greatest sum of happiness within their reach. For, supposing that all the members of a society were influenced by the most kind and Christian spirit, yet would they, for want of wisdom and experience, and a skilful system of polity, not only fail of effecting all that might be done for the common weal, but perhaps fall into such mistakes and inconveniences as would produce a state of things destructive of those very principles and dispositions which it has been imagined might render civil government altogether unnecessary.

---

\* *Nec commune bonum poterant spectare, neque ullis  
Moribus inter se scibant nec legibus  
uti.  
Quod cuique obtulerat prædæ fortuna,  
ferebat,  
Sponte sua, sibi quisque valere et  
vivere doctus.—Lucret. Lib. v.*

Besides which, it seems probable, that even for this complete dominion of Christian motives, we may have to be indebted to progressive improvements in education and government, conjointly with the intrinsic power and excellence of Christianity.

Those who assert the impracticability of any plans of this kind forget how much institutions respecting property have varied, and that society has actually existed under various modifications of them. The accumulation of landed property was guarded against under the Jewish Theocracy by the divine institution of the jubilee every 50th year, when all the lands which had been sold or alienated, were re-divided among the people. Levit. xxv. 23: "The land shall not be sold for ever, for the land is mine," &c. And in the Sabbatical year the produce of the land was to be common to all, and debts were to be remitted. (*See Belsham's Sermon on the Jubilee.*) Those who are disposed to consider the Mosaic as typical of the Christian dispensation, may easily discover, in the Sabbatical and Jubilee years, a type of the abolition of private property under the gospel. In some parts even of this country the laws are much less conducive to the accumulation of landed property than in others, and many changes, though mostly for the worse, have been made with respect to the tenure and descent of property: we hear much of the danger of innovations on private property, but little is said against the scandalous conversion of public into private property. A great part, perhaps all, of our lands were formerly *shack* lands, of which the occupant had the use only whilst his crop was on, the land then reverting to the community for pasturage. Even now the meer-bauks that separate the lands belong to the community, and the occupier of two adjoining fields has no right to plough up the meer-bauk between them.—"All the lands in a district called the Theel-land, lying in the bailiwick of Norden and Bertum," says a writer in the Edinburgh Review, "are held by a very extraordinary tenure—we speak in the present tense, for the customs of the Theel-land were subsisting in 1805, and we do not suppose that they have since become obsolete. The

Agrarian law, elsewhere a phantom, either lovely or terrific, according to the imagination of the spectator, is here fully realized. The land is considered as being divided into portions or Theels, each containing a stated quantity: the owners are called Theelmen, or Theel-boors; but no Theel-boor can hold more than one Theel in severalty. The undivided, or common land, comprising the Theels not held by individuals, belongs to all the inhabitants of the Theel-land, and is cultivated or farmed out on their joint account. The Theel-boor cannot sell his hereditary Theel, or alienate it in any way, even to his nearest relations. On his death it descends to his youngest son. If there are no sons it descends to the youngest daughter, under the restrictions after mentioned; and in default of issue it reverts to the commonalty. But elder sons are not left destitute: when they are old enough to keep house, a Theel is assigned to each of them (be they ever so many) out of the common lands, to be held to them and their issue, according to the customary tenure. If a woman who has inherited a Theel becomes the wife of a Theel-boor, who is already in possession of a Theel, then her land reverts to the commonalty."\*

In the degree of civilization hitherto attained, law has interfered only to prevent the perpetration of violence and the grosser kinds of fraud † in the acquisition of property, and to regulate in various ways its possession and conveyance. To equalize as much as possible the gifts of Providence amongst all, however consonant to reason, benevolence, and Christianity, has been scarcely at all its object. The progress of improvement, and a sense of

---

\* Edinburgh Review, No. LXIII., for July 1819, p. 10, on the Laws of Friesland. For a most interesting account of this district, and of the happiness and prosperity prevailing in it in consequence of this system, see also Travels in the North of Germany, by Mr. Hodgkins.

See also Tacitus de Moribus Germanorum, Cap. xxxvi.

† Chiefly, however, frauds which affect the rich. Those which are committed by them upon the poorer classes do not even incur reproach.

mutual advantage have, however, induced societies of men to unite for purposes which have this tendency: such are insurances, benefit societies, and all those institutions whose object it is to obviate the inequalities of fortune, and to lessen the weight of calamity by sharing it among a numerous association. The progress of knowledge and true civilization will tend to unite men in contriving the general security and welfare by mutual co-operation, and in discovering such laws and regulations as will enable all the members of any society to partake as much as possible of its wealth.

We are all ready to allow that the superfluities of the rich, "for which men swinck and sweat incessantly," give them no increase of enjoyment, while they in their waste consume the comforts of the majority: and yet we are blindly attached to a system necessarily productive of a state of things, which the Jewish revelation has censured, which poets and philosophers have always deplored, and which Christianity has fully condemned. If the prayer be a proper one, "Give me neither poverty nor riches, \* lest I be full and deny thee, and say, Who is the Lord? or lest I be poor and steal, and take the name of my God in vain,"—then is that constitution of things the best which does not expose men to these hurtful extremes, to the evils occasioned by the lubricity of fortune, and to the pernicious influence of avarice and selfish ambition, of which the poet has given us too true a picture:

"Some thought to raise themselves to  
high degree  
By Riches and unrighteous reward;  
Some by close should'ring; some by  
flatteree;  
Others through friends; others for base  
regard;

---

\* *Aurea mediocritas.*

*HOR. Carm. ii. 10.*

"*Molestissimus et occupatissimus, et si profundius inspicias, vere miserrimus est divitum status: contra autem dura quidem sed tutissima et expeditissima est paupertas. Mediocritas optima, et inter rarissima Dei dona hanc nobis contigisse gratulor.*"—*Petrarchæ Epist. Lib. iii. 14.*

And all by wrong waies for themselves  
prepard;

Those that were up themselves kept  
others low;

Those that were low themselves held  
others hard,

Ne suffred them to ryse or greater  
grow;

But every one did strive his fellow downe  
to throw.

*Faerie Queene, b. ii. c. 7.*

It may be unnecessary for me to add, that I consider both Wallace and Malthus \* as admitting the advantages of a community of goods, were it not for the danger of such an increase of mankind under the happy state which it would produce, that the world would not hold them, and that they must starve or eat one another; to prevent which catastrophe (according to the latter) the Creator has no better resource than to keep down their numbers by perpetuating vice and misery among them: or, as the Attorney-General of Chester lately expressed it, "There could be no doubt that poverty was the doom of heaven for the great majority of mankind." To such an objection I think no regard need be paid.

It was my intention to have considered the manifold ills which are alleged to have their source in the system of private property, and to take notice of the plans which have been proposed, or put in practice for superseding it: I must, however, content myself with referring to the publications of that zealous and unwearied philanthropist Mr. Robert Owen of Lanark; wherein, in addition to those plans of his own which it were much to be wished should undergo a careful trial, he details those which have been proposed or carried into execution by several individuals and societies. † I shall

---

\* This essay was written before Mr. Godwin's clear and satisfactory refutation of the theory of Mr. Malthus had appeared; but its entire incompatibility with the Divine goodness was enough to convince us that it would prove false.

† See "A New View of Society, by Robert Owen, Esq., of New Lanark." See also "Muratori's Account of the Government of the Jesuits in Paraguay;" "Remarks on the Practicability of Mr. Owen's Plan to improve the Condition of the



also appeal to the exquisite and admirable work, of one of the greatest men that has adorned this or any other country, I mean Sir Thomas More, which has been disgracefully neglected and misunderstood by his countrymen, who have represented him as not having been in earnest in what he wrote, and have even converted the word *Utopian* into a term of contempt and reproach, as implying something absurd and impracticable. With a few passages from his *Utopia*, in which there can be no doubt he expresses his real sentiments, I shall, therefore, conclude this essay.

“To speak plainly my real sentiments, I must freely own, that, as long as there is any private property, and while money is the standard of all other things, I cannot think that a nation can be governed either justly or happily; not justly, because the best things will fall to the share of the worst men; nor happily, because all things will be divided amongst a few, (and even these are not in all respects happy,) the rest being left to be absolutely miserable. Therefore, when I reflect on the wise and good constitution of the *Utopians*, among whom all things are so well governed and with so few laws; where virtue hath its due reward, and yet there is such an equality that every man lives in plenty: when I compare with them so many other nations, that are still making new laws, and yet can never bring their constitution to a right regulation; where, notwithstanding every one has his property, yet all the laws that they can invent have not the power either to obtain or preserve it, or even to enable men certainly to distinguish what is their own from what is another's; of which the many law-suits that every day break out and are eternally depending, give too plain a demonstration: when, I say, I balance all these things in my thoughts, I grow more favourable to Plato, and do not wonder that he resolved not to make any laws for such as would not submit to a community of all things; for so wise a man could not but foresee that the setting all upon a level was the only way to make a nation happy, which cannot be obtained so long as private property exists: for when every man draws to himself all that he can compass, by one title or another, it must needs follow, that how plentiful

soever a nation may be, yet a few dividing the wealth of it among themselves, the rest must fall into indigence. So that there will be two sorts of people among them, who deserve that their fortunes should be interchanged; the former useless, but wicked and ravenous; and the latter, who by their constant industry serve the public more than themselves, sincere and modest men: from whence, I am persuaded, that, till property is taken away there can be no equitable or just distribution of things, nor can the world be happily governed; for as long as that is maintained, the greatest and the far best part of mankind will be still oppressed with a load of cares and anxieties. I confess, without taking it quite away, those pressures that lie on a great part of mankind may be made lighter, but they can never be quite removed: for if laws were made to determine at how great an extent in soil, and at how much money every man must stop, &c. these laws might have such effect as good diet and care might have on a sick man whose recovery is desperate, they might allay and mitigate the disease, but it could never be quite healed, nor the body politic be brought again to a good habit, as long as property remains; and it will fall out as in a complication of diseases, that by applying a remedy to one sore you will provoke another; and that which removes the one ill symptom produces others; while the strengthening one part of the body weakens the rest.”—More, p. 60.

And, again, at the conclusion of his delightful work:

“Thus have I described to you, as particularly as I could, the constitution of that commonwealth, which I do not only think the best in the world, but indeed the only commonwealth that truly deserves that name. In all other places it is visible, that while people talk of a commonwealth every man only seeks his own wealth; but there, where no man has any property, all men zealously pursue the good of the public: and, indeed, it is no wonder to see men act so differently; for, in other commonwealths, every man knows that, unless he provides for himself, how flourishing soever the commonwealth may be, he must die of hunger, so that he sees the necessity of preferring his own concerns to the public, but in *Utopia*, where every man has a right to every thing, they all know that if care is taken to keep the public stores full, no private man can want any thing; for among them there is no unequal distribution, so that no man is poor,

---

Lower Classes;” and “Mr. Owen's proposed Villages for the Poor shewn to be highly favourable to Christianity.”

none in necessity, and though no man has any thing, yet they are all rich ; for what can make a man so rich as to lead a serene and cheerful life, free from anxieties ; neither apprehending want himself, nor vexed with the endless complaints of his wife ? He is not afraid of the misery of his children, nor is he contriving how to raise a portion for his daughters ; but is secure in this, that both he and wife, his children and grandchildren, to as many generations as he can fancy, will all live both plentifully and happily ; since, among them, there is no less care taken of those who were once engaged in labour, but grow, afterwards, unable to follow it, than there is elsewhere, of those that continue still employed. I would gladly hear any man compare the justice that is among them with that of all other nations ; among whom may I perish if I see any thing that looks either like justice or equity : for what justice is there in this, that a nobleman, a goldsmith, a banker, or any other man, that either does nothing at all, or, at best, is employed in things that are of no use to the public, should live in great luxury and splendour upon what is so ill acquired ; and a mean man, a carter, a smith, or a ploughman, that works harder even than the beasts themselves, and is employed in labours so necessary that no commonwealth could hold out a year without them, can only earn so poor a livelihood, and must lead so miserable a life, that the condition of the beasts is much better than theirs ? For as the beasts do not work so constantly, so they feed almost as well and with more pleasure ; and have no anxiety about what is to come, whilst these men are depressed by a barren and fruitless employment, and tormented with the apprehensions of want in their old age, since that which they get by their daily labour does but maintain them at present, and is consumed as fast as it comes in ; there is no overplus left to lay up for old age.

“ Is not that government both unjust and ungrateful that is so prodigal of its favour to those that are called gentlemen or goldsmiths, or such others that are idle or live either by flattery or by contriving the arts of vain pleasure ; and, on the other hand, takes no care of those of a meaner sort, such as ploughmen, colliers, and smiths, without whom it could not subsist ? But after the public has reaped all the advantage of their service, and they come to be oppressed with age, sickness, and want, all their labours and the good they have done is forgotten ; and all the recompence given

them is, that they are left to die in great misery.

“ Therefore, I must say, that, as I hope for mercy, I can have no other notion of all the other governments that I see or know, than that they are a conspiracy of the rich who, on pretence of managing the public, only pursue their private ends, and devise all the ways and arts they can find out ; first, that they may, without danger, preserve all that they have so ill acquired, and then, that they may engage the poor to toil and labour for them at as low rates as possible, and oppress them as much as they please ; and, if they can but prevail to get these contrivances established by the show of public authority, which is considered as the representative of the whole people, then they are accounted laws : yet these wicked men, after they have by a most insatiable covetousness, divided that among themselves with which all the rest might have been well supplied, are far from that happiness that is enjoyed among the Utopians : for the use as well as the desire of money being extinguished, much anxiety and great occasions of mischief is cut off with it ; and who does not see that the frauds, thefts, robberies, quarrels, tumults, contentions, seditions, murders, treacheries, and witchcrafts, which are, indeed, rather punished than restrained by the severities of the law, would all fall off, if money were not any more valued by the world. Men’s fears, solitudes, cares, labours, and watchings, would all perish in the same moment with the value of money ; even poverty itself, for the relief of which money seems most necessary, would fall.

“ I do not doubt but rich men are sensible of this, and that they well know how much a greater happiness it is to want nothing necessary than to abound in many superfluities ; and to be rescued out of so much misery than to abound with so much wealth : and I cannot think but the sense of every man’s interest added to the authority of Christ’s commands, who, as he was infinitely wise, knew what was best, and was not less good in discovering it to us, would have drawn all the world over to the laws of the Utopians, if pride, that plague of human nature, that source of so much misery, did not hinder it ; for this vice does not measure happiness so much by its own conveniencies as by the miseries of others, and would not be satisfied with being thought a goddess, if none were left that were miserable, over whom she might insult. Pride thinks its own happiness shines the brighter, by comparing it with the misfortunes of other

persons; that by displaying its own wealth they may feel their poverty the more sensibly."—More, p. 203.

D. R.

*Clergymen compellable to marry Unbaptized Persons.*

A WRITER in *The Christian Observer* for January, has communicated the following Case and Opinion on this subject, observing, that he is "informed that the present and the late Bishop of the largest diocese in England both consider a clergyman right in refusing to marry unbaptized persons." We invite the opinions of our correspondents who are in the profession of the law upon this question, which involves the dearest rights of no inconsiderable portion of the Dissenters.

"To Dr. J., *Doctors' Commons*.

"Banns of marriage between J. H. and M. W. were published in the parish church of K. on three several Sundays. The vicar being called upon to solemnize the marriage, refused the request upon its having been stated to him, that one of the parties, namely J. H., had never received the rite of baptism from any person whatsoever.

"Your opinion is requested, whether marriage may be solemnized, and whether the minister may be compelled to marry, without the rite of baptism being previously administered; and, if not, whether it will be necessary to republish the banns after baptism.

"J. T. H."

"To Rev. J. T. H.

"Whatever may have been required by the ancient Rubrick, it is now perfectly clear, that it is not incumbent upon the new-married couple to receive the Sacrament, though it be recommended as convenient to be done; and therefore the reasoning which was applicable to the law as it then stood, is not to be applied to it in its existing state. The Marriage Act, it is true, requires 'that the true Christian and Surname should be used in the publication of banns;' and perhaps, strictly speaking, there is no true Christian name but that which is received in baptism. It has, however, been held, that for the purposes of that Act, a Christian, as well as a Surname, may be acquired by repute; and that a person, whose name was Abraham Langley, was well married by, and after the publication of banns in, the name of George Smith. Vide the *King v. the Inhabitants of Billingham* (3 Maule and Selwyn, p. 250).

"I am therefore clearly of opinion, that the marriage in question not only may but ought to be solemnized; and that the minister refusing to perform the ceremony may be compelled to do so; and I therefore recommend that no further opposition be made to him.

"Signed, H. J.

"*Doctors' Commons*, 5 Dec. 1820."

*The late Rev. John Hornbrook's Letter on Clerical Subscription.*

*Birmingham,*

*February 2, 1821.*

SIR,  
THE following statement, by "a distressed clergyman," was the effusion of a heart that knew "its own bitterness:" it discloses the character of the individual from whom it proceeded, and shews that the pressure of clerical subscription has been more severely and extensively felt than persons living in the busy world may have imagined. I am enabled to inform you, on the authority of the writer himself, that this correspondent of *Mr. Urban* was the late Rev. John Hornbrook, who died, some years ago, at or near Plymouth. He was designed originally for the law: his turn of mind, however, induced him to take orders; and he officiated, for a considerable time, first as curate of Moretonhampstead, in Devonshire, and afterwards, in the same capacity, at Tamerton, in that county. From his diocesan, Bishop Ross,\* whom he made acquainted with his scruples in respect of reading the Athanasian Creed, he received the most satisfactory assurances of sympathy and candour. But Conformity was a burden too heavy to be endured by a man like Mr. Hornbrook. Many years before his death, he quitted the ministry and communion of the Established Church, and joined himself to a society of Unitarian Christians. He sometimes preached to the congregation at Plymouth, of which he had now become a member. The strain of his sermons was exceedingly plain and useful; and nothing but the tremulousness of his voice and frame prevented him from being heard with unabated pleasure.

\* Notices and letters of Bishop Ross will be found in *Nichols' Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*.



Mr. Hornbrook was a man of genuine piety, benevolence and tenderness of spirit. He was also one of the most modest of human beings, never assuming airs of superiority on account of his having formerly been enrolled among the clergy of the Church of England, but grieved and humbled that he had continued in that body so long.\* I have frequently heard him speak with tears on the subject of the annexed letter. With the best theological writers of his age and country he was extremely conversant: among these, *Sykes* was particularly his favourite; and I must express my obligations to Mr. Hornbrook's memory for his having first put into my hands that author's "Scripture Doctrine of the Redemption of Man by Jesus Christ."

Many interesting thoughts and recollections are awakened by the review of my intercourse with my venerable friend. As often as I have read the communication which I now transcribe for your pages, I have found it impossible to suppress the exclamation, "Offences must needs come: but alas for those by whom they come!"

JOHN KENTISH.

"MR. URBAN,†

"As your valuable magazine is held in high esteem, and much read, your inserting the following case in your next, will much oblige,

"Your very humble servant,

"*A Distressed Clergyman.*

"Having had great objections, for many years, to the subscription at present required of the clergy, by law, to the Thirty-nine Articles, &c., I took a resolution never to subscribe more, on any account whatever: and I have, accordingly, more than once declined applying to my friends, when they have had it in their power to provide for me; in consequence of which, I still remain in the situation in which I set out, when I first entered into orders; namely, in that of a country curate. It may likewise be proper to mention here, that I also joined with those of the clergy who lately petitioned Parliament for relief in this matter of subscription.

"By means of a small income which

I have besides my curacy, which last brings me in about forty pounds *per annum*, I am enabled to give a little assistance to some near relations, who would otherwise be reduced to great straits, and, which I should have mentioned before, to maintain a small family of my own, which it would not be in my power to do was it not for the small income of my cure. This, therefore, has prevented me hitherto from resigning my office in the Church, as I am satisfied I should otherwise have done before this time. For my wading through the different parts of the Liturgy in the manner I have done for some time past, notwithstanding my objections to them are much the same with those of Mr. Lindsey and Mr. Jebb, must be allowed by every serious man to be a task sufficiently hard and irksome.

"But here it will be asked, 'If your case be really so distressing as you have represented it, why do you not apply yourself to some other employment, in order to procure a subsistence in a manner that might be more agreeable?' To which I answer, that though I have frequently taken the matter into consideration, yet, having now been engaged in the ministerial office between twenty and thirty years, and confined myself entirely to the studies proper to a clergyman, I have not been able to think of any business to which I can turn myself; it being rather too late for a man of fifty to apply himself to new studies. And should it be said, 'You may open a place of worship somewhere upon Unitarian principles, as Mr. Lindsey has done,' I ask, where is it likely I should find a congregation to join with me? Could Mr. Jebb\* have found such a one, I dare say he would not have turned himself to the study of physic. Besides, having been always accustomed to a plain country congregation, and always preached to them in a plain manner, suited to their capacities, it would now be difficult for me to render myself in any manner agreeable to a town congregation.

"Having thus laid my case, in a few words, before the public, if any of your numerous readers should have it in their power, and will be so kind as to point out any method of relief, it will be doing an act of charity to a person in real distress."

In p. 16 of the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1778, the foregoing letter was

\* So Mr. Lindsey. *Apology*, &c. p. 225.

† *Gent. Magazine* for Dec. 1777, p. 566.

\* See, however, Mr. Belsham's *Memoirs of Lindsey*, pp. 94, 134, 135.

treated with an unfeeling taunt; but in p. 77 of the same volume, it is mentioned in those terms of candour, liberality and respect which it so justly merited.

J. K.

*Glasgow,*

*January 17, 1821.*

SIR,  
I OWE it to yourself and your readers to take notice of the promise which I ventured to make of some account of the Life and Writings of the late venerable and learned Mr. Joseph Bretland [Mon. Repos. XIV. 494]. I have never relinquished this idea since I first formed it, although, soon after my communication to the Repository, I was led to alter the mode of publishing the materials I had collected. That I have not hitherto accomplished my intention, is owing to a variety of circumstances unnecessary to be here detailed. In the simple and interesting narrative of the executor, prefixed to the two volumes of Discourses recently published, we are presented with such particulars of the late Mr. B. as the life of a recluse student might be supposed to furnish. My own plan differs considerably from this, and is intended to include an examination of the opinions contained in Mr. Bretland's papers in the Theological Repository, &c. I wish also to be able to subjoin some account of Mr. Bretland's literary and theological connexions, and of the progress of liberal theology in his time, and within his circle of influence. Yet I dare not encourage the hope that I shall interest more than the younger and less-informed Unitarian. I feel, however, that I shall discharge a duty which my high veneration for the deceased prompted me, perhaps prematurely, to undertake, and shall be amply rewarded for my pains if the narrative should excite or confirm in any breast that love for moral and theological truth, and that upright, patient, candid spirit in the search after it, for which Mr. Bretland was so conspicuous. The small publication which I contemplate will be enriched by some very interesting letters, never before published, of the Unitarian worthies, Priestley, Lindsey, Toulmin, &c. I am sorry that I have been able to procure so few of Mr. Bretland's own letters. My thanks are, however, due in particular to Mr. Joseph Priestley, to whom I applied

for leave to consult the correspondence between his illustrious father and Mr. Bretland; but, after inquiring for me on the other side of the Atlantic, he concludes that the loss of this is only one of the numerous injuries which the public has sustained from the Birmingham Riots in 1791. I beg leave respectfully to solicit the advice and communications of such of my older friends as may be able to promote my design, the promptness of which will expedite the publication.

B. MARDON.

*Portsmouth,*

*February 9, 1821.*

SIR,

IT is with reluctance I obtrude myself on the attention of your readers, but the animadversions of your Correspondent, the Inquirer, in pp. 12—14 of your last Number, certainly require that some notice should be taken of them: allow me, therefore, to request the insertion in your next of the following remarks.

The Inquirer, in referring to the Sermon I had the honour to deliver before the Supporters and Friends of the London Unitarian Fund Society in May last, says, "Though the preacher does not expressly mention the Inquirer's Four Letters to the Rev. Mr. Fox, he has obviously alluded to them, by censuring the application there made of the case of Elymas"\* (Bar-Jesus). So far was I from alluding to these Four Letters of the Inquirer, that I am at this moment perfectly ignorant of their contents, not having read a single sentence of either of them, nor had I heard that the case of Bar-Jesus was referred to in them till after the Sermon was published.

The greater part of the second paragraph applies to Mr. Fox, and was doubtless intended as, at least, a shot-wind for him, and to him I leave it.

In the third paragraph the Inquirer remarks, "Surely this was a crime by no means peculiar to Elymas, neither are we justified in imputing this crime to Elymas, unless Mr. Scott can shew that he had witnessed any miracle till that which deprived him of sight." The

---

\* Elymas is not the name of this person, but describes his profession as a magian.

crime was so far peculiar to Bar-Jesus, that we meet with no other instance in any way similar to it. This was a personal opposition of one learned man to another. The object of their contest was a man of rank, of talent, and of great influence in the island of which Barnabas was a native, and where he would naturally be peculiarly desirous that Paul should succeed with Sergius Paulus, as he would then become their first convert from among what was termed the idolatrous Gentiles; and, as his conversion would greatly facilitate the establishment of a Christian community in Cyprus, it became necessary to put an effectual stop to such opposition. The Apostle Paul, before his conversion, had been a strict Pharisee; hence he was every where peculiarly obnoxious to the Pharisees: they hated, opposed and persecuted him wherever he went. This general feeling of the Pharisees towards the apostle accounts for the peculiar animosity of Bar-Jesus towards him, as there can be very little doubt of his knowing Paul either personally or from the hatred of his Jewish friends to him. It was now ten years since the conversion of Paul; during this time he had been preaching the gospel, and to Jews only, if we except those Gentiles who were accustomed to worship with the Jews in their synagogues. The three first years he remained at Damascus preaching to his own nation, except a short journey into the neighbouring part of Arabia. The Jews were in great numbers at Damascus, and in great favour with the reigning prince; it is probable, therefore, that a man of Bar-Jesus' pursuits would visit this ancient city. And here he could not fail to hear of the apostle, from the very great hatred of its Jewish citizens towards him. Being at Damascus, the magian would naturally extend his route to Antioch, the third city in the Roman empire, and here also he would hear of the apostle, of his preaching, and of his miracles, since he had resided here, at two different times, the greater part of two years. If it be objected that this was taking a circuitous route to Cyprus, it must be observed, that the pursuits of Bar-Jesus would necessarily lead him to visit the most celebrated cities within his reach, and also that, in the then early state of navigation, particularly among the Jews, persons were

accustomed to prefer the shortest distance by sea. And Antioch was a very short distance, about twelve or fifteen miles, from Seleucia, the nearest port to the island of Cyprus. If Bar-Jesus were not a native of Jerusalem, he would doubtless have been there at the Passover, in the course of the ten preceding years; so that either at Jerusalem, or at Damascus, or at Antioch, he, as a Jew, could not fail of becoming acquainted with the nature of the miracles performed by Paul and by other apostles at some one or other of these places. Antioch was too near Cyprus for its Jewish inhabitants to be ignorant of what was transpiring in that city respecting the great schism in their own religion, since here it was that the believers in the divine mission of Jesus first became a distinct body from the Jewish unbelievers; and this occurred about three years before this visit of Paul's to Paphos. Besides, the apostle before he visited this place had been preaching at Salamis to the Jews in their synagogues; and of this Bar-Jesus could not be ignorant. Indeed, if he had not previously known something of Paul and of the nature of his mission, he would not at once have so strenuously opposed him, but would have waited in order to penetrate more clearly the designs and plans of Paul and his companions. But possessing the same malignant temper towards the apostle that the Pharisees generally manifested, he adopted the same line of conduct, and rejected Christianity notwithstanding the miraculous attestation which he could not but know had attended its preachers. And though I cannot from *positive* evidence, which the Inquirer asks for, shew that Bar-Jesus had witnessed any miracle before that which deprived him of sight, yet from *presumptive* evidence, which is all that can be procured in the present day, the very great probability is, that Bar-Jesus could not be unacquainted with the nature of the gospel and of the miracles which accompanied the preaching of the apostles, and therefore was punished for the wilful rejection of the evidence given to the divine mission of Jesus by the testimony of miracles.

In the fourth paragraph, p. 13, the Inquirer says, that "the Roman Catholic and the Protestant sectary are allowed the open profession and quiet



enjoyment of their peculiar modes of faith and worship." Its openness and its quietness are accompanied with the deprivation of civil rights and privileges to which they have as just a claim as their brethren in the Establishment. The disabilities are inflicted on those who are as good subjects and as honourable men as any of the members of that Church to whom these privileges are secured, and which is itself a mere creature of the State. "Situating as you are," says a very acute and forcible writer, "your whole ritual, all your ordinances and articles, are a part of the law of the land! The ecclesiastical corps, through all its ranks, is as much subject to this law as the army is to the annual Mutiny Bill." "Our ecclesiastical establishment, from first to last, is the work of the civil power." \* The Inquirer proceeds, "But Christianity in its most comprehensive sense, including the divine mission of our Lord and the doctrine of a future state of reward and punishment, is a part of the law of the land." Does the Inquirer forget that the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian Creeds also form a part of the law of the land? In what part of the Scriptures is it enjoined that the religion of Jesus shall become the common law of any land? Does not Jesus say his kingdom is not of this world? And where does he constitute the civil power of any country, the interpreter of his doctrines, the illustrator of his instructions, or the elucidator of his precepts for the benefit and advantage of his disciples? Does he not say, Ye have but one teacher, even Christ? And does not his apostle Paul say, that every man must stand or fall to his own master? Is not every man to judge for himself what he can receive as truth? "What is truth?" I protest I have no better answer to give to any one putting this question to me than by saying, with Mr. HORNE TOOKER, that it is 'what a man *throweth*.' It is not for me to guess at the degree of respect with which this distinguished scholar and philologist may regard the sanction of the most learned of all the apostles." †

The Inquirer afterwards proceeds,

\* Layman's Letter to the Rev. Dr. Goddard, p. 30. Chichester, 1811.

† Ibid. p. 38.

"that, for the protection of this offender," i. e. "the blasphemer, the scoffer, the daring violater of the national law, the reviler of the national faith," (the Athanasian Creed,) "the misleader of the simple, the abuser of the ignorant, the corrupter of youth, the destroyer of all that is sacred and venerable, Mr. Scott would impose an absolute restraint upon the exercise of lawful authority." In what part of my discourse can such an assertion be found, or any such inference be justly drawn? Or in what part of my life can such a spirit be attributed to me? And yet the Inquirer says, "All that I know of Mr. Scott claims respect." What! respect a man who is the abettor, or who "would impose an absolute restraint upon the exercise of lawful authority" on "the blasphemer, the daring violater of the national law, the abuser of the ignorant, the corrupter of youth, the destroyer of all that is sacred and venerable"! And this charge is brought against me because a miraculous exertion of power in an apostle of Christ does not appear to me to be a scriptural precedent for the civil magistrate of this country, who possesses no such power, to inflict what punishment he pleases on an Unbeliever. If this punishment of Bar-Jesus is to be established as a scriptural precedent, on the same principle we ought to adopt that which has been set us by the apostle Peter, for those who practise religious fraud and dissimulation, religious prevarication and falsehood, who thought it necessary to inflict the punishment of instant death on Ananias and Sapphira, who were guilty of these crimes. And why not punish with sickness, infirmities and death, those who misuse the Lord's Supper by introducing improper practices into its celebration, by obliging men to employ it as a qualification for a civil office? These precedents stand each of them upon a similar foundation; that of peculiarity in their nature, their circumstances, their time or their cause, and can have no kind of affinity to the case of modern Unbelievers.

In the next paragraph the Inquirer goes on to remark, "I beseech you, says St. Paul, be ye followers of me. No, says Mr. Scott, you must not follow Paul, unless you can produce similar evidence of being divinely com-

missioned." Is this true? Is it a fair inference from any thing I advanced? Paul himself shall be the judge between us. The apostle, finding the Corinthians inclined to be diverted by other teachers from those doctrines and precepts he had delivered to them, tells them that he was their father in Christ, and then exhorts them (1 Cor. iv. 16) to be followers of him in adhering to the truth in which he had instructed them. Not a word about Bar-Jesus! Not a syllable about his having enjoined the civil magistrate, "under the limitation of Christian benevolence, to exercise that power with which he is entrusted in defence of the dearest interests of men." In the 11th chapter of this Epistle, the apostle is arguing against eating things offered to idols, and concludes with the words, "Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ." But on what occasion does Christ employ the civil power in defence of his religion? Or when did he enjoin his disciples to punish others for unbelief? His whole conduct is the very reverse of any such practice, if we are to depend on his historians. In the 3rd chapter of his Epistle to the Philippians, we find the apostle opposing the Jewish zealots, who were desirous to prevail on the Gentile converts to be circumcised: "Brethren," (ver. 17,) "be followers together of me, and mark them which walk so, as ye have us for an ensample." I cannot see any connexion between circumcision and the civil magistrate's "exercising that power with which he is entrusted," not by Christ certainly, nor by his apostles, "in defence of the dearest interests of men." The Thessalonian converts had, we are informed, become the followers of Paul, but it was in remaining firm in their belief of the gospel in the midst of trials, difficulties and persecutions: they had become followers of Paul in bearing punishments with Christian fortitude, not in inflicting them "under the limitation of Christian benevolence."

It appears that there is another "fatal result" arising from the view taken of the conduct of Paul towards Bar-Jesus in this Sermon: "it tends to raise a barrier between us and that perfect Example on whom the spirit was poured without measure, and to remove it from our imitation."—P. 14.

Who ever thought of going to Bedlam or St. Luke's, and there imitate our Lord by rebuking the unclean spirits and commanding the devils to come out of its unfortunate inhabitants? If the exertion of miraculous power in Paul is to be imitated, "under the limitation of Christian benevolence," so must the exertion of miraculous power in the Master of Paul, so far as they possessed it in common, since the apostle says expressly, "Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ." "He who declared that he *came not to send peace on earth, but a sword*, had a divine commission: if *we*, who have no such commission, knowingly, and without an object of adequate magnitude, do what has in the smallest degree the same tendency, shall we not be found deficient in one of the essential requisites of the Christian character?"\*

"Paul," says the Inquirer, p. 14, "peculiarly the apostle of the Gentiles, and to whom we naturally look for a precedent in the treatment of Unbelievers—this very Paul has left the striking case of Elymas, a case that in after ages was likely to be of frequent occurrence, unguarded by word or hint that his conduct on this memorable occasion was *not* to be imitated by future Christians." It also happens that this very Paul has left this striking case *without a word* or hint that his conduct on this memorable occasion *was to be* imitated by future Christians. But then he has done better, by not leaving the matter in any degree of doubt or uncertainty. He has openly and plainly told us in his writings in what way we are to deal with Unbelievers. Rom. xvi. 17, 18: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; *and avoid them*. For they that are such, serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own bellies; and, by good words and fair speeches, deceive the hearts of the simple." 1 Cor. xvi. 22: "If any man love not the Lord Jesus," and not to love was then to hate and disbelieve, "let him be anathema maranatha," separated from you;† or,

\* Letter from a Southern Unitarian, &c., p. 11. Chichester, 1805.

† Wakefield and I. V.

as others think, let him be reserved for punishment to the coming of Christ. 1 Tim. i. 19, 20: "Holding faith and a good conscience, which some having put away, concerning faith have made shipwreck; of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander, whom I have delivered unto Satan," excluded them from our societies, "that they may learn not to blaspheme." And in chap. v. 6, Timothy is to withdraw himself from men of corrupt minds, or who are destitute of the truth. In the Second Epistle, (iii. 1,) the apostle desires Timothy to be prepared for great opposition to the gospel, by its enemies, who would of course be unbelievers, and especially as they were to resist the truth. What is Timothy to do with these men? Is he to punish them? No. Is he to deliver them over to the civil power to be punished "under the limitation of Christian benevolence"? No: but, in ver. 9, Paul desires they may be *left to themselves*, and *their folly* would soon become sufficiently manifest unto all men.

"Paul, peculiarly the apostle of the Gentiles, and to whom we naturally look for a precedent in the treatment of Unbelievers," has given us four, at least, each of which must be greatly superior to that which the Inquirer appears so solicitous to adopt, because each is unencumbered with the difficulties which necessarily attend a miraculous case; and they have each the advantage of being perfectly compatible with "Christian benevolence." They are superior in another point of view. Each of these four is an exhortation to a duty to be performed, and is recorded by the apostle himself. The case of Bar-Jesus is merely the narration of a circumstance which occurred, and to which Paul never afterwards alluded, nor is it probable that he even knew of its being placed on record. The history of the Acts of the Apostles is generally acknowledged to have been written in Greece, and about the time that Paul was imprisoned at Rome, previously to his death. This history was avowedly written for the use of an individual, and to whom it was in the first instance undoubtedly sent. It must have been some time, therefore, before it would get into circulation, and much longer before a

copy would reach Rome, where Paul suffered martyrdom. Luke mentions this miracle, as he states other facts, with a view to confirm the faith of his friend Theophilus in the divine authenticity of the gospel, to convince him that it was established on miracles, and to assure him that the Gentiles were equally to be participators of its advantages and blessings with the Jews. The Inquirer therefore appears desirous of attaching a degree of authority to the narration of this miracle which the occasion will not justify, and "has been carried further in this instance than scripture, when fairly interpreted, can warrant."

"I am inclined to think," says the Inquirer in the second paragraph of p. 14, "that political or sectarian prejudices, or perhaps a mixture of both, has in this instance carried him further than scripture, when fairly interpreted, can warrant." I am at a loss to conceive what could have induced the Inquirer to refer in this way to my political principles, and to insinuate that they have influenced my opinion in the case of Bar-Jesus. It is somewhat singular that the advocates of religious coercion should attribute the views of those who think differently from them to political prejudices; for this, Sir, is not a solitary instance in your pages. I like not the scowling aspect of this insinuation; I will not, therefore, trust myself any longer in its company, but, in taking leave, just whisper in its ear, "O! full of all subtilty and of all mischief!"

With regard to the "invidious remarks in pp. 26, 27," of the Sermon, I have only to observe, that, as they are founded on facts and established on the public conduct of the different sects there mentioned, I cannot see how they can justly be considered as envious or malignant. And if the truth is not to be spoken of the public conduct of such large bodies of Christians, we may, on the same principle, stigmatize with the epithet "invidious," the remarks of our Lord on the public conduct of the Pharisees; he may be declared envious and malignant when he told them, that if he did not exhibit to the people those points in which he thought they violated the law of Moses and disgraced their descent from Abraham, he should be a liar



like unto them (John viii. 55); he should not fulfil that mission with which he was entrusted.

The "prism" and the "pyramid" I send greeting to the church that is in Laodicea.

RUSSELL SCOTT.

*Liverpool,*

*February 9, 1821.*

SIR,  
OBSERVING in the newspapers an advertisement of a reprint by Mr. Hone of a scarce publication, entitled "*The Spirit of Despotism*," I turned to Vol. XII. p. 94, of the *Monthly Repository*, where one of your Correspondents wishes to learn who was the author of this excellent little production. I am sorry I am only able to furnish a *surmise* on this head, but there appears to be a considerable probability that the author ("who," as your Correspondent says, "from his correct and polished language, was no *every-day* writer") is not yet added to the "*great majority*," as he imagines. The original book was printed, but perhaps not published, in London, about 1794 or 1795, and in the succeeding year was reprinted in Philadelphia, *without note or comment*. This was about the time, it is conjectured, when Mr. Law (son of the late Bishop of Carlisle and brother to the present Bishop of Chester) emigrated to the United States, and by him the book was by many supposed to have been written. This supposition is strengthened by the *Unitarian* sentiment displayed in the work, which doctrine Mr. Law has, I am told, always maintained. It is not a little singular, that whilst one brother was vindicating in the House of Lords the persecution of *Mr. John Wright*, of Liverpool, for the very opinions held by his father, the venerable Bishop of Carlisle, another brother should shortly after assist Mr. Wright, on his removal to America, to establish an Unitarian Society.

The only copy of the "*Spirit of Despotism*" I have seen, was one brought several months since by a friend from Philadelphia, who lately took it to Mr. Hone with a view of endeavouring to trace the author, and procure its republication. Mr. Hone had just before, with some difficulty, procured a copy of the book, and was then

engaged in making a new edition of it, though he had not succeeded in making out the writer.

H. T.

SIR,  
A WORK, intituled *Not Paul but Jesus*, is (I am assured) on the point of offering itself to the public eye. The title is such as can scarce fail to excite no small interest, not to say emotion, in a Christian breast. The point which, if I understand aright, it is principally occupied in establishing, is—that the *inward* conversion of St. Paul never obtained credence either on the part of any of the disciples of the apostles, or on the part of the apostles themselves, or any of them. Supposing this proposition established, the consequences, in regard to doctrine, are too obvious to need mentioning, as well as too important to be thought of without anxiety; for curiosity would be too light a word.

This same opinion, as may be seen in Mosheim, Lardner and others, was entertained by the Ebionites, a sect of primitive Christians so called, the time of whose existence was as early as the commencement of the second century. (See Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. Cent. I. Pt. 2, Ch. 5, § 17.) To them, if Mosheim and his translator are correct, St. Paul was an object of undissembled abhorrence, in which seems necessarily implied, that, in their eyes, the allegation of his intercourse with Jesus was no other than an imposture. Of this opinion, the existence is all that is now known. As to the grounds on which it was built—the considerations from whence it was deduced—of these we know nothing. Whatsoever they may be, these, as far as the nature of the case has favoured his researches, the industry and discernment of the author will, of course, have been occupied in bringing to view. In the several histories we have of the affairs of the Christian Church, the place of this denomination of Christians has, of course, been in the list of *heretics*. But, whatever may have been the erroneousness of their doctrines, the stroke of the pen by which this denomination has been applied to them, will scarcely be thought to have afforded any very conclusive proof of it.

G—l S—h.

## REVIEW.

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

ART. I.—*An Examination of the Charges made against Unitarians and Unitarianism, and the Improved Version, by the Right Rev. Dr. Magee, Bishop of Raphoe, in his “Discourses and Dissertations on Atonement and Sacrifice:” with some Strictures on the Statements of the Bishop of St. David’s, Dr. Hales, Dean Graves, Dr. Nares, Dr. Pye Smith, and Mr. Rennel, &c.; and on the System pursued by some recent Editors of the Greek Testament.* By Lant Carpenter, LL.D. 8vo. pp. 502. Bristol, printed and sold by T. J. Manchee; sold also by Longman and Co., London. 1820.

**T**RINITARIANS and Calvinists, both in the Church of England and out of it, have long called for an answer from Unitarians to Dr. Magee’s “Discourses and Dissertations,” and have triumphed not a little in this *unanswerable* publication. To the Bishop’s statements and charges there have indeed been replies in our Repository and other works, which that redoubtable polemic has found it easier to sneer at than to dispose of in fair argument. But the difficulty of making a complete answer to him must be admitted; though the difficulty arises solely from causes not very creditable to his reputation as an author or a divine. His volumes form a heterogeneous and discordant mass, *rudis indigestaque moles*, a chaotic confusion, which it requires no small portion of time and labour to reduce into any thing like order. They treat of the atonement and of every thing else. They abound with false quotations and complex misstatements. The text is overwhelmed by notes, and the notes have often nothing in common with the text, except the *odium theologicum* which pervades both, and in which alone the author preserves the appearance of uniformity.

“ Who could willingly engage in controversy with an author who, imitating the example of a more acute and powerful disputant, and, as may reasonably be supposed, with similar expectancies, endeavours to bear down the doctrines

of an unpopular sect, and the arguments of those who defend them, by vilifying the talents and the character of his opponents? It is a savage species of warfare that is to be opposed. And if the author of a reply to the Dean of Cork\* do not succeed in convincing him, that he has offended against the laws of Christian equity and candour,—that he has been guilty of glaring perversion of our views, injurious misrepresentations of our arguments, and illiberal aspersion of our motives,—and in dispelling the mists with which the learned Dignitary appears enveloped, which prevent him, to take the most favourable supposition, from understanding that which he condemns, and which cause him to combat, instead of realities, the monsters of his own creation,—he can expect nothing but a repetition of ‘false and slanderous imputations’ directed against himself, certainly not to the advantage of his peace or of his good name.

“ There is nothing in the character of Dr. Magee’s work, to make the examination of it interesting. There is scarcely an oasis to afford rest and refreshment to the wearied mind, while traversing the desert. Those who, in perusing the writings of the Dean of Cork, merely look for the indications of scholarship and extensive reading, for caustic ardour and controversial dexterity, for confidence in his own critical and theological decisions, for supercilious and abusive invectives against those whom he attacks, and for the most extravagant assumption of superiority to them, will be satisfied: but if any seek for the luminous arrangement and close reasoning of the sound logician, for the accurate, cautious inferences of the mathematician, for the discriminating penetration and enlarged comprehension of mind which should be learnt in the schools of literature and philosophy, or for that well-proportioned union of independence of understanding and humility of soul, that correctness and impartiality in the statement of evidence, and that openness to conviction, and ability to discern what is just and important in the midst of apparent error, which form some of the striking characteristics of him who pursues truth, fearlessly yet judiciously, for the love of it,

\* The Dean of Cork was promoted to the bishoprick of Raphoe in the period between the writing and printing of the greater part of the “Examination” and its publication. ED.

—they may, under the influence of that charity which hopeth all things, hope that the intellectual and moral character of the Divine is not to be decided by his writings; but, in their search for such qualities as I have enumerated, they must be disappointed.”—Pp. 18—21.

To engage with such a combatant as the Bishop of Raphoe required a patience and perseverance which few writers possess. Dr. Carpenter has shewn himself eminent in these qualifications; and the Unitarians are indebted to him for one of their most masterly defences. His volume is preliminary; but it was necessary to clear away Dr. Magee's misrepresentations before he proceeded to the direct argument. With what success he has executed this part of his task, we shall shew the reader by a series of extracts. The complimentary terms in which he speaks of us, do not, that we are aware, bias our judgment when we pronounce that he displays throughout the volume a manly preference of truth to every personal and party consideration and a truly Christian indignation at the appearance of fraud and calumny, united with a candid judgment of the character of his fellow-christians and a spirit of evangelical piety. No writer ever kept faith with his reader more punctually: in matters of fact he is scrupulous in stating his authorities, and for every charge he produces abundant evidence. Yet the detail into which he is thus led, rarely, if at all, appears tedious; and in the chapters that from their titles would seem of necessity somewhat heavy, the reader is relieved and delighted by passages of great spirit and sometimes of exquisite beauty. In Dr. Carpenter's pages, we are frequently reminded of Dr. Priestley: there are in both the same simplicity of language, the same unreservedness in the expression of personal feelings, the same indifference to any other end than the promotion of Christian truth, and the same fervent and glowing expectations, founded on the same scriptural basis, of the final ascendancy of “religion, pure and undefiled.”

Dr. Carpenter thus explains himself on the subject of National Religious Establishments:

“The question of the expediency and influence of a Religious Establishment has no more to do with Unitarianism,

than the doctrine of Necessity has, or that of Materialism; and Unitarians differ very widely on the subject.

“There are some, and Mr. Belsham is understood to be in the number, who think that the rites and services of religion may be well supported by the interference of the State; and that there is nothing in Christianity which directly opposes the Episcopal form of Church-government, in all its detail, as existing in the English Establishment. There are many others, and I must class myself with them, who think that, independently of what they regard as objectionable in the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, the principle is radically wrong, which allows the interference of the Civil Magistrate in matters of Religion; and that all which Religion asks of the State is, that it may be left to itself.

“Wise and good men, in as well as out of the Church of England, have seen and lamented the tendency of the honours and wealth exclusively bestowed on those who subscribe to her articles of faith, to mislead men's judgments, to warp their consciences, to check their disposition to search after truth, to make them look with suspicion on those who differ from them, and to induce them to confine their charity and respect to those within their own pale. Numberless instances indeed occur, in which this tendency is effectually restrained, if not altogether prevented, by the liberal spirit of our common Christianity, by the strict principles of duty entertained by the individual himself, by the influence of those extensive associations for the temporal or spiritual welfare of men which draw different parties towards the common centre of Christian love, and by the liberalizing disposition produced by the diffusion of knowledge and the free communication of opinion. Yet the tendency exists, and necessarily attends an exclusive Establishment.

“I cordially wish, therefore, that the time may never arrive, when the principles of Unitarianism shall be alloyed by admixtures of worldly policy, or rested on the special support of civil authorities. And I doubt not that the period will come, when the support of public worship will be left to every one's own sentiments of its importance to society, and his own appreciation of its value to himself; when no preponderance will be given to any denomination of professing Christians, by exclusively connecting with them civil privileges; when worldly motives will not be mixed with the solemn concerns of religion; and when every one will be equally protected and encouraged in the



exercise of the inalienable right and duty of private judgment, and left, unbiassed by power and interest, to worship the God of his fathers in that way which he deems most accordant with Christian principle. Were I a Trinitarian, I should desire that period as earnestly as I do at present: because I could not less believe that Christ's kingdom is not of this world.

"That period will be accelerated by every instance in which the gradual yet rapid progress of enlarged and enlightened views is lost sight of; and, on the other hand, it is reasonable to suppose, that it will be retarded by every instance of wise accommodation to the liberal spirit of the times. Were I from conviction a member of the Church of England, I would aim to promote such accommodation. Truth cannot vary; but the modes of maintaining and promoting it must have some relation to circumstances, or they must be ineffectual."—Pref. pp. xiii.—xv.

The Monthly Repository has had the honour (for such, of course, we must esteem it) of being occasionally, though, as will appear, superficially, read by the Bishop of Raphoe. The following passage will shew how complacently his Lordship inferred, both from what he read and what he did not read in our numbers, that the Unitarians had abandoned the controversy on the Atonement: in quoting it, we make one omission, that of the name of the Editor of this work, introduced by an inadvertence, for which Dr. Carpenter has subsequently expressed more than sufficient regret.

"Dr. Magee's supposition, that the Unitarians had relinquished the prosecution of this controversy, appears, however, to have been in part produced by a singular train of reasoning which is found in the Postscript, p. 355 [819].\* He had informed his readers, near the beginning of his Postscript, p. 73 [537], that 'the Editors of the Unitarian Journal' had, in their number for December, 1814, 'notified their intention of making the doctrine of the Atonement the subject of their special examination, in a series of ensuing publications,' and 'for this purpose invited the free communications of the several correspondents.' In this last passage he tells them that a letter of Mr. Frend's on the subject of Atonement, drawing 'a broad line of distinction be-

tween himself and such Unitarians as Mr. Belsham,' 'there is good reason to think, had the effect of deterring the conductors of that journal from carrying forward the discussion on that subject.' The Editor of the Monthly Repository, and Mr. Frend, could tell him that his inference was erroneous; and any reader of that journal might shew him that it was unfounded. But I go further, and say that it is a proof of the most culpable negligence, in one who was bringing such heavy and numerous charges against his brethren, if he did not know that it was unfounded. Dr. Magee has shewn us that he was well acquainted with the volume for 1815,\* in which it was earnestly hoped by many that the doctrine of Atonement would have received a full discussion: he, therefore, ought to have known the two following facts. (1) Mr. Frend's letter (inserted in the first number for the year 1815) did not deter the Editor from carrying forwards the promised discussion; for he introduced communications on the subject even to the very last number of the volume.† And (2) Mr. Frend himself, having by vague expressions, drawn what Dr. Magee calls a 'broad line of distinction,' maintained a persevering silence as to the import of them, though repeatedly called upon to define precisely the difference existing between himself and the Unitarians to whom he referred.‡

"It is, however, the fact, that Mr. Frend's letter contributed to lead away

---

\* "See *Postscript*, p. 352 [816], where there is an enumeration of above twenty pages, (from p. 226 to p. 745,) as references to papers respecting the use of the appellation *Unitarian*."

† "In this number are several of the papers referred to in the preceding note, and included in the Dean's enumeration; and there can, therefore, be no doubt that he was not ignorant of its contents. What must we say, then, when we perceive that the first paper, under the head of Miscellaneous Communications, is an able Letter expressly ON THE ATONEMENT, and that the writer (G. of Manchester) adverts to the 'hardy assertions and inimitable criticisms of Dr. Magee'? See *Monthly Repository* for 1815, p. 738."

‡ "With a specific view to my own inquiries, I also solicited Mr. Frend to state his views in the *Monthly Repository*, but without effect; and I do not find that he has ever given his Unitarian brethren any clue to his meaning. That view of the ends of the death of Christ which, possibly, he adopts, I shall have occasion to notice hereafter."

---

\* These double figures refer to the different paging of Dr. Magee's Work in different editions. ED.

from the subject of the Atonement. He made some statements respecting the more extended use of the appellation *Unitarian*, which brought about a discussion displaying too much of that polemical and even party spirit which the defence of truth does not require, and which the Christian's rule forbids.\* The result has nevertheless been beneficial. With a very few exceptions, the term *Unitarian* is now applied, among us, to all who hold the Absolute Unity and Unrivalled Supremacy of God even the Father, who regard Him as the Sole Object of Religious Worship, and view Him as the Sole Original Source of the blessings which we possess through Christ Jesus. In compliance with what, at the period when I wrote my Letters to Mr. Veysie, was among all parties the prevalent use of the appellation, I employed it in its more restricted sense,—implying a belief in the Proper Humanity of Christ. Since that time, I have gladly contributed to extend the application of the term, believing that the principles, which separate all who avow them from the fellowship, and even the worship, of every Trinitarian Church, ought to be the bond of union among themselves; and knowing that among the believers in the Proper Humanity of Christ, differences exist on points much more important than the Pre-existence."†—Pp. 4—7.

And, again,

"But what is more than all, (to pass by some single sermons, the existence of which the Dean might have learnt from the Monthly Repository, ‡ and the valuable tract on the Sacrifice of Christ, above noticed, §) the volume for 1814 contained, in four numbers, a judicious and able

---

\* "I must, in this connection, refer my younger Unitarian brethren to an invaluable Discourse, entitled *The Love of Truth a Branch of the Duty of Benevolence*, by J. Kenrick, M. A., published by R. Hunter, St. Paul's Church-yard. If the opponents of Unitarianism would read it, it might afford them also some useful lessons."

† "I refer to the state between death and the resurrection, and especially to the final condition of the wicked. On these topics, Unitarians, as well as other classes of their Fellow-Christians, are divided among themselves."

‡ "For instance, a truly evangelical and excellent Discourse by Mr. Madge, on the *Salvation of Man by the Free Grace of God*; and another, by James Yates, M. A., entitled *The Nature, Manner, and Extent, of Gospel Salvation*."

§ Mr. Fox's *Letters to Dr. J. P. Smith*. Ed.

Review of the Discourses and Dissertations. The brief but comprehensive and acute strictures which are found there, certainly demanded the Dean's attention, and claimed some notice in his subsequent edition: yet he still leaves unaltered in the fourth, p. 412, the remark which appears near the close of the third, p. 492. 'It is now ten years [more than twelve years] since the first publication of this work; and, during that time, neither Mr. Belsham, nor any of his learned Unitarian fellow-labourers, have, as far as I know, favoured the public with any observations upon the arguments which it contains.' Dr. Magee was, however, acquainted with the number of the Monthly Repository for December 1814; and twelve pages of that number were occupied with the conclusion of a criticism on his work, from a pen which is guided by sound learning without ostentatious display."\*—Pp. 9, 10.

The following classification of the national clergy is, we believe, just:

"The characteristics of the *Evangelical* party in the Establishment are well known. Those who for some years were spoken of as the *True Church*, are now (it is understood) termed *Orthodox*, and are distinguished by their firm attachment to the doctrines and discipline of the Church of England, *as such*, (without reference to Calvinism or Arminianism,) and their indisposition to unite with those whom they term sectaries in religious objects of common interest. By the epithet *Secular*, I wish to denote that class, who are not solicitous about articles of faith and modes of worship on account of their supposed truth and value, but who are attached to the Church of England as the religion of the State, and supported by its honours and emoluments; and who believe that all worldly respectability is contained within its precincts. For the interest of religion one would willingly hope, that few deserve an exclusive place in this division; but is not the secular spirit distinctly visible among many who class under the other

---

\* "His *Appendix* (says the judicious Reviewer, *Monthly Repository* for 1814, p. 785) is highly discreditable to his reputation, both as a scholar and a gentleman; and must class among the most censurable effusions of arrogance and unfairness in controversy.' The Critic had not the task of reviewing the Dean of Cork's *Postscript*, or he must have used still stronger expressions of censure.

"Of this Review we must suppose the learned Dignitary ignorant: and yet, is it possible?"

divisions? That religious establishments naturally foster such a spirit is one grand evil inseparably connected with them." —P. 13.

[To be continued.]

ART. II. — *Observations on Mr. Brougham's Bill, &c., shewing its Inadequacy to the End proposed, and the Danger which will arise from it to the Cause of Religious Liberty.* 8vo. pp. 32. Baldwin and Co.

ART. III. — *A Defence of the British and Foreign School Society, against the Remarks in the Sixty-Seventh Number of the Edinburgh Review.* 8vo. pp. 48. Hatchard and Son.

ART. IV. — *A Brief Reply to the Rev. Richard Lloyd's "Letter to a Member of Parliament, on the Dangerous Defects of the British and Foreign Schools."* By James Shepherd, Treasurer to the City of London Royal British School. 8vo. pp. 76. Highley and Son.

MR. BROUGHAM has given notice that he means to bring forward his Education Bill, and he will present it, we fear, with little or no modification. Convinced that the project is openly hostile to religious liberty, and that it would eventually be a hindrance rather than a help to general education, we deem it right to endeavour to awaken the attention of our readers to the measure, and to call upon them to resist it by every constitutional method.

"The Nonconformist" (see pp. 25—33 of the last Number) has left us little to say on the threatening aspect of the Bill with regard to religious liberty. This, certainly, is our first objection. We know of no advantages scarcely, that we could allow ourselves to purchase by the sacrifice of the least portion of freedom of conscience.

The national clergy are very much dependant on the administration for the time being, and may therefore have, or think that they have, interests distinct from those of the people; for which reason it behoves us to look with jealousy upon any increase of their power. Mr. Brougham proposes to give them power without responsibility, and the sensible author of the first of these pamphlets supposes a

case of oppression in one of the projected schools in which there would be no possibility of redress: the humble parent of the child aggrieved might appeal from the parish-priest to the ordinary, but if the ordinary should listen to the tale of the priest rather than to that of the poor man, the grievance must remain. (Observ. pp. 20—22.)

It is unpleasant to indulge suspicions with regard to any body of men, but the past conduct of the clergy justifies the fear that with more power they would not shew less bigotry. The author of the pamphlet last quoted informs us,

"In a populous parish in London, an attempt was lately made to withhold parochial relief from a family because the children attended the British and not the National School; and in a large village near the metropolis, where the clergyman is the magistrate, the poor have been threatened with similar privations for this offence. Not long since, several boys were actually dismissed from a National School, because the parents, after taking them to attend the regular worship of the Established Church on the Sunday, sent their children in the evening to a Dissenting meeting-house."—P. 19.

There are two points of view in which the Dissenters may contemplate the probable operation of the new scheme of education; in reference first to their own community, and next to the mass of the population.

With regard to themselves, the Dissenters say truly, that the Bill is unnecessary; their poor are not uneducated; in their religious economy, a meeting-house and a school are generally connected. In the majority of their larger congregations, there are establishments for daily education, and in many of these there is provision for clothing the poor children. Few of them are without Sunday-schools, and, since the introduction of the new system of teaching, the improvement made by children in these schools is so great as to come up to the full idea heretofore entertained of common education. A considerable proportion of the children in these Dissenting schools are of Church-of-England parents. Thus providing for their own wants, and, in some degree, for those of others, the Dissenters are surely entitled to com-



plain of new establishments of which they must bear their quota of the pecuniary burden, at the same time that they are excluded from all management of them, and are, indeed, expressly excepted from even the humblest offices in them, on the ground of their Dissent. From causes that might easily be explained, they reckon in their communion a far greater number of schoolmasters than corresponds with their proportion of the population. But none of these meritorious individuals, how much soever wanted, could be employed in Mr. Brougham's schools; though these schools would certainly break up many private ones, and deprive the masters of their present means of subsistence. (*Defence*, p. 7.) Education would indeed be still open to Dissenting children; but, in lieu of "schools for all," we should have schools with distinct forms, and the back seats on which the little Nonconformists would sit, would bear the inscription of "heresy and schism."

The tone which the projected plan would give to all public schools already existing would also be an evil to the Dissenters. Many of the "Free-schools" throughout England are exempt from connexion with the Church; some of them have disentangled themselves within our memory; but it is one of the objects of Mr. Brougham's Bill to bring these establishments under clerical influence, and the managers could save themselves from this bondage only by introducing into them such rules and observances as would prevent the clergyman from complaining of their being destitute of proper religious instruction.

So far the Dissenters have, in our view, peculiar reason to object to the Bill: but it is said that national education is so great a good, that for the attainment of it they ought to be willing to sacrifice their separate interests. Is it to be taken for granted, however, that Mr. Brougham's is the only practicable plan of public education? Other plans have been suggested which are unexceptionable on the score of religious liberty, and more available as to the end in view. (See *Report of the Parliamentary Education Committee*, and the *Defence*, p. 8, &c.) These ought in decency to be tried in Parliament before the Dissenters are sum-

moned, on pain of being taxed with selfishness, to acquiesce in a measure that is both oppressive and insulting.

The advocates of the Bill seem to think that an Act of Parliament is all that is wanted, forgetting that the act would be only waste paper unless it carried with it the opinions and feelings of the people. A parliamentary enactment may raise school-rooms and salary masters, but it cannot of itself fill the schools. Every one that has been conversant in charitable education knows the difficulty with which the poorest part of the population are brought to consent to the schooling of their children: we have found, in some instances, the inducement of comfortable clothing insufficient. There need the reasonings and persuasions of intelligent and active individuals, at least to set the machine going; but all such voluntary efforts are superseded, not to say spurned, by the projected Bill. Instead of this living machinery, the proposer would introduce an engine of parchment. But, as the author of the *Defence* very wisely remarks, (p. 14,) "Benevolent feelings may be checked, but cannot be created by Act of Parliament."

The clergy are not universally popular, and there would be too great a likelihood of schools under their exclusive management being out of favour with the people. Wherever this should be the case, education would be at a stand. One part of this very Bill of Mr. Brougham's is designed to correct the enormous abuses that have crept into endowed schools, which have been chiefly under clerical controul; and what is to prevent the new establishments from sharing the fate of the old? Their poverty! But there may be as much unfair influence, and as much jobbing, in the appointment of an exciseman as in that of a lord of the treasury. The clergyman may choose to have no school at all, unless he can make a certain favourite the master. The Bill invites him to nominate the parish-clerk, and he may insist on this half-laic, half-clerical personage, for the precise reason that under him the boys would not learn too much. Is it uncandid to suppose some of the priesthood inimical to the instruction of the poor? Pamphlets and even sermons might be quoted in which this hostility is avowed. Supposing it then

to exist, the clergyman may stand in the way of a school altogether, or appoint an incompetent master, or fix the rate of quarter-pence so high as to make the school inaccessible to the very children that most want instruction, or introduce such vexatious rules of management as will disgust and turn away the parishioners. But, however useless the new schools might be, they would have the certain effect of breaking up some of the schools that are now conducted on liberal principles with considerable success: these institutions of benevolence are supported with difficulty, and an education-tax would diminish voluntary subscriptions on their behalf, and the compulsory schools would draw off from them so many of the children as to make the *cheap* education of the remainder impossible.

Mr. Brougham's Bill contemplates only one sex in children. For the education of girls it makes no provision whatever. Yet if morality and religion be the objects of education, is it of no moment to train the characters of those who, as mothers, have the greatest influence over the mind in the most ductile season? If the care of girls may be remitted to individual benevolence, so, we conceive, might that of boys too, under such legislative *encouragements* and *assistances* as have been again and again pointed out.

The spirit of Mr. Brougham's Bill is, in our serious judgment, unworthy, not only of himself as a professedly liberal senator, but also of the age in which he and we live. Even in France, under a Bourbon, an attempt to put education into the ecclesiastical trammels, which Mr. Brougham holds to be wisest and best, has totally failed. But the attempt was there made, not by any statesman of reputed comprehension of mind, but by the Catholic clergy. (*Defence*, p. 35.)

We can add only a word or two on the pamphlets whose titles stand at the head of these remarks. The *Observations* contain a series of calm but close reasonings: it is hardly possible for a Dissenter to read them and not be convinced of the injurious tendency of the proposed Bill with regard to religious liberty. The *Defence* is from an equally able, if not from the same pen, and fully answers and exposes

the Edinburgh Review, which, with memorable brevity of wisdom, decried in August last the very principle of education which in May of the same year it had highly extolled. A better advocate than this anonymous writer, the "British and Foreign School Society" cannot desire; and we trust that whatever be the fate of Mr. Brougham's Bill, the friends of universal education will still more zealously support an institution which is opposed and vilified by a certain class of politicians in pretty equal proportion to the sum of good which it is effecting throughout the world. The *Brief Reply* is not to be placed on a level with the foregoing pamphlets, but it has the merit of generous zeal for the interests of the human race, and of disdain of sectarian prejudices and passions. It is in answer to a "Letter" full of the cry, "The Church is in Danger." The Letter-writer, "the Rev. Richard Lloyd," is, to use his own words, quoted by Mr. Shepherd, (p. 35,) one of those "honourable and worthy characters" who have "of late been led to look back with *complacency*, and even with *preference*, to former days of ignorance and comparative simplicity:" and to such persons as this, Mr. Brougham would commit the work of popular education, at the same time accusing those that object to his selection of education-trustees, of turning their backs upon the agents expressly raised up for the office by Providence!

---

ART. V.—*The Christian Reflector, and Theological Inquirer*. Vol. I. 8vo. pp. 256. Liverpool, printed by F. B. Wright: sold by D. Eaton, London.

THIS work was published in cheap numbers and is still continued. Its design is to furnish those that have not access to a variety of books with short expositions of Scripture and essays on Evangelical truth. The publication is accommodated in some measure to the local controversies in the town of Liverpool, but the greater part of the contents is interesting to readers in general.

The following melancholy anecdote, copied from an American Journal into the *Traveller* English newspaper, had escaped our notice:

"The Western Reserve Chronicle of Ohio, of the first ultimo, gives a distressing account of the death of three only children of Mr. and Mrs. Stone, of Kinsman in that State, who were drowned by the hand of their mother. The circumstances are peculiar and were communicated for publication by a Clergyman.

"Mr. and Mrs. Stone possessed amiable dispositions, sustained unblemished characters, and had lived together in the utmost harmony. During a late revival of religion, Mrs. Stone was awakened, and supposed she had experienced a change of heart. Soon after, however, she settled down in a state of grief and melancholy, and declared that she had committed the unpardonable sin. Under this impression and believing that if taken off at their present tender age, the children would be happy, and believing also that having committed the Unpardonable Sin, no injury would follow to herself—while her husband was gone to Meeting on Sunday, the 14th day of May, 1820, she drowned the little innocents in a spring, about three feet deep.

"The verdict of the Coroner's Inquest was, 'Drowned by the mother in a fit of insanity.'"—P. 187.

The Editors have given us some interesting passages from Mr. Southey, the Poet Laureate's "Address to A. S. Cottle, on publishing his translation of Icelandic Poetry:"

"——— 'Twas a strange belief!  
And evil was the hour when men began  
To humanize their God, and gave to  
stocks  
And stones the incommunicable name.  
It is not strange that simple men should  
rear  
The grassy altar to the glorious sun,  
And pile it with spring flowers and summer  
fruits,  
And when the glorious sun smil'd on  
their rites  
And made the landskip lovely, the warm  
heart  
With no unholy zeal might swell the  
hymn  
Of adoration. When the savage hears  
The thunder burst, and sees the lurid  
sky  
Glow with repeated fires, it is not  
strange  
That he should hasten to his hut and veil  
His face, and dread the Dæmon of the  
storm.  
Nor that the ancient Poet, he who fed  
His flock beside the stream of Helicon,  
Should let creative fancy people earth

With unseen powers, that, clad in darkness,  
roam  
Around the world, and mark the deeds  
of men.

But that the Priest with solemn mockery,  
Or monstrous faith, should call on God  
to lead

His armies forth, and desolate and kill,  
And over the red banners of the war,  
Even in the blessed name of JESUS, pour  
Prayers of a bloodier hate than ever rose  
At Odin's altar, or the Mexican,  
The victim's heart still quivering in his  
grasp,

Rais'd at Mexitlis' shrine—this is most  
foul,

Most rank, most blasphemous idolatry!  
And better were it for these wretched  
men

With infant victims to have fed the fire  
Of Moloch, in that hour when they shall  
call

Upon the hills and rocks to cover them,  
For the judgment day is come.

"The Poet eulogizes America, as  
——— that happier shore  
Where Priestley dwells, where Kosciusko  
rests

From holy warfare. Persecuted men!  
Outcasts of Europe! sufferers in the  
cause

Of Truth and Freedom! ye have found a  
home,

And in the peaceful evening of your days  
A high reward is yours, the blessedness  
Of self-applause.

"He expresses his surprise at the negligence and inattention of men to Christianity.

——— Is it not strange, my friend,  
If aught of human folly could surprise,  
That men should with such duteous zeal  
observe

Each idiot form, each agonizing rite  
Of Pagan faith, whilst there are none  
who keep

The easy precepts of the Nazarene,  
The faith that brings with it its own  
reward,

The law of peace and love?—But they  
are wise

Who in these evil and tumultuous times  
Heed not the world's mad business;  
chiefly they

Who with most pleasing labouring acquire

No selfish knowledge. Of his fellow-kind

He well deserves, who for their evening  
hours

A blameless joy affords, and his good  
works,

When in the grave he sleeps, shall still  
survive."—Pp. 191, 192,



There is an article, pp. 219—222, on the progress of Unitarianism in America, partly extracted from the *Christian Reformer* and partly original. The Editors say, “a subscription has been commenced at Washington, by THOMAS LAW, (brother to the late *Lord Ellenborough* and the present *Bishop of Chester*,) his son JOHN LAW, and several other persons, for the purpose of building a church, sacred to the worship of the *One only God*.” They also furnish us with the following passages from a sermon preached before the “General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States,” at Philadelphia, in May last, by the Rev. J. H. Rice, D. D. which are the most decisive evidence that has yet come before us of the wide and rapid spread of Unitarianism in America :

“After lamenting the want of attention in the orthodox to make literature subservient to religion; the preacher says, ‘But it deserves particular consideration, that there is a set of men (and they possess great facilities for carrying on their purposes) who are making vigorous efforts to give to the whole literature of the country, a direction in favour of what we do conscientiously believe to be fatal error.’ ‘They expect to occupy the seats of learning and direct the influence of literature.’ ‘And now they are almost continually throwing into circulation something calculated to further their plans, and to give the hue and tone to public sentiment.’

“‘The very circumstance that religion is becoming fashionable is one that may alarm us. We have in this country nothing to bind men to the support of sound orthodox divinity, but a feeling that this system of truth is necessary for the peace and salvation of a sinner. Socinianism is the religion exactly suited to a man who wishes to escape the odium of infidelity, and yet maintain the pride of his understanding, and indulge his favourite inclinations. It will find friends on every side. Its acute and industrious advocates perceive where their advantage lies, and they will make the most of it. The pestilence will spread like wild-fire. At our own doors, and by our own firesides, we shall have to maintain the contest with this most formidable enemy of ‘the faith once delivered to the saints.’ Considering the great extent of country and its population committed to our care, and the smallness of our numbers, it is impossible for us to render personal service every where. It is our duty, then,

to embody our best thoughts and best feelings, and present them to all who can and will read through our country; to address our fellow-citizens not merely in evanescent words, but permanent writings. By zeal, talents and industry combined, we may thus exert a continual influence, may give to ourselves a sort of pluri-presence, that in a considerable degree may compensate for the paucity of our numbers, and the limited extent of our personal exertions. Are these plans visionary? Why should they be thought so? Are we as a body incapable of enlightening the public mind, and giving direction to the public taste? Then certainly we ought, with increasing zeal, to follow the things whereby one may edify another. Is the situation of our country thought to be such, that schemes like these cannot be executed? The energy of Socinianism will shew us the contrary. Are we so divided, so intent on local interests and personal schemes, that we cannot be brought to co-operate with sufficient zeal and perseverance? Then our Jerusalem is, in its present condition, like the ancient city, within which were divisions and contention, while without it was beleagured by Roman armies. I am sometimes afraid, too, that the enemy will succeed; that here the banner of Socinianism will be unfurled, and wave in triumph. Had such fears been expressed in the days of Mather and Elliott, the prophet would, perhaps, have been laughed to scorn. *But look at what was once the scene of their labours, and the theatre of their triumphs. Look at the present state of once flourishing Presbyterian Churches in England! Look at Geneva!* It is necessary that something should be done. As far as the influence of the clergy is separated from the general literature of the country, and it falls into other hands, infidelity, in some form or other, is almost sure to prevail; it will be broad, open, unblushing Deism; or it will try to wear the garb, and assume the port and bearing of Christianity; it will be insinuating and sly; talk much of moderation, while violence is in its heart; and of liberal views, while all its feelings are sectarian; and of the pure morality of the gospel, while it is a very free liver;—and it will misname itself Unitarianism. In some form infidelity will prevail. Aware of this, we ought to go forth in all the strength with which God has endowed us, and all the zeal of which we are capable, and seize on every point which will give us any advantage in the conflict that we have to sustain.’ [Pp. 16—20.]” —Pp. 220—222.

ART. VI.—*The Warning Voice! A Sermon, preached on Sunday, Dec. 10, 1820, at Walworth, in Surry.* By George Clayton. 8vo. 2nd ed. pp. 62. Black and Co.

WE have here a coarse political Sermon against the study of politics, and a violent remonstrance on behalf of quietness. In a style of vulgar flippancy, and by sad jokes and strained metaphors, the preacher endeavours sometimes to insult, sometimes to ridicule, and sometimes to denounce and proscribe, with what is commonly called Jacobinical fury, all the Reformers of England, including the most exalted in our aristocracy, our wisest and wealthiest commoners, and a large proportion of our educated, moral and religious public. There is, indeed, a marvellous indistinctness even in his satire, but if he do not mean all that we have stated, his oration is sound without sense. Let him attack bad men of all parties, if he please; but let him not, without discrimination, fling his saucy common-places, gleaned from our most depraved and venal journals, at that large body of Englishmen, of every rank and denomination, who, feeling deeply for their beloved country, seek to save it by restoring in a constitutional manner the great political principles on which the Throne and the seats of justice can alone securely rest.

In his "Advertisement," the political preacher betrays an apprehension that his doctrine is not quite English; for he boldly avows, that if he were to *exercise his functions* in Westminster or at Whitehall, he might expose "grievances," and call for a diminution of "the *onerous weight* of civil and ecclesiastical taxation, *under which the nation groans.*" And yet he seems to condemn, almost to future punishment, that part of this "groaning nation" who are legally endeavouring to persuade such as they send to Westminster and Whitehall to relieve this "onerous weight," and to save the people from being ground to dust!

With a higher aim, perhaps, than he chooses to avow, this advocate of social order degrades the pulpit into a vehicle of abuse on those of the other sex that manifest public spirit, or, in the ap-

propriate style of the awkward censor, "the lady-politicians of the *modern day.*" "Happy," says he, "would it be for the country and for the world if every female would *emulate the qualities* of a distinguished character of former times, 'a mother in Israel,' who thus explained her pretensions to Joab, *I am one of those that are peaceable and faithful in Israel.*" (P. 55.) Now, really, there is deep but scarcely concealed Radicalism in this recommendation; for "the mother in Israel" was no other than the *wise woman* (2 Sam. xx. 16—22) who proved her peaceableness and fidelity by using her eloquence to procure the destruction of a troubler of her native city: *Then the woman went unto all the people in her wisdom, and they cut off the head of Sheba, the son of Bichri, and cast it out to Joab.*

We are no friends to turbulent Reformers, but neither are we to the thorough-going, unblushing advocates of *whatever is*; and we deprecate sermons like this, from whichever side they come, as tending to exasperate men's minds, and to prevent those temperate and healing measures by which alone the distresses of the country can be cured or alleviated.

ART. VII.—*The Resurrection from the Dead, an Essential Doctrine of the Gospel: and the Neglect of it by reputed Orthodox Christians an Argument against the Truth of their System.* By Richard Wright, Unitarian Missionary. 12mo. pp. 38. 1820.

IN the design of this little pamphlet there is something of novelty; and the argument is forcibly as well as ingeniously put. We can imagine minds that resist the impression of particular texts of Scripture, but would nevertheless be affected by this reasoning from the undisputed object of the Christian revelation, and by the contrast here exhibited between apostolic and modern sermons; and therefore we cordially recommend Mr. Wright's tract to the perusal of intelligent and candid persons of "reputed orthodox" predilections and partialities.

## CRITICAL NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

ART. I.—*Essays and Sketches on Life and Character.* 12mo. pp. 254. 2nd ed. Longman and Co. 1821.

IT is generally known that the author of this little volume is Lord John Russell. In the first edition, the work bore the fictitious appearance of "Papers by a Gentleman that had left his Lodgings," but the fiction answering no end whatever, is now properly dropped.

The Essays are worthy of the reputed author; sensible, good-natured, unaffectedly written, and containing some shrewd observations on manners. They betoken a lively regard to pure morals; and the disquisition entitled "State of the English Constitution," breathes the spirit of pure patriotism.

The author speaks, no doubt, from mortifying observation on character in the higher circles, when he says, (p. 200,) "We are apt to despise the South-sea islanders for exchanging their pigs and yams for beads and red cloth; but you see that, for stars and ribands, red, green and blue, the Europeans will truck their fortune, their character, and even their liberty."

He bears a little hard upon *converts* in the following passage, pp. 41, 42: "At first none appear to be more unjustly persecuted than those who change their opinions, either in politics or religion. Reason would teach us that such a change was rather a favourable proof of candour, but experience has shewn that it is so generally the effect of a *want of integrity and principle*, as to justify the saying of a lady of great talents, that *she never could help confounding a convert and a convict.*" Whatever be the fair censor's talents, we demur to her wisdom. If all conversion or change of opinion is to be stigmatized, what is the possible use of debates in Parliament and books of argument? Chillingworth changed his opinions to and fro, but he would, in our judgment, betray something worse than the weakness which this conversion and re-conversion may be

thought to prove, who should charge that admirable man with "want of integrity." But the *convert* and the *convict* are a pretty alliteration for a female tongue, and Lord John Russell has quoted the *jeu d'esprit* somewhat too gravely.

ART. II.—*Supplementary Memoirs of English Catholics, addressed to C. Butler, Esq., Author of the Historical Memoirs of the English Catholics.* By the Rev. J. M., D.D. F. S. A. 8vo. pp. 338. Keating and Brown. 1820.

THE Rev. J. M., is Dr. Milner, the Roman Catholic Vicar Apostolic. From his well-known learning and talents, we expected under the above title a very different and far more valuable work. The "Supplementary Memoirs" are in fact occupied almost entirely with the squabbles of the Catholic body, uninteresting and nearly unintelligible to the Protestant reader; and the Vicar Apostolic seems in compiling them to have had no higher object in view than to *run down* the literary and even moral character of Mr. Butler, whose instructive and liberal work received our commendation [XV. 48—51]. Some of his charges against this gentleman are of a very grave character, but Dr. Milner furnishes us with a decisive proof of the value of his assertions in the following passage, which we shall quote without any other comment than the expression of a wish that the reader would refer to the letters alluded to, inserted in our XIVth Volume, pp. 707—712:

"A certain advocate of impiety, by name Aspland, defending his friend Carile in *The Times* newspaper of last November, appeals with high praises to Mr. C. B.—'s theological works, and particularly to his new Apostles' Creed of eleven articles, published in his *Confessions of Faith* and his *Life of Fenelon.*"—*Note*, p. 194.



## NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

**Specimens of the Russian Poets, with Preliminary Remarks and Biographical Notices.** Translated by John Bowring, F. L. S. 12mo. 8s.

**The Speeches of Sir Samuel Romilly in the House of Commons, with a Memoir of his Life, collected and arranged by William Peter, Esq., with a fine Portrait by Reynolds, after a painting by Sir Thomas Lawrence, R. A.** 2 vols. 8vo. £1. 6s.

**Vindiciæ Britannicæ : a Vindication of the People from the Charge of Blasphemy, and a Defence of the Freedom of the Press.** In Six Letters addressed to W. Wilberforce, Esq., M. P. By Christophilus. 4s. 6d.

**Picturesque Piety; or Scripture Truths, illustrated by 48 beautiful Engravings, with an Original Poem to each, and an Address to Parents.** By the Rev. Isaac Taylor, of Ongar. 2 vols. half-bound. 6s.

**Histoire de la Secte des Amis, suivie d'une Notice sur Madame Fry, et la Prison de Newgate à Londres.** Par Madame Adèle du Thou. 5s.

**The Spirit of Despotism, a new edition.** 8vo. 1s. 6d.

**A Christian Biographical Dictionary, containing an Account of the Lives and Writings of the most distinguished Christians and Theologians of all Religious Denominations and in every Nation, from the Commencement of the Christian Æra.** By John Wilks, Jun. 12mo. 9s.

**Memoirs of the Rev. Mark Wilks, late of Norwich. By His Daughter.** 7s. Portrait.

**Miraculous Prophecies and Predictions of Eminent Men, from the Earliest Records.** 5s.

**The History of Seyd Said, Sultan of Muscat; together with an Account of the Countries and People of the Shores of the Persian Gulph, particularly of the Wahabees.** By Shaik Mansur, a native of Rome, who, after having practised as a physician in many parts of the East, became Commander of the Forces of the Sultan of Muscat, against the Geovas-seom and Wahabee Pirates. 12s. extra boards, with a Plan.

**Travels in various Countries of the East, being a Continuation of Memoirs relating to European and Asiatic Turkey, &c.** Edited by Robert Walpole, M. A. 4to. £3. 3s. Plates.

**The Bioscope; or, Dial of Life explained.** By Granville Penn, Esq. 12mo. with a Plate. 12s.

**The Life of the late George Hill, D. D., Principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews.** By George Cook, D. D., F. R. S. E. 8vo. 10s. 6d. Portrait.

**The Life of Sir Thomas Bernard, Bart.** By the Rev. James Baker, his Nephew and Executor. 8vo. 8s. 6d. Portrait.

**One Hundred and Twenty-six Sepulchral Mottoes; consisting of Original Verses for Epitaphs.** 4s.

**An Illustration of the Liturgy of the Church of England, including an Exposition of the Athanasian Creed, shewing its Scriptural Foundation, &c.** With an Appendix, Historical, Critical and Practical. By T. Pruett, Curate of Dursley, Gloucestershire. 2 vols. Royal 8vo. £1. 14s.

**A General History of the House of Guelph, or Royal Family of Great Britain.** With an Appendix of Authentic and Original Documents. By Andrew Halliday, M. D., Domestic Physician to His Royal Highness the Duke of Clarence. 4to. £2. 10s.

**Zoophilos, or Considerations on the Moral Treatment of Inferior Animals.** By Henry Crowe, A. M.

**A Catechism of Political Economy.** By Jean Baptiste Say, Professor of Political Economy at the Royal Athenæum of Paris. Translated by John Richter. 6s.

**Observations on Mr. Brougham's Education Bill, shewing its Inadequacy to the End proposed, and the danger that will arise from it to the Cause of Religious Liberty.** 8vo. 6d.

**Plain Thoughts on the Abstract of Mr. Brougham's Education Bill, humbly submitted to the Consideration of the Legislature.** By a Plain Englishman. 1s.

**A Brief Reply to the Rev. Richard Lloyd's Letter to a Member of Parliament on the dangerous Defects of the British and Foreign Schools, &c.** By James Shepherd, Treasurer to the City of London Royal British School, for Educating Three Hundred Boys, in Harp Alley, Fleet-market.

**Vindiciæ Hebraicæ; or, a Defence of the Hebrew Scriptures, as a vehicle of Revealed Religion; occasioned by the recent Strictures and Innovations of Mr. J. Bellamy, and in Confutation of his**

Attacks on all preceding Translations, and on the Established Version in particular. By Hyman Hurwitz. 8vo. 9s.

A Reply to the Economists, in Defence of the Answer to Mr. Malthus's Essay on Population. By William Godwin. 8vo. 1s.

Thoughts on the Criminal Prisons of the Country, occasioned by the Bill, now in the House of Commons, for Consolidating and Amending the Laws relating to Prisons; with some Remarks on the Practice of looking to the Taskmaster of the Prison rather than to the Chaplain, for the Reformation of Offenders, and of purchasing the Work of those whom the Law has condemned to Hard Labour as a Punishment, by allowing them to spend a Portion of their Earnings during their Imprisonment. By George Holford, Esq., M. P. 8vo. 2s.

The Exclusion of the Queen from the Liturgy, historically and legally considered. By a Barrister. 2s.

A View of the Sovereign Power, and of the Statute Law, on the Question of the Omission of the Queen's name in the Liturgy of the Church of England. 1s.

Nuptiæ Sacræ; or, An Inquiry into the Scripture Doctrine of Marriage and Divorce. 8vo. 5s. 6d.

Memoirs of the Life of Anne Boleyn, Queen of Henry VIII. By Miss Benger. Small 8vo.

The National Joy on the Abandonment of the Bill of Pains and Penalties, vindicated, in a Letter to a Friend. By John Walker, LL.B., Vicar of Hornchurch, Essex, and late Fellow of New College. Second edition. 1s.

#### *Baptism.*

Thoughts on the Essential Requisites for Church-Communion, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, as they stand connected with Christian Missions: being an Examination of the Sentiments of the Rev. S. Greatheed, F. A. S.; to which are added, some Miscellaneous Essays. By W. Moorhouse, Jun. 4s.

A History of the Baptized Church meeting at Shortwood, in the Parish of Horsley, Gloucestershire, read at a Centenary Commemoration of its Establishment. By William Winterbotham. 8vo. 9s.

#### *Sermons.*

On Infidelity. By the Rev. Andrew Thomson, M. A., Minister of St. George's, Edinburgh. 18mo.

Theology Explained and Defended, in a series of Sermons. By the late Timothy Dwight, S. T. D. LL.D., President of Yale College, in America. 5 vols. 8vo. £3. 10s.

On the Christian Faith and Character.

By the Rev. John Bird Sumner, Prebendary of Durham, and Vicar of Mapledurham, Oxon. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

On the Beatitudes, &c. By the Rev. D. S. Wayland, M. A., Vicar of Kirton in Lindsey. Vol. II. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Two Discourses on the Unity of the Church, its Divisions and their Removal. To which is subjoined, A Short View of the Plan of Religious Reformation, originally adopted in the Secession. By Thomas M'Crie, D. D., Minister of the Gospel, Edinburgh. 12mo.

For Domestic Use; intended to inculcate the great Practical Truths of Christianity. By William Bishop, M. A., Rector of Upton Nervet, Berks. 10s. 6d.

#### *Single.*

The Wisdom and Benevolence of the Deity in the Ordination of Death. A Discourse, occasioned by the Death of the Rev. Thomas Howe, delivered at Bridport, November 26, 1820. By T. Southwood Smith, M. D. 1s. 6d.

The Residence of God in the Church, preached at the Opening of the Poultry Chapel, by the Rev. J. Clayton, Senior. 1s. 6d.

Christian Loyalty (as taught by St. Paul) acceptable to God and beneficial to Mankind, preached in the Parish Church of Wooburn, Bucks, November 12, 1820, By the Rev. Thomas Mortimer, Curate. 1s.

Attention to the Origin and Design of the Gospel recommended, including Observations on the Doctrine of Imputed Righteousness, preached at Whitehaven, July 14, 1820, at the Visitation of the Bishop of Chester. By William Ainger, B. D. 1s.

Preached at Lambeth, November 12, 1820, at the Consecration of the Right Rev. William Carey, D. D., Lord Bishop of Exeter. By the Rev. Edmund Goodenough, D. D., Head Master of Westminster School.

National Gratitude enforced: a Sermon on the Relinquishment of the Bill of Pains and Penalties against Her Majesty, preached at the Independent Chapel, Chalford, Gloucestershire, Nov. 26, 1820. By S. Nicholls. 1s.

"Go and Sin no more:" preached Nov. 26, 1820, at the Evening Lecture in the Parish Church of Sittingbourne. By J. Hodgson, B. A., of Trinity College, Perpetual Curate of Oure, in Kent, and Chaplain to Lord Harris. 8vo. 6d.

Christ Anointed to preach the Gospel to the Poor, preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, December 10, 1820. By J. T. Barrett, D. D. of Peter's College, Cambridge. 6d.

## OBITUARY.

*The Rev. Dr. JAMES LINDSAY.*

To none of our readers scarcely will the melancholy intelligence be new, that the world has been deprived, by an awfully sudden death, of this distinguished friend of truth and liberty. Hereafter, we shall endeavour to do justice to his manly and generous character: at present, we must confine ourselves to the circumstances of his death and interment.

On Wednesday, the 14th instant, the Dissenting Ministers of the Three Denominations had assembled to receive the Report of a Committee previously appointed to consider and watch the progress of Mr. Brougham's Education Bill. There were probably fifty in number. Dr. Rippon was in the chair. The business was opened by Dr. Rees, the chairman of the Committee, who related the substance of a conversation with which Mr. Brougham had favoured the Committee, we think the preceding day. He was followed by Mr. Innes, another member of the Committee, who corroborated Dr. Rees's statements, and added other particulars. It being known that Dr. Lindsay differed in some degree from most of his brethren with regard to the magnitude of the evil involved in the Bill, there was now a general, but friendly call, upon the Doctor, who was also on the Committee, to explain his sentiments. This wish expressed by the Body, proceeded from that cordial respect which they universally entertained for him, and which his uniformly frank and courteous manners never for a moment permitted any difference of opinion to lessen. He rose and spoke with great ability, and with some animation, though not in our judgment with quite his usual energy, for about ten minutes. He did not defend Mr. Brougham's Bill, as has been reported, but maintained that some of its clauses were highly objectionable, and pledged himself to unite with his brethren in an honourable and candid opposition to them: he stated most clearly, however, that such, in his opinion, was the power of education over error and injustice, and even over whatever might be faulty in the plan of education itself, that he would rather have the Bill as it was than risk the postponement of a scheme of national education to an indefinite period. At the same time, no one could have gone farther than he went in

disclaiming all approbation of national religious establishments, and in asserting the principles of Nonconformity. He expressed a more than ordinary warmth of esteem for his brethren around him, and especially for the venerable Dr. Rees, who, he said, would have swayed his mind somewhat differently on the question, if he could have allowed himself to be determined by any authority whatever. He sat down, declaring that he would go with the meeting as far as he could, and that when he could go no further he would make no opposition, but cheerfully yield to the decision of the majority. Mr. Clayton then spoke for two or three minutes, and Dr. Waugh for about the same time. Something dropped by this last gentleman, led Dr. Rees to rise again to explain the *principle* of the Bill, which was not education simply, but education under ecclesiastical patronage. At this moment, the eye of the writer met Dr. Lindsay's, and he assented by a decisive motion of the head to Dr. Rees's explanation, saying, without rising from his seat, "Certainly, I admit it: that is the principle of the Bill." These were his last words. After Dr. Rees had made one or two remarks, and Mr. Innes had thrown in an explanatory sentence, the Secretary, Dr. Morgan, was proceeding to read a series of resolutions proposed by the Committee to the adoption of the meeting, and had advanced to the fourth or fifth, when the attention of the persons around Dr. Lindsay was attracted by a sort of groan, three times repeated. They found him inclining forward on his walking-stick, and on lifting him up, perceived that he had been seized with a fit. A slight convulsive motion of the head and face was observed by the gentleman nearest to him. He was instantly carried into the inner library, and within five or six minutes medical aid was procured; but in vain: pulsation had ceased, and the spirit had fled. Till long after his death was matter of certainty he continued to be surrounded by his sorrowing brethren, one of whom, Dr. Waugh, offered up on the occasion a solemn and deeply impressive prayer to the Almighty.

The shock of this calamity put an end to the business of the meeting; and as soon as the persons present could compose themselves sufficiently to recollect what had passed before their lamented brother's seizure, they congratulated each



other that not the least deviation from urbanity or friendship had taken place in the conversation in which Dr. Lindsay had shared, and, in fact, that no single expression had been uttered which even now any one of the speakers would have wished to retract or alter.

In this public manner did this public-spirited man breathe his last. Such of his brethren of Dr. Williams's Trust as were present, authorized the family of the deceased to make use of the Library-house for the funeral obsequies, and individual ministers of the Three Denominations expressed their wish to follow the remains of their departed brother to the grave. The body lay at Red-Cross Street until Friday, the 23rd instant, when it was removed for interment to Bunhill Fields. The procession consisted of nearly fifty coaches, of which several were the private carriages of his friends, and six were filled by former pupils of the excellent man now carried to his long home. The concourse of people was very great, both around the library and in the burial-ground. The corpse was preceded by Dr. Rees and Mr. Barrett: the latter delivered an appropriate address and prayer at the grave. The pall was borne by the following ministers of the Presbyterian body, according to seniority: Mr. Belsham, Mr. Coates, Dr. T. Rees, Mr. Aspland, Mr. Fox, and Mr. Mallison. Then followed the family: after whom came the personal friends of the deceased, the members of his congregation, (about 80 in number,) and ministers of the Three Denominations. More genuine honour was never paid to any man's memory; and in this rarely-witnessed deep and general expression of respect was remarkably exemplified Dr. Lindsay's own favourite principle, laid down in the preface to his sermons, (see Mon. Repos. XV. 37,) "that in the end firmness and consistency will secure more esteem even from those to whom we refuse to yield, than the sycophancy of those despicable characters, who become all things to all men for the sake of popularity or filthy lucre."

Dr. Lindsay was in his 67th year, and had been upwards of thirty-five years minister of the Presbyterian congregation in Monkwell-Street. Four daughters survive him.

We lament to announce the death, after a short illness, on the 18th inst., of the Rev. WM. BLAKE, of Crewkerne, Somerset. Some correspondent will, no doubt, furnish us with further particulars of this exemplary Christian minister.

1820. April 2, at *Castle Howard, Ireland*, WILLIAM PARNELL, Esq., M. P. Mr. Parnell was distinguished in private society for the amiableness of his manners, and for the suavity and intelligence of his conversation. He deservedly ranked high in letters and in politics for his general acquirements, but more especially for his writings, "*The Causes of Popular Discontents in Ireland*," and "*The Apology for the Catholics*:" works which have been greatly esteemed by the highest authorities for their elegance of style, the statesmanlike principles which they enforce, and the pure patriotism of the author. Had Mr. Parnell lived, the attention which he was in the habit of giving in Parliament to Irish affairs would have been productive, ere long, of lasting benefits to his country. Time only was wanting to enable him to give effect to those plans, which had been his constant study from his earliest years, for relieving Ireland from her grievances, and for ameliorating the condition of all classes of her people, in wealth, in manners, and in morals. The following lines are from the poems of the late Mrs. Henry Tighe:

To. W. P., Esq. Avondale.

"We wish for thee, dear friend! for  
summer eve  
Upon thy loveliest landscape never cast  
Looks of more lingering sweetness than  
the last;  
The slanting sun, reluctant to bereave  
Thy woods of beauty, fondly seemed  
to leave  
Smiles of the softest light, that slowly  
past  
In bright succession o'er each charm thou  
hast  
Thyself so oft admired. And we  
might grieve  
Thine eye of taste should ever wander  
hence,  
O'er scenes less lovely than thine  
own; but here  
Thou wilt return, and feel thy home  
more dear,  
More dear the Muse's gentler influence;  
When on the busy world, with Wisdom's  
smile,  
And heart uninjured, thou hast gazed  
awhile."

1821. Jan. 5, at *Blandford*, in the 88th year of his age, the Rev. HENRY FIELD, who had been engaged in the ministry at that place for a period of 67 years, and was regarded as the father of the Dissenting ministers in the county of Dorset.

Jan. 7. In Holles Street, Cavendish Square, in the 79th year of her age, Mrs. ANNE HUNTER, widow of that distinguished physiologist, John Hunter. She was the eldest daughter of Mr. Robert Home, an eminent surgeon, first in the army and latterly at the Savoy. To her we are indebted for many popular lyric effusions—the stanzas “On November, 1784,” (inserted in our XIVth Volume, p. 636,) “Queen Mary’s Lament;” “the Death-song of Alknomook, the Indian Warrior,” &c. When Haydn passed a season in London, Mrs. Hunter became the Muse of that celebrated composer; and his beautiful Canzonets were composed on words which she supplied. Most of these are original, and particularly the pathetic song of “My mother bids me bind my hair;” first written as accommodated to an air of Pleydell’s; and then beginning with what is now the second stanza, “’Tis sad to think the days are gone.” The elegant authoress collected her poems in a small volume, published about twenty years ago. She lived in retirement, but enjoyed select literary society. Her character is highly, and we believe deservedly eulogized, by such as had the honour of her acquaintance.

Feb. 2, at *Taunton*, in the 83rd year of her age, Mrs. ELIZABETH HURLEY. In early life she was connected with the Calvinistic Baptists, but on subsequent reflection was induced to forsake their communion, and became a decided Unitarian. She was, during a long course of years a regular attendant on the ministry of the Rev. Dr. Toulmin. Her religious faith was adorned by a consistent life, and numerous were her acts of disinterested kindness and generosity; but to publish her virtues now would be little consistent with her wishes and the modest retirement of her life. “Her record is on high.” May those who have had the benefit of her example, emulate her virtues; and may he who has ever experienced from her more than parental kindness, and who now pays this humble but sincere tribute of respect to her memory, fulfil the pious wishes and prayers of her who was his best, his earliest and his dearest friend.

O. J.

— 7, in his 55th year, at *Lichfield*, the venerable and Rev. EDMUND OUTRAM, D. D., Archdeacon of Derby, Chancellor and Vicar-General of the Diocese, Canon, Residentiary Prebend, and Treasurer of the Cathedral, Lichfield, Master of St.

John’s Hospital, Domestic and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop, a Magistrate for the counties of Warwick and Stafford, and Rector of St. Philip’s Church, Birmingham. Whilst conversing with a pensioner of St. John’s, he was suddenly seized with an affection in his head which baffled the aid of medical skill in the space of half an hour. The general regret expressed on this melancholy occasion is the best testimony to the distinguished worth of this excellent man, for it may with great truth be said, that few persons have possessed, in so high a degree as Dr. Outram, the cordial esteem and respect of every class of his neighbours and of every variety of religious denomination among us. To the attainments of an excellent scholar were added the urbanity of the gentleman, and the mild and conciliatory spirit of the Christian minister: though decidedly attached to our established institutions in Church and State, he appears to have acted under the influence of that divine injunction, “If it be possible, as much as lieth in you live peaceably with all men,” and, therefore, on all occasions he manifested a due respect for the temperate and conscientious expression of opinions from which his principles compelled him to dissent. In the maturity of his years, possessing high and influential stations—ready, as far as his health would allow him, to every benevolent work—beloved and venerated by his parishioners, and deeply lamented by all. The public and personal virtues of such a man as the late Dr. Outram will long be remembered in this place; they are his best relicts, and they will then be most honoured by his survivors when contemplated by them as models for imitation.

— 9, in his 60th year, the Rev. Dr. NICOL, upwards of 25 years minister of the Scots Church, Swallow Street.

— 11, at *Richmond*, aged 90, Mr. ADAM WALKER, the late celebrated lecturer in experimental philosophy. His ingenious mind was ever active in the pursuit of science, and his original invention of that beautiful machine the Eidouranion or Transparent Orrery, and the Celestina, the great revolving lights on the Isle of Scilly and Cromer, by which, under Providence, thousands of lives and property have been saved, the warm air-stove under the House of Lords and Italian Opera-house, the present mail-coach, &c., still remain as proofs.

# INTELLIGENCE.

## DOMESTIC.

### RELIGIOUS.

#### *The Quarterly Meeting of Unitarian Ministers in South Wales.*

THE Quarterly Meeting of Unitarian Ministers in South Wales was held at Aberdâr, Glamorganshire, on Thursday the 28th of December, 1820. Two discourses were delivered at the place of meeting in the evening of the day preceding; one by Mr. J. Griffiths, of Llandyfaen, Carmarthenshire, from 2 John 9; and the other by J. James, of Gelli-Onnen, Glamorganshire, from 1 Tim. i. 15, and the introductory service of reading and praying was conducted by Mr. Wm. Williams, of Blaen-y-gwrach, Glamorganshire. The hymns were all given out by the minister of the place. Mr. Thomas Evans. Mr. J. Davies, of Capel-y-Groes and Ystrad, introduced on the 28th, and Mr. J. Thomas, of Pant-y-defaid, both in Cardiganshire, preached the sermon from John i. 4, and concluded with a short prayer, when the meeting was converted into an open conference, by the unanimous call of Mr. Evans, the minister of the place, into the chair. The question proposed from the chair was, Whether the Person of Christ consisted of two natures? Mr. David John, of St. Clears, spoke at some length, and with general and great approbation, in defence of the negative side of the question, and several others made short observations on the same side, but no one opened his mouth in support of the doctrine of two natures forming the one person of Christ. The meeting was respectably attended, and appeared to afford general satisfaction.

The next meeting is to be held at Wick, Glamorganshire, on Thursday the 26th of April next; Mr. J. Davies, of Capel-y-Groes and Ystrad, Cardiganshire, to preach the sermon, and the Nature and End of Sacrifices is the subject to be discussed at the conference.

J. JAMES.

January 19th, 1821.

#### *Quarterly Meeting of the Presbyterian Ministers of Manchester.*

THE Christmas Quarterly Meeting of the Presbyterian Ministers of Manchester and its vicinity, was held at Manchester on the 4th of January, in the Chapel of the Rev. John James Tayler. The Rev. Mr. Brooks of Hyde, performed the intro-

ductory devotional services, and the Rev. Mr. Elliott, of Rochdale, preached the sermon, from Psalm cxli. 5. The preacher expatiated with much interest upon the duty of administering reproof; and particularly enforced its obligation, as a most important, but much-neglected branch of the pastoral character. A select number of friends afterwards dined together, and the afternoon was passed in pleasing and instructive conversation. A new interest seemed to be excited in the support of these meetings, which, it is to be regretted, have been for some time upon the decline, but which, conducted and supported with proper spirit, might be rendered eminently serviceable to the cause of truth and of rational Christianity.

W. H., Sec.

#### *A List of the Committee of Deputies appointed to protect the Civil Rights of the Three Denominations of Protestant Dissenters, for the Year 1821.*

William Smith, Esq., M. P., Chairman, Philpot Lane; Joseph Gutteridge, Esq., Deputy Chairman, Camberwell; James Collins, Esq., Treasurer, Spital Square; Edward Busk, Esq., Pump Court, Temple; James Esdaile, Esq., Bunhill Row; W. A. Hankey, Esq., Fenchurch Street; David Bevan, Esq., Walthamstow; Joseph Bunnell, Esq., Southampton Row, Bloomsbury; John Bentley, Esq., Highbury; William Titford, Esq., Turner Square, Hoxton; James Gibson, Esq., Lime Street, Fenchurch Street; John Christie, Esq., Hackney Wick; William Freme, Esq., Catherine Court, Tower Hill; Robert Wainewright, Esq., Gray's Inn Square; Samuel Jackson, Esq., Hackney; Benjamin Shaw, Esq., London Bridge-foot; Henry Waymouth, Esq., Wandsworth Common; Thomas Wood, Esq., Little St. Thomas Apostle, Queen Street; William Marston, Esq., East Street, Red Lion Square; Joseph Stornard, Esq., Stamford Hill; George Hammond, Esq., Whitechapel; B. P. Witts, Esq., Friday Street; Robert Winter, Esq., Bedford Row; Joseph Benwell, Esq., Battersea.

WE are informed that the Annual Sermon, recommending the Society established for the relief of the *Necessitous Widows and Children of Protestant Dissenting Ministers*, will be preached, on Wednesday the 4th of April, by the Rev.



W. J. Fox, at the Old Jewry Chapel, (removed to Jewin Street, Aldersgate Street). Service to begin at Twelve o'Clock.

#### ECCLESIASTICAL PROMOTIONS.

The Right Rev. C. M. Warburton, D. D., Bishop of Limerick, to the Bishopric of *Cloyne*.

The Rev. T. Elrington, D. D., to the Bishopric of *Limerick*.

Dr. Kyle appointed the new Provost of the University of Dublin. He was previously a resident fellow of Trinity College.

The Rev. Henry Phillpotts, Prebendary of Durham, has been presented to the living of *Stanhope in Weardale*, in that diocese, *vice* Hardinge, deceased; and the Bishop of St. David's (Dr. Burgess) succeeds to the first *prebendal stall*, void by the cession of Mr. Phillpotts; and the Rev. John Bird Sumner, M. A., of Eton, to the vacant prebend.

The Rev. H. H. Norris, Curate of St. John's at Hackney, to a prebendal stall at Landaff.

The Rev. R. Stevens, M. A., to be Dean of Rochester in the place of Dr. W. B. Busby, deceased.

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

##### *Proceedings of Royal Society.*

Sir Humphry Davy was lately elected President of the Royal Society, in the room of Sir Joseph Banks, deceased, Lord Colchester, the late Speaker of the House of Commons, was a competitor with Sir Humphry, but the latter obtained a great majority of votes. The Society consisted of 1066 members at the time of Sir Joseph's death.

Sir Humphry Davy took the chair as President, in the sitting of Dec. 7, and delivered an able and elegant discourse on the objects of the Society, and its relation to other scientific institutions, which he concluded by expressing his confidence that the Fellows of the Royal Society, in all their future researches, would be guided "by that spirit of philosophy, awakened by our great masters, Bacon and Newton; that sober and cautious method of inductive reasoning, which is the germ of truth and of permanency in all the sciences. I trust," he said, "that those amongst us who are so fortunate as to kindle the light of new discoveries, will use them, not for the purpose of dazzling the organs of our intellectual vision, but rather to enlighten us by shewing objects in their true forms and colours. That our philosophers will attach no importance to hypotheses, ex-

cept as leading to the research after facts, so as to be able to discard or adopt them at pleasure; treating them rather as parts of the scaffolding of the building of science, than as belonging either to its foundations, materials or ornaments:—that they will look, where it be possible, to practical applications in science; not, however, forgetting the dignity of their pursuit, the noblest end of which is to exalt the powers of the human mind, and to increase the sphere of intellectual enjoyment by enlarging our views of nature, and of the power, wisdom and goodness of the Author of nature."

##### *Horton Academy.*

This important institution for the education of ministers in the Independent connexion, educates forty students. Its managers have made an appeal to the public, on the ground of "great inadequacy of funds." They say that "during the last three years, thirty-six valuable ministers have been sent out; and nineteen have, within the same period, been successful in raising new interests in considerable towns, in which new chapels have been, or are soon to be, erected."

##### *Ireland.*

AN unusual calm has prevailed for some time in this country, so long agitated with fierce storms and destructive tempests. To what is this owing? In part, we believe, to the wisdom and liberality of the government, and especially to the temper and conduct of the Right Hon. Charles Grant, Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, and the acting minister for Ireland. This gentleman is the object of virulent abuse to the High-Church party in that country, and a Letter has been addressed to him by a writer under the signature of Anglo-Hibernus, arraiging him of the high crime of associating with the open or insidious enemies of the Established Church, of encouraging all the institutions of the sectaries, and of stretching out the hand of patronage to the Roman Catholics and their priests. The revilings of this Letter, which are eagerly repeated by the Antijacobin Review, are in the highest degree honourable to Mr. Grant. But for them, the attention of the English public would not perhaps have been drawn to his enlightened, liberal policy. In proportion as bigots hate and traduce, candid and impartial men will respect and honour him, and we feel ourselves doing only an act of justice in challenging the gratitude of our readers on his behalf, as one of the benefactors of Ireland.

LITERARY.

*Royal Society of Literature.*

THIS is a new and somewhat singular institution. More, we suspect, is meant by it than meets the eye. There has been a complaint of the talents employed by the press in opposition to ministers, and this may be an attempt to enlist literature in the service of what is so facetiously called *loyalty*.

The Society is professedly instituted "for the Encouragement of Indigent Merit, and the Promotion of General Literature," and is to consist of honorary members, subscribing members and associates.

The class of honorary members is intended to comprise some of the most eminent literary men in the three kingdoms, and the most distinguished female writers of the present day.

An annual subscription of two guineas will constitute a subscribing member. Subscribers of ten guineas, and upwards, will be entitled to the privileges hereafter mentioned, according to the date of their subscription.

The class of associates is to consist of twenty men of distinguished learning, authors of some creditable work of literature, and men of good moral character; ten under the patronage of the King, and ten under the patronage of the Society.

His Majesty has been pleased to express, in the most favourable terms, his approbation of the proposed Society, and to honour it with his munificent patronage, by assigning an annual sum of one hundred guineas each, to ten of the associates, payable out of the privy purse; and also an annual premium of one hundred guineas for the best dissertation on some interesting subject, to be chosen by a council belonging to the Society.

Ten associates will be placed under the patronage of the Society, as soon as the subscriptions (a large portion of which will be annually funded for the purpose) shall be sufficient, and in proportion as they become so. An annual subscriber of ten guineas, continued for five years, or a life subscription of 100 guineas, will entitle such subscribers to nominate an associate under the Society's patronage, according to the date of their subscription.

The associates under the patronage of the King will be elected by respected and competent judges. The associates nominated by subscribers must have the same qualifications of learning, moral character, and public principle, as those who are elected, and must be approved by the same judges.

Every associate, at his admission, will choose some subject, or subjects, of literature for discussion, and will engage to devote such discussions to the Society's memoirs of literature, of which a volume will be published by the Society from time to time; in which memoirs will likewise be inserted the successive prize dissertations.

From the months of February to July, it is proposed that a weekly meeting of the Society shall be held, and a monthly meeting during the other six months of the year.

His Majesty, says the *Gentleman's Magazine*, has intrusted the formation of this Institution to the learned and eminent Dr. THOMAS BURGESS, Bishop of St. David's. Other branches of the Royal Family have become subscribers; ministers give their aid; many of the most distinguished among the clergy concur in promoting the plan; and the leading members of both Universities are among its friends. The funds are already considerable; and his Majesty may be considered as the *personal* as well as Royal Founder and Patron of the Society. The first *Prize Questions* are as follows:

*Premiums for 1821 and 1822.*

1. The King's Premium of *One Hundred Guineas*, for the best Dissertation on the Age, Writings and Genius of Homer; and on the State of Religion, Society, Learning and the Arts, during that period, collected from the writings of Homer.
2. The Society's Premium of *Fifty Guineas*, for the best Poem on Dartmoor.
3. The Society's Premium of *Twenty-five Guineas*, for the best Essay on the History of the Greek language; of the present language of Greece, especially in the Ionian Islands; and on the Difference between Ancient and Modern Greek.

THE United Body of SCOTCH SECEDERS have commenced a magazine at Glasgow, under the title of "The Christian Recorder." The Prospectus is altogether a manifesto of the church militant. The worthy Scots who compiled it thus speak of a portion of their brethren: "We are sorry indeed to be under the necessity of adding, that those usually known by the name of *English Presbyterians* have long ago forsaken the faith of the gospel, and drunk deep at the streams of the Arian and Socinian heresies." These infallible Presbyterians further promise "the friends of truth" regular bulletins of "the position and strength of the *enemies' forces*, whether under the designation of Heathen Idolaters, Deluded Ma-

homedans, Ignorant and Superstitious Papists, Free-thinking Infidels, or Rational Christians." Still, the aforesaid literary and religious purveyors promise that one part of the work shall be an "Intelligencer;" which metaphorical personage is to "know no party," but is to be "at once a Baptist, a Methodist, a Moravian, a Presbyterian, an Independent, an Episcopalian, and even a Papist and a Unitarian:" yet this creature of fancy and of all religions is to be no better than a spy of the Scottish Burghers and Anti-Burghers; for his spiritual metamorphoses are to be all adopted in order to enable him never to "lose sight of the enemy." *Simulation* has heretofore succeeded in commerce; it may answer with the United Seceders from the Kirk. But we would whisper, if our feeble voice can reach the adventurers, that the English market is overstocked with this species of wares; and that though Scottish literature and science always find their price South of the Tweed, there is no encouragement to the importation of Scottish sectarian bigotry.

DR. REID is preparing for the press a

new edition of his *Essays on Hypochondriasis and Nervous Affections*.

In the press, *Sermons for Families*, by the Rev. WILLIAM BROWN, of Enfield.

Mr. W. Faux, an English farmer, has issued proposals for publishing the following work:—"Memorable Days in America, being a Journal of Tours, Voyages, Visits and Visitations, made in the Years 1819-20, from England to the United States, principally for ascertaining, by Positive Evidence, the Condition and probable Prospects of British Emigrants, and the consequent Good or Evils of Emigration generally; as exemplified by the Author's Personal Examination of the Enterprize and Economy of M. Birkbeck, Esq., the Flower Family, and other distinguished Refugees. The whole interspersed with Anecdotes and Examples, intended to shew Men and Things as they are in America. To which are added, new and interesting Facts relating to a recent Commercial Intercourse with the Aborigines of the North-West Coast and the Islands of the South Sea."

## CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from Messrs. Frend; Thomas Foster; Cogan; M'Cready (of Cork); S. Gibbs (Plymouth Dock); and J. Smethurst; W. J. (Manchester); T. C. H. (Edinburgh); T. F. (Liverpool); Q in the Corner; C. B.; Theophilus (Bristol); E. T.; and G. M. D.

The remarks in the last volume on the *Quakers' Yearly Epistle* have occasioned several Communications to be made to us by members of that denomination, some of which will be inserted in the next number.

We are requested by "The Editor of the Apocryphal New Testament" to say, that he means to propose for the next number some defence of himself, in relation to the animadversions of our Reviewer (pp. 39—41).

Some singular and interesting MSS. of Mr. JOHN FOX's, formerly of Plymouth, have come into our possession, and will be laid before our readers in our successive numbers. Mr. Fox was educated for the ministry amongst the Nonconformists, and was the contemporary and friend of Archbishop Secker, Dr. Chandler, Mr. Peirce, and other eminent men; and the MSS. consist of his own *Memoirs*, written with great liveliness, and containing many curious particulars relating to himself and others; of *Biographical Sketches* of some leading Dissenting Ministers of the West of England; and of *Letters* to himself from Secker and Chandler.

An Engraved PORTRAIT of the late Rev. JOSEPH BRETLAND, of Exeter, was given with the last number, which we mention lest any of the copies should have been accidentally delivered without it.

Volume XV. may be had of the Publishers in boards, price 18s. 6d.; as may also single Numbers of that Volume, and the preceding Volumes and Numbers which are not out of print. They have also on sale a complete set of the work in half-binding.

Communications are requested to be addressed (*post paid*) to the Publishers only; to whom likewise, or the Printer, ADVERTISEMENTS must be sent and paid for on delivery. The Editor receives no Advertisements.